

PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt / Egyptology

EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CULTURE AND CO- PRODUCTION LEADERSHIP BELIEF: DOES BELIEF HAVE IMPACT ON FOLLOWER OBEDIENCE AND CONSTRUCTIVE RESISTANCE?

Joko Suyono Risgiyanti, Sinto Sunaryo, Sarjiyanto, Adnan Effendi*
Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia

(*Corresponding author's e-mail: jokosu_feb@staff.uns.ac.id)

Joko Suyono Risgiyanti, Sinto Sunaryo, Sarjiyanto, Adnan Effendi, examining the relationship between culture and co-production leadership belief: does belief have impact on follower obedience and constructive resistance? – PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology 17(9s) (2020), ISSN 1567-214X.

Keywords: co-production Leadership, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, obedience, constructive resistance

Abstract

Discussion on leadership and followership cannot be separated from cultural aspects such as system of norms, beliefs, and values. The present study aims to examine the effect of cultural values on co-production leadership belief which emerges as one of the followers' role in the leadership process. This study also examines the co-production Leadership belief in followers' obedience and constructive resistance. The population of the study was all civil servants in Surakarta and Salatiga city. The sample was selected using cluster random sampling, out of 400 questionnaires that were distributed, 263 were returned. The hypothesis was tested using Structural Equation Modeling-Partial Least Square (SEM-PLS) using WarpPLS 6.0. The present study found that power distance negatively affects co-production leadership belief, while uncertainty avoidance and collectivism positively affect co-production leadership belief. The present study proves that co-production leadership belief positively affects obedience and constructive resistance. This finding extends the existing concept of followership, particularly co-production leadership, which is still understudied.

Introduction

Leadership plays a pivotal role in organization life and emerges as a widely studied phenomenon. It cannot be separated from a long history of leadership literature in organizational study (Torres, 2014). Most of the existing leadership theories emphasize the leader itself, stating that followers passively respond to their leader's action and behavior (Baker, 2007). These leader-centered theories have been widely studied and enjoy their status as stable theories nowadays.

Recent studies begin to study the role of followers through follower-centered approach (Howell & Shamir, 2005; Shamir, 2007). Studies on followership realize followers as the main focus and explore how followers' behavior is associated with organizational outcome. Growing bodies of

followership study fill the gap in leadership literature concerning the complexity of followers' role in the leadership process (Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009). Thus, followership becomes the main concept underlying studies on followers. It is defined as the extent to which an individual believes that the followers' role covers a collaboration with the leader to advance the mission of the organization and to achieve optimal productivity (Carsten & Uhl-Bien, 2013).

Following this concept, followers hold a variety of beliefs about the role that they should play in the leadership process (Carsten, Uhl-bien, West, Patera, & Mcgregor, 2010). One of the beliefs that define the leader-follower's relationship is co-production leadership. Co-production leadership refers to a follower's belief that their role in the leadership process as the leader's partner in achieving a crucial organizational outcome (Carsten & Uhl-Bien, 2012). Moreover, Shamir (2007) states that co-production leadership covers leader-follower collaboration to affect organization achievement so that this kind of belief deserves to be given more attention in the leadership process. Due to a lack of previous research addressed about co-production leadership, the researchers call for the importance of a more in-depth understanding of the follower's belief in their role within co-production leadership and its impact on the organization (Carsten & Uhl-Bien, 2013; Shamir, 2007; Uhl-bien, Riggio, Lowe, & Carsten, 2014).

In its development, discussion on leadership and followership cannot be separated from cultural aspects such as system of norms, beliefs, and values (Lawrence, 2017). Culture acts as a powerful element that may affect interpersonal communication and establish an implicit view regarding their leader in a followership scheme (Bartram, 2012). Individuals who are involved in the leadership process should interact and influence people from different cultural values (Alon & Higgins, 2005; Ngunjiri & Madsen, 2015). An effective leader needs to consider cultural values, respect diversity, and develop flexible leadership (Lawrence, 2017). However, studies on the effect of different cultural values on followership is still scarce (Blair & Bligh, 2018). Therefore, it is necessary to conduct a study that reveals about the time and the way how cultural differences affect the followers' belief regarding their role within a leadership process.

Eventually, followers' belief in interaction with their leader through co-production leadership may determine their obedience. In this regard, followers may perceive that the leader's legitimacy makes them powerless so that they hold no other option than to obey the leader (Carsten & Uhl-Bien, 2012). Furthermore, followers feel that they should stand in a lower position than their leader, obey them due to their lower organizational rank requires them to do so (Baker, 2007; Ravlin & Thomas, 2005).

In addition to the followers' obedience, co-production leadership may also result in followers' constructive resistance. Constructive resistance is basically the form of followers' rejection to blindly obey their leader. Constructive resistance may arise when a follower thinks that his leader tends to show unethical behavior (Blass, 2009). Another study conducted by Blass (1991) assert that personality and social belief can predict the followers' obedience/disobedience toward unethical leader's order. Furthermore, Blass (1991) explains that an individual's belief in status and authority difference may account for followers' obedience or disobedience. Such disobedience may be exhibited in the form of constructive resistance. According to Tepper, Duffy, & Shaw (2001), constructive resistance occurs when a follower directly

expresses an alternative suggestion towards their leader's instruction or states the reason for rejection. In this situation, followers employ resistance strategy to open a dialog with the leader when they perceive their leader's instruction is illogical.

Follower-centered paradigm emerges as a new issue in the regional government of Indonesia where its organizational structure is bureaucratic structure. According to Prasojo & Rudita (2014), the government's bureaucratic issues that require serious attention is related to the establishment of the leadership of change. The existing composition of bureaucratic human resource seems to be difficult to promote changes and development. The existing structure results in slow bureaucratic movement and less attentive on the changes. This bureaucratic structure tends to result in formal hierarchical roles, where in this context, followers possess lower self-expectation, which makes them feel reticent to provide suggestions to their leaders (Uhl-Bien & Pillai, 2007). Followers' belief about the co-production leadership provides an opportunity to develop leader-follower interaction that provides a more significant portion for the follower's role. Accordingly, they do not blindly obey their leader but may provide a constructive suggestion for the development of the organization. Therefore, the present study aims to examine the effect of cultural aspect (i.e. power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and collectivism) on co-production leadership practice and its influence on obedience and constructive resistance.

The present study provides several contributions. First, the present study gives an essential contribution to the followership literature. First, this study provides insight on how cultural aspects and followers' behavior associated with belief in co-production leadership. As it has been described above, the present study is a response to the suggestion from previous researchers (Carsten & Uhl-Bien, 2012; Shamir, 2007; Uhl-Bien, Riggio, Lowe, & Carsten, 2014) to understand further about co-production leadership and its relationship with culture, which is still understudied. Second, the present study employed civil servants as the subject, which is very different from the previous study (Carsten & Uhl-bien, 2012, 2017; Torres, 2014). In other words, this study may add a reference especially regarding the concept of co-production leadership that has not been examined on the public organizations, that is undoubtedly different from the nature of general business organizations. Public organization is tending to more focus on regulatory implementation and service delivery to citizens, and operate within unique constitutional framework and financially constrained context (Ferguson, Ronayne, & Rybacki, 2016).

Literature Review

Followership

In the field of organizational study, followership gains less attention from scholars (Uhl-bien et al., 2014). However, the role of followership cannot be put aside. Leadership occurs only when it has a follower - without a follower, there will never be a leader. Thus, followership is a pivotal component in the leadership process. In the followership context, follower's behavior reflects the willingness to obey other parties in some certain manners (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Bjugstad, Thach, Thompson, & Morris (2006) define followership as an ability to effectively follow instructions and to support the leader's attempt to maximizing a structured organization. According to Blackshear (2004),

followership refers to a relationship between follower and leader. One party acts as co-dependent while another party becomes dependent. Furthermore, Blackshear (2004) explains that followership can emerge in a situation where organized, or unorganized, or shared leadership exists.

The growing body of research on followership exhibit a variety of view on the follower's role in a leadership process. Some perspectives view that followers construct their role in a traditional definition, i.e., fully obey the leader. Whereas other perspectives view that followers construct their role in a partnership and contribution context and focus on involvement like their leader (for instance, to influence, to voice, and to make a decision) (Carsten and Uhl-Bien, 2012). According to Blackshear (2004), successful followership is determined by some factors as follow: (a) belief in the vision, mission, and goal of organization; (b) willingness to set aside personal interest for common interest; (c) loyalty; and (d) focus.

Kelley's model categorizes followers in terms of dimension of thought and action. In the dimension of thought, an independent and critical thinking follower consider the impact of their actions, they act as a creative and innovative individual and give criticism. Otherwise, dependent and uncritical follower only perform their leader instruction and accept the leader's thought (Bjugstad et al., 2006). The second dimension, the dimension of action, is used to determine the follower's action. An active follower takes the initiative in making a decision, while passive follower only does what he is instructed to (Bjugstad et al., 2006).

Co-production Leadership

Ample body of research on followership exist, one of them examines individuals' belief in their role as a follower in a leadership process (Carsten & Uhl-bien, 2009; Carsten et al., 2010). One of the beliefs in followers' role orientation that is believed to be able to provide better contributions to an organization is co-production leadership. This concept extends the literature on leadership that mostly use leader-centric approaches. (Carsten et al., 2010; Uhl-bien et al., 2014).

In the prior study, Carsten and Uhl-Bien (2009) develop a measure of follower's belief in co-production leadership. Co-production leadership exhibits leader-follower involvement in determining a crucial organizational outcome (Carsten & Uhl-Bien, 2012). It measures to what extent an individual believes that they act as their leader's partner in achieving positive leadership outcome together. Furthermore, when acting as a follower, these individuals mostly behave based on their belief. Carsten & Uhl-bien (2009) found that the follower's belief in co-production leadership is positively and significantly associated with voice behavior, and is negatively associated with power distance and authority legitimacy. Overall, the result of the study suggests that the follower's belief in co-production is associated with how an individual performs his role in the organization.

Individuals with strong co-production leadership belief may serve as proactive followers (Carsten & Uhl-Bien, 2012; Uhl-bien et al., 2014). This belief leads them to exhibit active behaviors by collaborating with their leaders in order to improve their work unit's performance. Such individuals believe that followers play an integral role within a leadership process (Carsten & Uhl-Bien, 2013). In contrast, those with weak co-production leadership belief tend to be passive followers. (Carsten & Uhl-Bien, 2012; Uhl-bien et al., 2014). These individuals believe that their leader knows best for their work unit, accordingly, they will merely obey and respect their leaders' decisions (Carsten & Uhl-Bien, 2013).

Hypotheses Development

Cultural Values and Co-Production Leadership

In Co-production leadership, a leader emphasizes the follower's participation as his partner. In today's rapidly changing environment, a leader faces inevitable complex issues, including cultural diversity. Culture is often depicted as a set of mental map that distinguishes a group of an individual from others (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010). Culture emerges as a powerful element that affects communication, shapes implicit views on the leader, and informs follower when they develop a scheme of follower (Bartram, 2012). Accordingly, culture holds a pivotal role in follower-centered co-production leadership. It is helpful to focus on national culture since it provides a metric to differ and to predict human responses (Hofstede et al., 2010). Cultural factor is believed to contribute to the implicit leader's belief and the possibility of followership scheme (Hofstede et al., 2010; Popper, 2015). Individuals who are involved in the leadership process should interact and influence people from different cultural values (Alon & Higgins, 2005; Madsen and Ngunjiri, 2015). Carsten et al. suggest to conduct a study on co-production beliefs in different cultural backgrounds (Carsten & Uhl-Bien, 2012; Carsten et al., 2010). Some of the cultural elements in the form of power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and collectivism may affect follower-centered leadership like co-production.

In studying the effect of culture on co-production leadership belief, values related to hierarchy and inequality are pivotal (Blair & Bligh, 2018). One of the cultural elements is power distance, it relates to the extent to which a powerful individual receives unequal power distribution. (Hofstede et al., 2010). In other words, power distance measures the extent to which an individual receives unequal power distribution within an organization. A culture with high level of power distance is closely related to higher acceptance towards hierarchical differences and higher obedience toward the leader. Power distance that reflects the distance of authority between a leader and a follower will determine the perception of co-production leadership.

Followers with high power distance orientation tend to adhere to the authority and are more prepared to accept their status differences (Adsit, London, Crom, & Jones, 1997). Such followers tend to expect their leader to provide solutions for their work-related problems and to drive each of their actions (Farh, Earley, & Lin, 1997). In other words, followers with high power distance orientation will exhibit blind obedience toward their leader's instruction (Newman & Butler, 2014). Cultural values with high power distance tend to create greater social distance and demand employees to show respect, loyalty, and obedience toward the figure of authority (Farh, Hackett, & Liang, 2007).

In contrast, followers with low power distance orientation tend to possess high involvement within a leadership process and actively participate in the decision-making process (Newman & Butler, 2014). In other words, they actively work with their leader to seek solutions for their work-related problems. Followers possess opportunities to negotiate conditions, rules, and expectations with their leader only when the social and power distance between a leader and a follower is relatively low (Farh et al., 2007). This is supported by previous study which found that followers with low power distance orientation tended to actively collaborate with their leader to improve their unit's performance (Lawrence, 2017). Put differently, they possess high co-production leadership belief. They believe that they act as a leader's partner within a leadership process in order to achieve the expected outcomes.

Based on the description above, the following hypothesis is formulated:

Hypothesis 1a: Power distance is negatively associated with co-production leadership belief

Likewise, uncertainty avoidance that depicts an individual's response to the uncertainty can also influence follower's role orientation. Uncertainty avoidance refers to the extent to which a member of community feels discomfort with regard to unstructured and ambiguous situations (Ergeneli et al., 2007). Put differently, they prefer an ordered, structured situation, where such a situation increases their dependence on clear procedures, strategies that are proven to be effective, and well-understood regulation in order to minimize discomfort due to unknown situations. Further, Ergeneli et al., (2007) state that followers with higher cultural values of uncertainty avoidance tend to have low self-efficacy. Such individuals prefer specialist positions, resist changes, and tend to avoid competition and risks.

Since these individuals emphasize more on rules and procedures, leaders in an environment with high cultural values of uncertainty avoidance face more demands from their followers compared to those in environments with lower cultural values of uncertainty avoidance where the followers are more tolerant with ambiguity and innovative behavior (Koopman, Den Hartog, Konrad, & al, 1999). Followers with high values of uncertainty avoidance also tend to have lower assertiveness and are reticent to make decision and take responsibility (Ones, Anderson, Viswesvaran, & Sinangil, 2018). Therefore, they tend to exhibit less participation in decision-making processes in order to avoid responsibilities (Yan & Hunt, 2005). For instance, they are reticent to receive additional responsibilities when they express their ideas in a meeting because they are afraid to be blamed by their leaders when making a mistake while receiving those responsibilities. Hence, the leadership style in high cultural values of uncertainty avoidance tends to be directive, not participative leadership, (Taras, Kirkman, & Steel, 2010) the leaders also tend to be less delegating and less approachable (Offermann & Hellmann, 1997).

The description above indicates that cultural values of uncertainty avoidance potentially affects co-production leadership belief, considering that this belief concerns the extent to which an individual believes that a follower is a leader's partner in affecting and enhancing the quality of leadership process. This is supported by Lawrence (2017) who states that followers with high cultural values of uncertainty avoidance tend to have lower co-production leadership belief. In other words, these individuals tend to believe that their leader knows best for their working unit, accordingly, they will merely obey

and respect their leaders' decisions (Carsten & Uhl-Bien, 2013; Yan & Hunt, 2005). Such a condition does not occur when followers possess high co-production leadership belief. Therefore, based on the description above, it is expected that:

Hypothesis 1b: Uncertainty avoidance is negatively associated with co-production leadership belief

As explained above, cultural values of collectivism hold the potential to influence followers' perceptions regarding their orientation role within a leadership process. Collectivism measures the extent to which an individual is integrated within a group (Hofstede, 1980). Collectivism values are in contrast with individualism values. Collectivism values emphasize more on group interest rather than individuals' interest (Triandis, 2001). Followers with collectivism values uphold social norms, and rarely exhibit individual voice behaviors (Kirkman & Shapiro, 2001; Lee, Scandura, & Sharif, 2014; Triandis, 1996). In addition, they do not exhibit proactive followership behaviors and tend to take passive roles (Lawrence, 2017). It is supported by Thomas (2014) who states that high collectivism values will make followers refuse challenging leadership, thus creating followers with less-critical character. This contradicts the idea of co-production leadership, which believes that followers play roles as active contributors within a leadership process in order to achieve organizational goals (Uhl-bien et al., 2014). It is in line with the result of the study conducted by Lawrence (2017) which found that followers' collectivism values negatively affect co-production leadership belief. Based on the consideration above, the following hypotheses are formulated:

Hypothesis 1c : Collectivism is negatively associated with co-production leadership Belief

Co-production Leadership, Obedience, and Constructive Resistance

Studies on followership grow by examining the individual's belief in the role of the follower in a leadership process. Belief in co-production leadership is defined as the extent to which an individual believes that a follower should be the leader's partner in a leadership process (Carsten and Uhl-Bien, 2012). Belief in followership role develops along with an individual's interaction with others regarding authority. This is understandable given that when carrying out their role as a follower, individuals' behavior is directed by their belief.

Carsten et al. (2010) argue that an individual with low co-production leadership belief tends to define their role as obedience and respect to leader because they perceive their leader as a more capable person, and believe that the leader knows best for the organization. Whereas an individual with high co-production leadership belief defines their role as a leader's partner to improve group performance, and believe that followers play an integral part in a leadership process.

This finding affects the ethical behavior in the organization. Followers with low co-production leadership belief tend to be involved in deviant obedience since they believe that the follower's role is to serve their leader and obey the leader's instruction without question. On the other side, a follower with high co-production leadership belief possibly constructively resist their leader when they face unethical instruction. They believe that a follower is an active participant in the leadership process, and questions matters considered

jeopardy for the organization (Carsten and Uhl-Bien, 2012). Based on the previous studies and thoughts, the hypotheses are formulated as follow.

Hypothesis 2: Co-production leadership belief is negatively associated with follower’s obedience

Hypothesis 3: Co-production leadership belief is positively associated with followers constructive resistance




Figure 1. Research Model

Methodology

A. Population and Samples

This study is categorized as a survey study. Survey is the primary data collection method by asking questions to individual respondents (Cooper & Schindler, 2008). Information is collected from respondents by using questionnaires. The population of the study was all civil servants in Surakarta and Salatiga city. The sample was selected using Stratified Random Sampling technique. Prior to the selection, the population was divided into a relevant, appropriate, and meaningful group in the context of the study. To this end, the population is divided in terms of Regional Government Unit (SKPD) in each regency/ municipality government that becomes the object of the study. SKPDs are heterogeneous in terms of duty and responsibility. After the population was clustered, the sample was selected from each cluster using systematic sampling, proportional to the total element of each stratum. Out of 400 questionnaires that had been distributed, 263 questionnaires were returned and ready for analysis. The response rate was 65.75 percent. Among the 263 employees, 135 were female (51.3 %), with an average age 43.6 years and average organizational tenure of 18 years. The data were analyzed using Partial Least Square (PLS) and was done using WarpPLS 6.0.

B. Measurement

In this research, co-production leadership was measured using scale consisting of five items developed by Carsten & Uhl-bien (2009). One of the items reads “the follower should voice their opinion, although the leader may not agree”. Power distance was measured using six point statements developed by Dorfman & Howell (1988). One of the items reads “Leaders should make most decisions without consulting followers”. Uncertainty avoidance was measured

using five-point statement developed by Dorfman & Howell (1988). One of the statements reads " Instructions for operations are important for employees on the job". Collectivism is measured by 8 items adapted from Triandis & Gelfand (1998) to measure collectivism values. The example of collectivism item is: "For me, spending time with other people is a great thing to do". Obedience was measured using 3 items adapted from Carsten and Uhl-Bien (2012) to find responses on followers' obedience to leaders ($\alpha = .801$). The following is the example of obedience item: "I will obey any forms of the leader's order". Constructive Resistance was measured with a questionnaire adapted from Tepper et al. (2001) which consists of four items, to determine the rejection in efforts to influence followers ($\alpha = .714$). The example of statement regarding constructive resistance is: "When I think that the leader's order is inappropriate, I will ask for a further explanation". Each item was scored using -point Likert scale, from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree".

Results and Discussion

A. Results

Descriptive statistics and inter-correlations between study variables are reported in table 1. The adequacy of the measurement models was evaluated on the criteria of reliability, convergent validity, and discriminant validity. Firstly, reliability was examined using the composite reliability and Cronbach alpha score. Table 1 shows that all score of Cronbach alpha and composite reliability were above 0.7, which is the commonly accepted level for explanatory research. The convergent validity was verified by using two criteria (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). First, all indicator loadings should be significant and greater than 0.7. Second, the average variance extracted (AVE) by each construct should exceed due to the measurement error of that construct (AVE should be greater than 0.50). However, if the range of indicator loadings is within 0.5 to 0.6 or if AVE is less than 0.5, but composite reliability is higher than 0.6, the convergent validity is still adequate (Hair et al., 2013; Fornell & Larcker, 1981). From table 2 and table 3, the convergent validity was acceptable. All indicator loadings were higher than 0.6, and AVE was above 0.5.

Table 1. Means, standard deviations, and inter-correlations of study variables

	Means	Std	Power Distance Uncertainty Avoidance	Collectivism	Production Leadership	Obedience	Constructive Resistance	
Power Distance Uncertainty Avoidance	1.771	0.552	0.801					
Collectivism	4.440	0.619	-0.222	0.823				
Production Leadership	4.195	0.603	-0.215	0.527	0.843			
Obedience	3.918	0.752	-0.251	0.446	0.405	0.841		
Constructive Resistance	3.703	0.848	-0.191	0.246	0.200	0.066	0.799	
	4.118	1.01	-0.170	0.369	0.348	0.462	0.097	0.749

Table 2. Result of Reliability and Convergence Validity Test

Variables	R square	AVE	Composite Reliability	Cronbach's Alpha
Co-Production Leadership (Co-Pro)	0.249	0.614	0.888	0.841
Obedience (Obey)	0.006	0.833	0.909	0.799
Constructive Resistance (ConsRes)	0,216	0.800	0.889	0.749
Power Distance (PowerDis)		0.716	0.883	0.801
Uncertainty Avoidance (UnAvoid)		0.589	0.877	0.823
Collectivism (CV)		0.568	0.886	0.843

Table 3. The Indicator Loading Values for Convergence Validity Test

	Power Distance	Uncertainty Avoidance	Collectivism	Co-Production	Obedience	Constructive Resistance
PD1	(0.841)					
PD2	(0.872)					
PD3	(0.824)					
UA1		(0.740)				
UA2		(0.829)				
UA3		(0.852)				
UA4		(0.696)				
UA5		(0.708)				
CV2			(0.528)			
CV4			(0.721)			
CV5			(0.826)			
CV6			(0.801)			
CV7			(0.819)			
CV8			(0.787)			
CL1				(0.684)		
CL2				(0.842)		
CL3				(0.769)		
CL4				(0.852)		
CL5				(0.758)		
IO2					(0.913)	
IO3					(0.913)	
CR1						(0.894)
CR2						(0.894)

The discriminant validity of the scale was assessed by using the guideline suggested by Fornell & Larcker (1981). The square root of the AVE from the construct should be greater than the correlation shared between that construct and others in the model. Table 4 lists the correlations between the construct, with the square roots of AVE on the diagonal. All the diagonal values exceed the inter-construct correlations. Hence the test for discriminant validity was

acceptable. Therefore, based on the previous explanation, we can conclude that the scales should have sufficient construct validity and reliability.

Table 4. Latent Variable Correlation Matrix

	Power Distance	Uncertainty Avoidance	Collectivism	Co-Production	Obedience	Constructive Resistance
Power Distance	(0,846)					
Uncertainty Avoidance	-0.222	(0.767)				
Collectivism	-0.215	0.527	(0.754)			
Co-Production	-0.251	0.446	0.405	(0.783)		
Obedience	-0.191	0.246	0.200	0.066	(0.913)	
Constructive Resistance	-0.170	0.369	0.348	0.462	0.097	(0.8944)

The structural model was used to test the proposed hypothesis. The following is the result of analysis by using Partial Least Square (PLS):




Figure 2. Path Coefficient Value and P-Value

Table 5. Path Coefficient Value and P-Value

	Co-Production	Obedience	Constructive Resistance	Description
Power Distance	-0.138**			H1a is accepted

Uncertainty Avoidance	0.294***			H1b is rejected
Collectivism	0.202***			H1c is rejected
Co-Production		0.098*		H3 is rejected
Co-Production			0.468***	H2 is accepted

Note:
 *** : Significant in p- value <0.001
 ** : significant in p- value <0.01
 * : significant in p- value = 0.05

B. Discussion

The present study attempted to build a better understanding of followers' belief regarding their role in the co-production leadership process and its impact on the organization. This study examines the contribution of cultural value (i.e., Power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and collectivism) to the co-production leadership belief and examines the effect of this belief on followers' obedience and constructive resistance. By selecting participants from the bureaucratic environment, the present study discovers some findings that extend the literature on leadership, particularly related to followership. The present study found that power distance negatively affects co-production leadership belief. This result supports the hypothesis stating that power distance negatively affects co-production leadership. This result is in agreement with the study conducted by Lawrence (2017) who found that power distance contributes to the development of role scheme that underlies the followers and their belief in co-production leadership. This contribution is negative. In other words, the higher the power distance culture, the lower the co-production leadership belief. Given that co-production leadership emphasize on followers' active role as leader's partner to contribute to the organization, it is lowered in a culture where the power distance is high. This occurs because, in a culture where the power distance is high, it is impossible for an employee to be active since, in this kind of structure, the leader's type tends to be initiating structure (Bochner & Hesketh). In such a culture, people with high authority (leader) will dominate the people with lower status. In this culture, leader and followers hold certain borders. These borders make the followers cannot make a decision or express their idea, although it is for organizational interest. Accordingly, followers experience a huge amount of pressure when they take an active role in a leadership process. In addition, high power distance also results in follower's inconvenience to take an active role in the leadership process. This makes co-production leadership is low in an environment with a high power distance culture.

Regarding uncertainty avoidance, the present study shows that uncertainty avoidance positively and significantly affects co-production Leadership belief. This result does not support the hypothesis stating that uncertainty avoidance negatively affect co-production Leadership. The result of the study is in contrast with the study conducted by Lawrence (2017), which found that uncertainty avoidance negatively affects co-production Leadership. This different finding may be accounted for by the context of the study. The participants who come from a bureaucratic environment, especially in Indonesia, may have different implication from the previous studies. To date, public organization faces phenomena of bureaucratic reform. Bureaucratic reform makes the civil servants stand in an environment that is full of

uncertainty due to changes in their work environment for the purpose of optimal public service. This culture of uncertainty avoidance eventually leads them to reticence in taking risk related to job security. In a reformation, all civil servants are required to actively contribute to their organization. When their performance is considered poor, this may result in demotion, lower incentives, or even dismissal. Accordingly, in the context of the present study, uncertainty avoidance positively contributes to co-production leadership. When they avoid risk due to poor performance, they tend to believe that they should be more actively contribute to the organization along with their leader to exhibit an optimal public service.

Regarding collectivism culture, the present study shows that collectivism positively and significantly affects co-production Leadership belief. This result does not support the hypothesis stating that collectivism negatively affects co-production leadership. In other words, high collectivism culture strengthens co-production Leadership belief. Within the context of the present study, followers view that, with high co-production leadership belief, the group's purposes will be achieved more easily since they act as active contributors. Different result found in this study may be accounted for by the leadership style, which was not measured in this study. Previous study conducted by Jung & Avolio (1999) found that followers with high collectivism values bring more ideas when they are led by transformational leaders, compared to transactional leaders. Accordingly, a leader's leadership style may affect followers' behavior in a certain culture, including their role orientation within a leadership process.

In general, the present study proved that cultural aspect affects followers' co-production Leadership belief. This culture affects their orientation regarding their role in the leadership process. The present study also examines the effect of follower's orientation of role on their behavior, particularly obedience and constructive resistance. The present study shows that co-production Leadership positively and significantly affect obedience. This finding is different from the proposed hypothesis and the finding of the study conducted by Carsten and Uhl Bien (2012) who found that co-production Leadership negatively affects follower's obedience. Whereas, with regard to constructive resistance, the finding of this study support the proposed hypothesis and Carsten and Uhl-Bien (2012) who found that co-production Leadership positively and significantly affect constructive resistance. This finding means that when an employee holds a firm belief in co-production Leadership, he tends to constructively resist policies contradicting organizational interest or ethically questioned. Constructive resistance means that the employee will refuse while offering an alternative, in destructive solution for organization interest. They tend to discuss by expressing their view related to a policy that contradicts organizational goal or ethically questioned.

Regarding different result on relationship between co-production Leadership and obedience, this may occur due to different context of the study. Following theory of planned behavior, individual's belief and attitude interact with context to affect behavior. In the context of this study, the leader in bureaucratic environment is highly respected. This respect comes from the fact that the employee's performance assessment also depends on the leader. They constructively resist their leader's policy when it is ethically questioned or does not comply with organizational goal. However, they will accept their leader's final decision as a form of obedience.

Conclusion

More research on co-production leadership is needed to be done in order to get a deep understanding of this important concept given the previous study is still limited. The present study aims to examine the effect of cultural aspect on co-production leadership practice and its influence on obedience and constructive resistance. The result of the study shows that cultural aspect affects followers orientation of role in the leadership process where it is related to co-production Leadership belief in this study. The present study found that power distance negatively affects co-production leadership belief. Whereas uncertainty avoidance and collectivism positively affects co-production Leadership. The present study proves that co-production Leadership belief positively affect obedience and constructive resistance. The result of the study is different from the prior studies related to the relationship between uncertainty avoidance and co-production Leadership belief, and the relationship between co-production Leadership belief and followers' obedience. Different result of the study may be due to the different context of the study. Following the theory of planned behavior, individual's belief and attitude interact with context to affect behavior.

The result of this study responds to the call from previous studies to examine and understand deeper the concept of co-production Leadership, which is still understudied. Cultural aspect which is found as affecting co-production Leadership belief broadens the previous literature on followership. Examining the concept of followership in the bureaucratic environment is also a novelty. The different findings of the study can be used as a consideration to understand the concept of co-production Leadership in various context, particularly regarding its effect on follower's behavior.

The result of this study supports the previous theory stating that in order to change one's behavior, change their belief (Conner & Armitage, 1998). In this study, co-production Leadership belief emerges as one of the predictors of follower's obedience and constructive resistance. This could be a consideration for organization leaders to consider their follower's belief when expecting a certain behavior from their followers.

The present study contains some limitation that can be improved in future study. First, this study was conducted to the civil servants who work in a bureaucratic environment, an environment which is totally different from that of private organization. Accordingly, generalization should be made cautiously. Second, cross-sectional nature of this study prevents more in-depth analysis of the concept of followership because the data were collected only from a single period of time. Third, the data that were collected is limited to the respondent's response to the question in the questionnaire. The information would be richer when using an in-depth interview with the respondent.

References

- 1) Alon, I., & Higgins, J. M. (2005). Global leadership success through emotional and cultural intelligences. *Business Horizons*, 48, 501–512.
- 2) Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 421–449.
- 3) Baker, S. D. (2007). Followership: Theoretical foundation of a contemporary construct. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 14, 50–60.

- 4) Bartram, D. (2012). Stability of OPQ32 personality constructs across languages, cultures, and countries. In F. L. A. Ryan & F. Oswald (Eds.), *Conducting multinational research: Applying organizational psychology in the workplace* (pp. 59–89).
- 5) Bjugstad, K., Thach, E. E., Thompson, K. J., & Morris, A. (2006). A Fresh Look at Followership: A Model for Matching Followership and Leadership Styles. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, 7(3).
- 6) Blackshear, P. B. (2004). The followership continuum: A model for increasing organizational productivity. *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal*, 9(1), 1–14.
- 7) Blair, B. A., & Bligh, M. C. (2018). Looking for Leadership in All the Wrong Places: The Impact of Culture on Proactive Followership and Follower Dissent. *Journal of Social Issues*, 74(1), 129–143. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12260>
- 8) Blass, T. (1991). Understanding behavior in the Milgram obedience experiment: The role of personality, situations, and their interactions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 398–413.
- 9) Blass, T. (2009). From New Haven to Santa Clara: A historical perspective on the Milgram obedience experiments. *American Psychologist*, 64, 37–45.
- 10) Carsten, M. K., & Uhl-bien, M. (2009). Implicit followership theories (IFT): Developing and validating an IFT Scale for the study of followership. 2009 Annual Meeting of the Southern Management Association. Asheville, NC.
- 11) Carsten, M. K., & Uhl-bien, M. (2017). Leader perceptions and motivation as outcomes of followership role orientation and behavior. *Leadership*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715017720306>
- 12) Carsten, M. K., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2012). Follower Beliefs in the Co-Production of Leadership Examining Upward Communication and the Moderating Role of Context. *Zeitschrift Für Psychologie*, 220(4), 210–220.
- 13) Carsten, M. K., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2013). Ethical followership: An examination of followership beliefs and crimes of obedience. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 20(1), 49–61. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051812465890>
- 14) Carsten, M. K., Uhl-bien, M., West, B. J., Patera, J. L., & McGregor, R. (2010). Exploring social constructions of followership: A qualitative study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(3), 543–562. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.03.015>
- 15) Conner, M., & Armitage, J. (1998). Extending the Theory of Planned Behavior: A Review and Avenues for Further Research. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28(15), 1429–1464.
- 16) Dorfman, P. W., & Howell, J. P. (1988). Dimension of national culture and effective leadership patterns: Hofstede revisited. *Advance in International Comparative Management*, 3, 127–150.
- 17) Ferguson, J., Ronayne, P., & Rybacki, M. (2016). Comparing Leadership Challenges Civil Service vs. Private Sector. Greensboro, North Carolina: Center for Creative Leadership.
- 18) Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind* (Rev. 3 rd ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.
- 19) Howell, J., & Shamir, B. (2005). The role of followers in the charismatic leadership process: Relationships and their consequences. *Academy of Management Review*, 30(1), 96–112.
- 20) Lawrence, T. O. (2017). Followership in A Global Context: Examining The Relationship Between Chinese National Culture and Follower Role Orientation. Indiana Institute of Technology.

- 21) Ngunjiri, F. W., & Madsen, S. R. (2015). *Women as Global Leaders (Women and Leadership)*. Information Age Publishing.
- 22) Popper, M. (2015). Followership, deity, and leadership. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 46(2).
- 23) Prasojo, E., & Rudita, L. (2014). Undang-Undang Aparatur Sipil Negara: Membangun Profesionalisme Aparatur Sipil Negara. *Jurnal Kebijakan Dan Manajemen PNS*, 8(1), 13–29.
- 24) Ravlin, E. C., & Thomas, D. C. (2005). Status and stratification processes in organizational life. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 966–987.
- 25) Shamir, B. (2007). From passive recipients to active co-producers: Followers' roles in the leadership process. In B. Shamir, R. Pillai, M. Bligh, & M. Uhl-bien (Eds.), *Follower-centered perspectives on leadership: A tribute to the memory of James R. Meindl* (pp. ix–xxxix). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishers.
- 26) Tepper, B. J., Duffy, M. K., & Shaw, J. D. (2001). Personality moderators of the relationship between abusive supervision and subordinates' resistance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 974–983.
- 27) Torres, E. M. (2014). *Followers' Characteristics as Predictors of Their Preference For Servant Leadership: A Followership Approach*. San Diego State University.
- 28) Triandis, H. C., & Gelfand, M. (1998). Personality moderators of the relationship between abusive supervision and subordinates' resistance. *Personality Moderators of the Relationship between Abusive Supervision and Subordinates' Resistance*, 74(118–128).
- 29) Uhl-Bien, M., & Pillai, R. (2007). The romance of leadership and the social construction of followership. In B. Shamir, R. Pillai, M. C. Bligh, & M. Uhl-Bien (Eds.), *Follower-centered perspectives on leadership: A tribute to the memory of James R. Meindl* (pp. 187–209). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing, Inc.
- 30) Uhl-bien, M., Riggio, R. E., Lowe, K. B., & Carsten, M. K. (2014). Followership theory: A review and research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(1), 83–104. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.007>

