

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/320894132>

Exploring the Relationship Between Personality Factors and Workplace Deviant Behavior Among Pekanbaru City Civil Servants

Article in *Performance* · October 2017

DOI: 10.20884/1.performance.2017.24.1.309

CITATIONS

2

READS

1,091

4 authors, including:



Idris Mdnoor

Universiti Malaysia Perlis

43 PUBLICATIONS 109 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



Abdullah Osman

Abu Dhabi University

21 PUBLICATIONS 455 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



Zulkarnain Lubis

Universitas Medan Area

30 PUBLICATIONS 46 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



The Effects of Interest Free Microfinance on Borrowers Household Welfare [View project](#)



leadership [View project](#)

EXPLORING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERSONALITY FACTORS AND WORKPLACE DEVIANT BEHAVIOR AMONG PEKANBARU CITY CIVIL SERVANTS

Dwi Hastuti^{1*}, Idris Mohd Noor², Abdullah Osman³, Zulkarnain Lubis⁴

^{1, 2} Universiti Malaysia Perlis, Malaysia

³ Kolej Universiti Insaniah, Malaysia

⁴ Universitas Medan Area, Indonesia

*E-mail: dweehastutihasan@yahoo.co.id

ABSTRACT

This study investigated personality factors as predictors of workplace deviance behavior among civil servants in Pekanbaru, Indonesia. Using cross-sectional survey method, data were conducted to 263 civil servants from various departments and Agencies in Pekanbaru by using questionnaires. The instrument for data collection includes the Big Five Inventory (BFI) and the Workplace Deviance Scale. The hypothesis was used multiple regression with data analyzed by using Partial Least Square (PLS). The results revealed that there were a significant influence personality factors to workplace deviance behavior. The independently, extraversion and conscientiousness have negative significant to workplace deviance behavior and neuroticism and openness to experience have positive significant to workplace deviance behavior but not agreeableness significantly. This study recommended that the importance of taking personality traits into consideration during employee recruitment processes to minimize workplace deviant behavior.

Keyword: workplace deviant behavior, big five personality traits; civil servants

INTRODUCTION

Currently, the numbers of organizational scholars have studied workplace deviance behavior (WDB), employee behavior is described the voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norm and in doing so threaten well-being the organization, the worker or both (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). WDB continues to be a serious and pervasive problem for organizations globally (Vardi & Weitz, 2004). Because of its negative effects on the organizations, the widespread trends in industrial and organizational psychology is currently showing a sustained increase in the study of WDB (Levy & Tziner, 2011). It has

been estimated that Billions of dollars are lost annually due to WDB (Johnson & Indvik, 2001). Greenberg (1997) found that organizations in the United States suffered a loss of \$ 200 million per year in cases of theft by workers. While employees who become targeted of WD Bare more likely forced to quit, can suffer stress-related problem, feel unsafe at work, has decreased productivity and low morale (O’Leary-Kelly., Griffin & Glew, 1996). So, discussions about the effect of this behavior is a very interesting topic for the researcher and organization. However, much research focused on desirable behavioral such as prosocial behavior, citizenship behaviors that have a positive impact on the organization (Robinson & Bennett, 1995).

There are many factors that can lead to WDB. These factors can be influenced by situational factors such as work stress, job satisfaction and work justice (Spector and Fox, 2005) and individual factors. However, individual factors as a personality have potentially to influence the WDB. It can affect people’s perceptions and appraisal of the environment, their attributions for causes of the event, their emotional responses, and their ability to engage WDB (Spector, 2010). Personality factors are attributed to work performance forms of various forms of activity (Baumgartl, Nascimento, Patrick, Arvey, & Krueger, 2009). Colbert et al. (2004); Jensen & Patel (2011) state that using a personality trait approach can make a significant contribution to WDB. However, it is unclear whether the personality traits provide the unique prediction of WDB. So, the purpose of this study is to explore whether the personality traits is a valid predictor for explaining and understanding WDB.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Workplace Deviant Behavior

WDB is known by various names. The synonyms used in the literature for WDB include counterproductive behavior (Spector, Bauer & Fox, 2010), antisocial behavior (Giacalone, Riordan and Rosenfeld, 1997), misbehavior (Vardy & Weiner, 1992), destructive behavior (Murphy, 1993) and many more terms used to replace deviant behavior in the workplace. WDB is defined as intentional acts that harm the organization or people in the organization (Spector & Fox, 2005). WDB covers a wide range of employee negative behaviors that threaten survival, productivity and other legitimate purposes of an organization. The most researched WDB including absence, theft, sabotage, use the drug and overt acts of aggression. As a result, the term of WDB become the umbrella of any directed negative behavior

In Indonesia, data show that public sector organizations are engaged with organizational and interpersonal deviances. This leads to the inefficiency of public organizations in the distribution of resources, resulting in substantial losses to governments, especially regarding the financial and human resources. Economic and social planning is disturbed thus affecting organizational effectiveness (Indonesian Corruption Watch, 2017). Thus, many studies consider that personality as individual factors are related to WDB (Abdullah & Marican, 2016; Ferreira & Nascimento, 2016)

Big Five Personality Trait

Personality definitions are varied. However, all definitions seem to have common characteristics of personality, including individual differences, behavioral dispositions, and stability overtime, and that personality can be elaborated into specific and fundamental parts (Furnham & Heaven, 1999). Personality is made up of characteristics pattern of thought, feelings, and behaviors that make a person unique (Eysenck, 1967). The personality factors that will be used in this study are big five personality traits because from the previous research it has confirmed that big five personality is consistent when used for different populations including the population of children, students and adults (Costa and McCrae, 2004; McCrae et al., 2004; and Aluja et al., 2005) can even be used for cross-cultural ones (Felman, 2003). The dimensions of factors of personality consist of:

Agreeableness can be categorized as an individual that have compassionate, likes to cooperate and does not like to be suspicious and do not like create hostility with other. This trait is more indicative of individual differences in their concern for creating social harmonization. Nice person, easygoing with others, caring, friendly, optimistic, generous, helpful and willing to compromise (Rothmann and Coetzer, 2013). Extraversion is characterized as a personality that has positive emotions because individuals with high extraversion will tend to be confident, dominant, active and happy to seek joy, likes to interact with people and are full of energy.

Conscientiousness is an individual who tends to show self-discipline, act obediently, and aim to achieve above expectations. This trait emphasizes action that is always planned rather than spontaneous action (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Neuroticism is a personality trait that is associated with a person's emotional stability, the person has a high neuroticism is a tendency to experience negative emotions, such as irritability, easily anxiety, or depression.

Openness to experience shows individuals who are more creative, imaginative and have an interest in new things because they have great curiosity (Woo and Stark, 2013). The employees with more open personalities were more likely to be emotionally exhausted and easy to engage in deviant behavior in the workplace (Deary, Watson and Hogston, 2003). Bolton (2010) argued that higher openness to experience has related to deviance behavior in the workplace.

WDB and Big Five Personality.

Research on the big five personality traits and WDB has been thoroughly studied but empirical research finds inconsistency (Bolton, Becker and Barber, 2010, Ferreira and Nascimento, 2016; Nielsen, Glaso and Einarson, 2017). Bolton et al (2010) found that agreeableness, conscientiousness, and extraversion were valid predictors of deviant behavior in the workplace, in which agreeableness predicts workplace deviant interpersonal and conscientiousness as predictors of workplace deviant organizational. However, the results of this study have different findings in Kozakoet. (2013) in which neuroticism, openness to experience and agreeableness have relationship with workplace deviant organizational while neuroticism, openness to experience, extraversion and agreeableness have a relationship to workplace deviant interpersonal. However, extraversion has no relationship to workplace deviant organizational and conscientiousness has no relation to both forms workplace deviant organizational and interpersonal. Laith and Zulkarnain (2016) only found that emotional stability (opposite of neuroticism) had a negative significant to workplace deviant, but found there is no significant relationship between agreeableness, conscientiousness to WDB. So, in this study need to test again relationship of big five personality traits and WDB.

METHODOLOGY

A survey was conducted to collect data for this study. A set of questionnaires was distributed to 264 employees who work civil servants in Pekanbaru are randomly selected from the public organization. There are two variables is being studied, personality trait and workplace deviance and before distributed to the respondent all variables in this research was done back translation process. Questionnaires are divided into three parts, namely section A, B and C. Part A consists of demographic data of respondents consisting of, gender, age, rank, education level and working period. Part B consists of questions about personality using BFI (big five inventory) and section C is a list of questions about WDB and below will explain in detail:

Workplace deviant behavior is measured using Bennett and Robinson's (2000) Workplace Deviant Behavior Scale, which consists of 19 items question and measured using a Likert scale of value from 1 to 7. Item questions will show how often respondents who engage in WDB. The higher score obtained showed the higher rate of occurrence frequency WDB. In contrast the lower the score obtained indicate the low frequency of occurrence of workplace of deviant behavior. Examples of workplace deviant item: 'Being racist', "drug use in working time"

Personality traits measurement was measured using Big Five Personality (BFI) was adapted from John and Srivastava (1999). The 44 items question with 5 points Likert scale was used, respondents were asked to answer 1 to 5 from extremely inaccurate to extremely accurate.

DATA ANALYSIS

Measurement Model

In the analysis using PLS-SEM testing measurement models is important because of the purpose of measuring model is to ensure that the items measure a construct are valid and so proves the instrument is reliable. Besides the purpose of testing the measurement model is analyzed the relationship between the items to the constructs. This measurement model testing is essential to ensure the use of indicators that can be ascertained is suitable a construct to run well (Churchill, 1979).

Table 1. Measurement Model Result

Construct			Item		CR ^a	AVE
Workplace Deviant Behavior (WDB)			WDB1	0.578	0.917	0.511
			WDB 2	0.479		
			WDB 3	0.551		
			WDB 4	0.476		
			WDB 5	0.851		
			WDB 6	0.872		
			WDB 7	0.806		
			WDB 8	0.752		
			WDB 9	0.797		
			WDB 10	0.729		
			WDB11	0.814		
Agreeableness			A1	0.753	0.916	0.554
			A2	0.753		
			A3	0.746		
			A4	0.852		

	A5	0.893		
	A6	0.794		
	A7	0.672		
	A8	0.720		
	A9	0.413		
Extraversion	E1	0.452	0.886	0.536
	E2	0.739		
	E3	0.776		
	E4	0.884		
	E5	0.823		
	E6	0.764		
	E7	0.597		
Conscientiousness	C1	0.784		
	C2	0.902	0.882	0.524
	C3	0.714		
	C4	0.865		
	C5	0.571		
	C6	0.573		
	C9	0.573		
Neuroticism	N1	0.798		
	N2	0.828	0.890	0.510
	N3	0.567		
	N4	0.749		
	N5	0.735		
	N6	0.689		
	N7	0.780		
	N8	0.499		
Openness to experience	O10	0.750	0.902	0.507
	O2	0.724		
	O3	0.729		
	O4	0.682		
	O5	0.609		
	O6	0.693		
	O7	0.744		
	O8	0.732		
	O9	0.735		

Table 2. Structural Model Result

Hypothesis	Beta	t value	P value	Result
<i>Agreeableness</i> ->WDB	-0.015	0.424	0.336	No Significant
<i>Extraversion</i> ->WDB	-0.136	3.434	0.000	Significant
<i>Conscientiousness</i> ->WDB	-0.320	7.255	0.000	Significant
<i>Neuroticism</i> ->WDB	0.556	10.040	0.000	Significant
<i>Openness to exp.</i> ->WDB	0.110	2.442	0.007	Significant

$R^2 = 0.528$

$Q^2 = 0.245$

f^2 (agree= 0.00, extra= 0.035, cons= 0.203, neuro= 0.625, open= 0.026)

Based on the table for model measurement found that reliability indicator shows the loading of each item is between 0.413 and 0.902, while the loading number did not reach 0.4 is aborted in question items (Hair, Ringle & Sarstedt., 2013). Meanwhile, the value of the average variance extracted (AVE) of each item should exceed the number 0.50 (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988). So is the value of the composite reliability (CR) are above 0.70 (Hair, Babin and Black, 2010).

Structural Model

After measurement model of PLS Analysis is done, next step is calculating the structural model. In this study, applied standard bootstrapping method to obtain significant levels of any relationship between the construct. In the structural model is an important thing to determine the significant of path coefficients, Evaluating the level of R^2 , then determine the effect size (f^2), determining the predictive relevance and last examine the moderating effect (Henseler, Ringle & Sinkovics, 2009). And the table below will show the results of structural model.

From the table, there is a significant relationship between a personality trait and WDB, agreeableness ($\beta = -0.015$, $t = 0.424$, $p > 0.1$), not supporting H1, its means there is no significant relationship between agreeableness and WDB. Result also suggested relationship extraversion and WDB ($\beta = -0.136$, $t = 3.434$, $p < 0.000$), conscientiousness, ($\beta = -0.320$, $t = 7.255$, $p < 0.00$), and thus H2 and H3 were supported, then neuroticism and openness to experience are ($\beta = 0.556$, $t = 10.040$, $p < 0.000$) and ($\beta = 0.110$, $t = 2.442$, $p < 0.001$) respectively where H4 and H5 also supported

Furthermore, other criteria that are important in looking at the structural model is seeing the value of R^2 which is coefficients of determination (Hair, Sarstedt, Ringle & Mena., 2012, Henseler et.al., 2009). The R^2 value is symbolized the proportion of variation in dependent variables(s) that can be explained by the independent variable(s) (Hair et al., 2010). Although an acceptable value of R^2 depends on the context of study (Cohen, 1998) shows the value of 0.26, 0.13, and 0.02 represent high, moderate and weak sequentially, but in this study, R^2 is considered high for 0,528 that mean as much as 52.8% explained the variance of WDB.

Effect size (f^2) personality trait and WDB were evaluated using Cohen's (1988) effect size. Effect size f^2 is the impact given by exogenous latent variable (independent) specific to the endogenous latent variable (dependent) to see how big the contribution of exogenous latent variable specific to an endogenous latent variable (Chin, 1998). Effect size values of 0.02, 0.15, and 0.35 that suggest small, medium and large effect, respectively (Henseler et al, 2009). The table shows effect size 0.00 for agreeableness, thus the effect size was no effect, also extraversion shows that small effect. For conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness to experience the effect size showed 0.203, 0.625, and 0.026 that means the effect sizes were from large and small). With applied Stone Geisser's Q^2 (Geisser, 1974) blindfolding procedure is used to determine the predictive relevance of the research model. A value greater than zero indicates relevant model (Henseler et al.,2009). The table shows Q^2 WDB is 0.245, indicating models is accepted 0.245

DISCUSSION

This paper studies the relationship personality trait and WDB among civils servant in Pekanbaru, Indonesia. From the analysis of data found shows that the agreeableness does not show the effect to WDB. The results of this study are the same with studies by Layth and Zulkarnain (2016) as well as Lim, Teh and Bejamin. Besides, conscientiousness has a negative effect on WDB. The high conscientiousness is someone who has a responsibility, hardworking, well-organized, well behaved, morally good and avoids engaging WDB. This study has also been supported by previous studies of Ferreira and Nascimento (2016). Nor do extraversion factors also have a negative relationship to WDB, this is because individuals with high extraversion in themselves will tend to be friendly, full of energy, and like to talk so that this situation makes them not to do the negative behavior in the workplace (Kosoko, 2013). Similarly, the study also found that neuroticism and openness to experience factors have a positive relationship WDB, but this result also been supported by previous studies (Santos and Eger, 2014; Kozako et al., 2013)

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results of the research can be concluded that an individual's personality as a factor is a very important factor that can predict the behavior of employees in the workplace. And more important that personality factors such as neuroticism and openness to experience are critical factors that are always associated to WDB. The implications for Human Resources Development must work hard to determine the personality type of workers who have the potential to conduct WDB, especially when selecting, recruiting and undertaking worker placement.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, A., & Marican, S. (2016). The Effects of Big-Five Personality Traits on Deviant Behavior. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 219, 19-25.
- Aluja, A., Garcia, O., Rossier, J. & Garcia, L. F. (2005). Comparison of the NEO-FFI, the NEO-FFI-R and alternative short version of the NEO-PI-R (NEO-60) in Swiss and Spanish samples. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 38, 591-604
- Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(3), 349.
- Baumgartl, V. O., Nascimento, E., Patrick, C., Arvey R., & Krueger, R. (2009). Integridade e externalização: Estudo exploratório em uma amostra de estudantes de psicologia. *Psico-USF*, 14(3), 299-308.
- Bolton, L. R., Becker, L. K., & Barber, L. K. (2010). Big Five trait predictors of differential counterproductive work behavior dimensions. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 49(5), 537-541
- Chin, W. W. (1998), "The partial least squares approach to structural equation modeling", in Marcoulides, G. A. (Ed.) *Modern Methods for Business Research*, Laurence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, New Jersey, pp. 295-336
- Churchill Jr, G. A. (1979). A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 64-73

- Cohen, J. (1988), *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, N
- Colbert, A. E., Mount, M. K., Harter, J. K., Witt, L. A., & Barrick, M. R. (2004). Interactive effects of personality and perceptions of the work situation on workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(4), 599.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-EEI) professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources
- Eysenck, H. J. (1967). *Dimensions of Personality*. London, UK: Routledge & Kegan Paul
- Farhadi, H., Fatimah, O., Nasir, R., & Shahrazad, W. S. (2012). Agreeableness and conscientiousness as antecedents of deviant behavior in workplace. *Asian Social Science*, 8(9), 2.
- Feldman, R.S. (2003). *Essentials of Understanding Psychology*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Ferreira, M. F., & Nascimento, E. D. (2016). Relationship between Personality Traits and Counterproductive Work Behaviors. *Psico-USF*, 21(3), 677-685.
- Giacalone, R.A., Riordan, C.A. & Rosenfeld, P. (1997). In R. Giacalone & J. Greenberg (Eds.), *Antisocial behavior in organizations* (pp. 109-129). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Babin, B. J., & Black, W. C. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis: A global perspective* (Vol. 7). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson
- Hair, J. F., Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C. M., & Mena, J. A. (2012). An assessment of the use of partial least squares structural equation modeling in marketing research. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 40(3), 414-433
- Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2013). Editorial-partial least squares structural equation modeling: Rigorous applications, better results and higher acceptance

- Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sinkovics, R. R. (2009). The use of partial least squares path modeling in international marketing. In *New challenges to international marketing* (pp. 277-319). Emerald Group Publishing Limited
- Henseler, J., & Fassott, G. (2010). Testing moderating effects in PLS path models: An illustration of available procedures. In *Handbook of partial least squares* (pp. 713-735). Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Jensen, J. M., Patel, P. C., & Raver, J. L. (2014). Is it better to be average? High and low performance as predictors of employee victimization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99(2). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0034822> 24219126.
- John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*, 2(1999), 102-138.
- Johnson, P.R., Indvik, J. (2001), Rudeness at work: Impulse over restraint. *Public Personnel Management*, 30, 457-465.
- Kozako, I. N., Ain, M. F., Safin, S. Z., & Rahim, A. R. A. (2013). The relationship of big five personality traits on counterproductive work behaviour among hotel employees: An exploratory study. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 7, 181-187.
- Levy, T., & Tziner, A. (2011). When destructive deviance in the workplace becomes a liability: A decisional behavioral model. *Quality & Quantity*, 45(1), 233-239.
- Lima, L. C., Teha, C. J., & Chan-Yin-Fah, B. (2016). A Preliminary Study of the Effects of Personality Traits on Workplace Deviance in the Voluntary Sector. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 6(7S).
- McCrae, R. R., Costa, P. T., Martin, T. A., Oryol, V. E., Rukavishnikov, A. A., Senin, I. G., ... & Urbánek, T. (2004). Consensual validation of personality traits across cultures. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 38(2), 179-201.
- Murphy, K.R. (1993), *Honesty in the Workplace*, Belmont, CA: Brooks Cole
- Nielsen, M. B., Glasø, L., & Einarsen, S. (2017). Exposure to workplace harassment and the Five Factor Model of personality: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 104, 195-206.

- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(2), 555-572.
- Rothmann, S., & Coetzer, E. P. (2003). The Big Five Personality Dimensions and Job Performance. *Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 29(1), 68-74.
- Salgado, J. F. (2002). The *Big five personality* dimensions and counterproductive behaviors. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10(1-2), 117-125.
- Sandberg, J. (2003), Workplace Klepto Culture Squaders Key Resources. The Wall Street Journal Online.
- Santos, A., Eger, A. (2014), Gender differences and predictors of workplace deviance behaviour: The role of job stress, job satisfaction and personality on interpersonal and organisational deviance. *International Journal of Management Practice*, 7(1), 19-38
- Spector, P. E., Bauer, J. A., & Fox, S. (2010). Measurement artifacts in the assessment of Counterproductive Work Behavior and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Do we know what we think we know? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(4), 781-90. doi: 10.1037/a0019477.
- Stone, M. (1974). Cross-validatory choice and assessment of statistical predictions. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 36, 111–147.
- Vardi, Y. and Weiner, Y. (1992). 'Organizational misbehavior (OMB): A calculative-normative model'. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Las Vegas.
- Weldali, L. M. S. A., & Lubis, Z. (2016). Personality traits and counterproductive work behavior: Moderator effect of perceived organizational support. *Imperial Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, 2(5).
- Woo, S. E., Chernyshenko, O. S., Stark, S. E., & Conz, G. (2014). Validity of six openness facets in predicting work behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 96(1), 76-86.