

PERSONALITY FACTORS AS PREDICTOR OF WORKPLACE DEVIANT BEHAVIOR AMONG CIVIL SERVANTS

JAM

15, 3

Received, May 2017

Revised, August 2017

Accepted, September 2017

Dwi Hastuti

Idris Mohd Noor

Universiti Malaysia Perlis

Abdullah Osman

Kolej Universiti Insaniah, Malaysia

Zulkarnain Lubis

Universitas Medan Area, Indonesia

Abstract: The purpose of this study is to investigate empirically the influence of personality traits to workplace deviant behavior among civil servants in Pekanbaru, Indonesia. Using cross-sectional survey method and stratified proportionate random sampling data were conducted to 263 civil servants from various departments and Agencies in Pekanbaru by using questionnaires. The data analyzed using Partial Least Square (PLS). The findings emphasize the importance of taking personality traits into consideration during employee recruitment processes to minimize workplace deviant behavior. This study contributes the important role of employee personality traits in minimizing workplace deviant behavior.

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

Many years, researchers have studied organizational workplace deviance behavior (WDB), employee behavior which violates significant organizational norm and in doing so threaten well-being the organization, the worker or both (Robinson and Bennett, 1995). WDB continues to be a serious and pervasive problem for organizations globally (Vardi and Weitz, 2004). Billions of dollars are lost annually due to WDB (Johnson and 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 workers who are targeted to WDB may influence work stress, have a feeling of insecurity in the workplace, so discussions about the effect of this behavior is a very interesting topic for the researcher and organization. However, numerous studies are more focused on desirable behavioral such as prosaically behavior, citizenship behaviors that have a positive impact on the organization (Robinson and Bennett, 1995).

WDB can be influenced by situational factors such as work stress, job satisfaction and work justice (Spector and Fox, 2005). However, individual factors as a person have potential to influence the WDB. It can affect people's perceptions and appraisal of the environment, their attributions for causes of an event, their emotional responses, and their ability to engage WDB (Spector, 2010).



Journal of Applied
Management (JAM)
Volume 15 Number 3,
September 2017
Indexed in Google Scholar

Correspondent Author:
Dwi Hastuti, Universiti
Malaysia Perlis, E-mail:
dweehastutihasan@yahoo.co.id
DOI: [http://dx.doi.org/
10.21776/
ub.jam.2017.015.03.01](http://dx.doi.org/10.21776/ub.jam.2017.015.03.01)

Personality assessment is common in the organizational context both in the process of selection and employee development. The results show that these personality factors are attributed to work performance forms of various forms of activity (Baumgartl, et al. 2009). Colbert, et al. (2004), Jensen and Patel (2011) state that using a personality trait approach can make a significant contribution to WDB.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Workplace Deviant Behavior

WDB is defined as intentional acts that harm the organization or people in the organization (Spector and Fox, 2005). Many researchers use different terms, such as counterproductive behavior (Spector, et al., 2010), antisocial behavior (Giacalone, et al., 1997), misbehavior (Vardi and Weiner, 1992), destructive behavior (Murphy, 1993) and many more terms used to replace deviant behavior in the workplace. 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 or extreme apathy. 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 person as individual factors are related to WDB (Abdullah and Marican, 2016 and Ferreira and Nascimento, 2016)

Big Five Personality Trait

Personality definitions are varied. However, all definitions seem to have common characteristics of personality, including individual differences, behav-

ioral dispositions, and stability over time, and that person can be elaborated into specific and fundamental parts. 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 traits are consistent when used for different populations including the population of children, students and adults (McCrae, et al., 2004 and Aluja, et al., 2005) can even be used for cross-cultural ones (Feldman, 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, easy going with others, caring, friendly, optimistic, generous, helpful and willing to compromise (Rothmann and Coetzer, 2013). Extraversion is characterized as a person 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 and 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, et al., 2013). The employees with more open personalities were more likely to be emotionally exhausted and easy to engage in deviant behavior in the workplace. Bolton, et al. (2010), argued that higher openness to experience has related to deviance behavior in the workplace.

WDB and Big Five Personality Traits

Research on the big five personality traits and WDB has been thoroughly studied but empirical research finds inconsistency (Bolton, et al., 2010, Ferreira and Nascimento, 2016, Nielsen, et al., 2017). Bolton, et al. (2010), found that agreeableness, conscientiousness, and extraversion were valid predictor 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 Kozako, et al. (2013), in which neuroticism, openness to experience and agreeableness have a relationship with workplace deviant organizational while neuroticism, openness to experience, extraversion and agreeableness have a relationship to workplace deviant interpersonal. Further, extraversion has no relationship to workplace deviant organizational and conscientiousness has no relation to both forms workplace deviant organizational and interpersonal. Weldali and Lubis (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.

RESEARCH METHODS

A survey was conducted to collect data for this study. The population is men and women employees who work as a civil servant in Pekanbaru. With stratified proportionate random sampling, they are 500 set of questionnaires were distributed and got returned questionnaires are 331, finally, 264 respondents are used for data analysis after excluded from missing data and outlier.

There are two variables are being studied, personality trait and workplace deviance and before distributed to the respondent all variables in this research were 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. 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 the 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).

Based on table 1 above, 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, et al., 2013). Meanwhile, the value of the average variance extracted (AVE) of each item should exceed the number 0.50. So is the value of the composite reliability (CR) is above 0.70 (Hair, et al., 2010).

Structural Model

After measurement model of PLS Analysis is done, next step is calculating the structural model. In this study, an applied standard bootstrapping method to obtain significant levels of any relation-

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	0.882	0.524
	C2	0.902		
	C3	0.714		
	C4	0.865		
	C5	0.571		
	C6	0.573		
Neuroticism	C9	0.573	0.890	0.510
	N1	0.798		
	N2	0.828		
	N3	0.567		
	N4	0.749		
	N5	0.735		
	N6	0.689		
	N7	0.780		
N8	0.499			

Personality Factors as Predictor of Workplace Deviant Behavior among Civil Servants

Construct	Item		CR ^a	AVE
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		

Source: Data proceed, 2017

ship between the construct. In the structural model is an important thing to determine the significant

effect of path coefficients, evaluating the level of R², then determine the effect size (f²), determining

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

R²0.528
Q²0.245
f² (*agree*= 0.00, *extra*= 0.035, *cons*= 0.203, *neuro*= 0.625, *open*= 0.026)

Source: Data proceed, 2017

the predictive relevance and last examine the moderating effect (Henseler, et al., 2009). And the table below will show the results of structural model

From the table 2, 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 R² which is coefficients of determination (Hair, et al., 2012 and Henseler, et al., 2009). The R² value has 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 R² depends on the context of study (Cohen, 1998) shows the value of 0.26, 0.13, 0.02 represent high, moderate and weak sequentially, but in this study, R² is considered high for 0,528 that means as much as 52.8% explained the variance of WDB.

Effect size (f²) personality trait and WDB were evaluated using Cohen's effect size. Effect size f²

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 (Stone, 1974), blindfolding procedure is used to determine the predictive relevance of the research model. A value greater than zero indicates relevant model (Henseler, at 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 civil 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 Weldali and Lubis (2016) as well as Lima, et al. (2016). Besides, conscientiousness has a negative effect on WDB. The high conscientiousness is someone who has a responsibility, hardworking, well-organized, well behaved, moral 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 (Kozako, et al., 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

Workplace deviance as a construct has major implication for employees as well as for organizations. The present research explored workplace deviance behavior in personality traits context among public's employees in Pekanbaru. The result revealed that employee of public sectors engages workplace deviance behavior. And the more important that personality factors such neuroticism and openness to experience are critical factors that always associated to WDB.

RECOMMENDATIONS

As mentions in the beginning that workplace deviance has huge financial implications, and the objective of this study to explore the relationship of it. The organization's policies and procedures have a definite bearing on the workplace deviance, and organizations must be transparent and while managing human beings at work. 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., and 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. and. 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., and 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., and 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., and Barber, L. K. 2010. *Big Five trait predictors of differential counterproduc-*

- itive 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., and 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., and 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 and Kegan Pau
- Feldman, R. S. 2003. *Essentials of Understanding Psychology*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Ferreira, M. F., and Nascimento, E. D. 2016. *Relationship between Personality Traits and Counterproductive Work Behaviors*. *Psico-USF*, 21(3), 677-685.
- Giacalone, R. A., Riordan, C. A. and Rosenfeld, P. 1997. *In R. Giacalone and J. Greenberg (Eds.)*, Antisocial behavior in organizations (pp. 109-129). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Babin, B. J., and 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., and 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., and Sarstedt, M. 2013. *Editorial-partial least squares structural equation modeling: Rigorous applications, better results and higher acceptance*.
- Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., and 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
- Jensen, J. M., Patel, P. C., and 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., and 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. and Indvik, J. 2001. *Rudeness at work: Impulse over restraint*. *Public Personnel Management*, 30, 457-465.
- Kozako, I. N. A. M. F., Safin, S. Z., and 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.
- Lima, L. C., Teha, C. J., and 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., and 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., and 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., and Bennett, R. J. 1995. *A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study*. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(2), 555-572.
- Rothmann, S., and Coetzer, E. P. 2003. *The Big Five Personality Dimensions and Job Performance*. *Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 29(1), 68-74.
- 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., and 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-validators 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., and 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., and Conz, G. 2014. *Validity of six openness facets in predicting work behaviors: A meta-analysis*. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 96 (1), 76-86.