

Personality and Counterproductive Work Behaviour (CWB) at AEON Tebrau, Johor Bahru

Wan Nurul Aziera Ameerah Wan Mohamad Tahir, Mohamad Hafifi Baharun & *Arenawati Sehat Hj Omar

Faculty of Administrative Science and Policy Studies, UiTM Sarawak

Email of corresponding author: mhdhafifi95@gmail.com

Abstract

Limited study regarding the factors contribute to counterproductive work behaviour (CWB) has been directed in investigating whether the Big Five Personality are the predictors of counterproductive work behaviour such as organizational constraints, co-worker performance failure and supervisor pressure. More specifically, the researcher examined whether there is relationship between Big Five Personality (i.e. conscientiousness, agreeableness, neuroticism, openness to experience and extraversion) with CWBs. Other than that, Counterproductive work behaviour (CWB) usually consists of explicit acts such as aggression and theft, or conversely, of more subtle and passive actions, such as willingly failing to fulfil tasks, carelessly following instruction, or doing work incorrectly. Generally, these kinds of matter have negative impacts either individually or towards an organization itself because it can be as a limitation of organization to achieve goal oriented purpose. Regarding this issue, personality of an individual can be as elements in this problem. Among of these five traits personality, there are some have the major contributions towards counterproductive work behaviour in the organization. Thus, this research is conducted to uncover the association between personalities and counterproductive work behaviour.

Keywords: *Personality, Big Five Personality, counterproductive work behaviour, behaviour*

1.1 Introduction

This research is conducted to study and investigate the relationship between personality and counterproductive work behaviour (CWB) towards an organization achievement and performance. It studies on the relationship between Big Five Personality also known as CANOE which is conscientiousness, agreeableness extraversion, neuroticism and lastly openness with counterproductive work behaviour.

2.1 Literature Review and Concept

2.1.1 Personality

Personality traits is the differences of human behaviour towards each other. Thus, researchers have found that the employees job performance are influenced by their personality traits (Mount et al. 1998). In the other words, conscientiousness seem to be more general on the job performance whereas agreeableness and neuroticism interrelated with the job performance through the employees work in group. In addition, extraversion seem to be predict to the job performnace when the employees facing any situation such as managing sales or maybe management position.

2.1.2 Five Factor Model of Personaaity (FFM)

Five Factor Model of Personality is a hierarchical organization of persolaity traits which includes conscientiousness, agreeableness, neuroticism, opennes to experience and extraversion. These five basic dimension of personality shows te important ways on the differences in the form of how human enduring their emotional, interpersonal, attitudes and motivational styles.

Conscientiousness.

Conscientiousness is one of the personality traits that refers to organized and thorough person. In fact,

these traits seems to be the encouragement for a person to achieve their goals, get along with anything and find meanings (Hogan *et al.* 1996). Ones and Viswesvaran, (1997) claimed that person with this traits will spend most their time towards the job completion and will be determined to meet job expectations.

Agreeableness

Agreeableness is found to be positively anticipated with cooperative behaviour (Lephine and Dyne, 2001). Thus, agreeableness will help employees which engage in this traits to have good or effective communication whereby in return reduced their stress realting to both work or non-work aspects (Shaffer *et al.* 2006). In this context, the ability to have good social position with colleugues is the outcomes of the employees who engage with this traits.

Neuroticism

Neuroticism explained traits like tense, moody and anxious. Richards (1996) claimed that this trait normally related with living and working in an unfamiliar environment. Apart from that, According to Hogan and Shelton (1998) argue that neuroticism enables the expatriates to achieve goals as well as to get along and find meaning.

Openness to experience

Openness to experience refers to traits such as having an interest towards something, imaginative as well as insightful. According to McCrae and Costa (1997), openness to experience is a trait whereby emanates from motivational and cognitive components which motivation is the willingness of trying new things.

Extraversion

Extraversion refers to personality like talkative and energetic. In a social environment workplace, the extraversion person are more likely to expose their low level of arousal and less level of stimulation at home (Neubert and Tagger, 2004). In fact, according to Lephine and Dyne (2001) there is positive relationship between extraversion and cooperative behaviour.

2.1.3 Counterproductive Work Behaviour

Counterproductive work behaviour (CWB) can be defined as intentional behaviors that harm or intend to harm organizations or people in organizations. Examples of CWB include yelling at someone, stealing from the organizations, damaging organization's property, and taking longer breaks than allowed. (Zhou, Meier, & Spector, 2014 as cited in Spector & Fox, 2005)

Organizational Constraints

Organizational constraint is more about the limitation faced by the employees that leads to counterproductive work behaviour done by the employees. Hence, several steps must be take in order to avoid this issue from being occurred and plan the best strategy to avoid any organizational constraint which will make the failure to achieve organizational goals and demands.

Coworker performance failure

Coworker performance failure can be defined in many form. One of that is when a cowoker perform task incorrectly, complete task haphazardly and fail to initiate task at all. When coworker failed in performing their task according or in line with the organization's rules and procedures it will leads to increase the workload of others employees. This situation can be even worst when the coworker is part of a workgroup or has taks that are interdependent to others cowokers (Bauer, 2013).

Supervisor pressure

Supervisor pressure define as the situation that faced by the employees in the workplace that come out from the management where include from the top level management and middle level management such as from the manager or from the supervisor. Supervisor pressure will lead to several negative outcome such as burnout, job stress and turnover intention from the employees (Bauer, 2013).

The table below shows the conceptual framework of the study:




Figure 2.1 Proposed conceptual framework

3.0 Conclusion

In conclusion, personality of the individual play an important role in the organization as it can reflect the organization's image and performance. Other than that, personality of the workforce can be as a measurable tool to the quality of the organization for instance the ability to finish their task efficiently and effectively. Hence, this study will provide a further knowledge of type of personality that will leads to counterproductive work behaviour in an organization. This paper may provide researchers or the organization themselves theoretical understanding of personality of individual that can contributes to counterproductive work behaviour.

References

- Balducci, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Fraccaroli, F. (2011). The Job demands-resources model and counterproductive work behaviour: The role of job-related affect. *European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology*.
- Bowling N. A., & Eschleman K. J. (2010). Employee personality as a moderator of the relationships between work stressors and counterproductive work behaviour. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 1,91-103.
- Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 1241–1255.
- Dalal, R., Lam, H., Weiss, H. M., Welch, E. R., & Hulin, C. L. (2009). A within-person

- approach to work behavior and performance: Concurrent and lagged citizenship counterproductivity associations, and dynamic relationships with affect and overall job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52, 1051 – 1066.
- Dill, K. E., Anderson, C. A., Anderson, K. B. & Deuser, W. E. (1997). Effects of aggressive personality on social expectations and social perceptions. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 31, 272-292.
- Douglas, S. C., & Martinko, M. J. (2001). Exploring the role of individual differences in the prediction of workplace aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 547-559.
- Fox, S., Spector, P. E., Goh, A., Bruursema, K., & Kessler, S. R. (2011). The deviant citizen: Measuring potential positive relations between counterproductive work behaviour and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*.
- Hollinger, R. C. & Clark, J. P. (1983). *Theft by Employees*. Lexington, MA: DC Heath & Co. Lexington Books.
- Hoobler, J. M. & Brass, D. J. (2006). Abusive supervision and family undermining as displaced aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 1125-1133.
- Hung, T. K., Chi, N. W., & Lu, W. L. (2009) Exploring the relationships between perceived coworker loafing and counterproductive work behaviors: The mediating role of a revenge motive. *Journal of Business and Psychology* 24(3), 257-270.
- Jones, D. A. (2009). Getting even with one's organization: Relationships among types of injustice, desire for revenge, and counterproductive work behaviors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30, 525-542.
- LePine JA, Van Dyne L. (2001). Voice and cooperative behavior as contrasting forms of contextual performance: Evidence of differential relationships with big five personality characteristics and cognitive ability. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 326-336.
- Marcus, B., Schuler, H., Quell, P., & Humpfer, G. (2002). Measuring counterproductivity: Development and initial validation of a German self-report questionnaire. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10, 18-35.
- Miles, D. E., Borman, W. E., Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2002). Building an integrative model of extra role work behaviors: A comparison of counterproductive work behavior with organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10, 51-57.
- Mitchell, M. S., & Ambrose, M. L. (2007) Abusive supervision and workplace deviance and the moderating effects of negative reciprocity beliefs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 1159-68.
- Penney, L. M., & Spector, P. E. (2005). Job stress, incivility, and counterproductive work behavior (CWB): The moderating role of negative affectivity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 777-796.
- Penney, L. M., Spector, P. E. (2008). Emotions and counterproductive work behavior. In N. M. Ashkanasy & C. L. Cooper (Eds.). *Research Companion to Emotion in Organizations* Elsevier Science.
- Peters, L. H., & O'Connor, E. J. (1980). Situational constraints and work outcomes: influences of a frequently overlooked construct. *Academy of Management Review*, 5, 391-397.
- Sackett, P. R. (2002). The structure of counterproductive work behaviors: Dimensionality and relationships with facets of job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10, 5-11.
- Spector, P. (2011). The relationship of personality to counterproductive work behavior

- (CWB): An integration of perspectives. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21, 342-352.
- Spector, P. E., Bauer, J. A., & Fox, S. (2010). Measurement artifacts in the assessment of counterproductive work and organizational citizenship behavior: Do we know what we think we know? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95, 781-790.
- Spector, P. E., Fox, S., Penney, L. M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A., & Kessler, S. (2006). The dimensionality of counterproductivity: Are all counterproductive behaviors created equal?. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68, 446-460.
- Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2005). A model of counterproductive work behavior. In S. Fox & P. E. Spector (Eds.), *Counterproductive workplace behavior: Investigations of actors and targets* (pp. 151-174). Washington, DC:APA.
- Taggar, S., & Neubert, M. (2004). The impact of poor performers on team outcomes: An empirical examination of attribution theory. *Personnel Psychology*, 57(4), 935-968.
- Venkataramani, V., & Dalal, R. S. (2007). Who helps and harms whom? Relational antecedents of interpersonal helping and harming in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 952-966.