

Personality Factors As Predictors Of Counterproductive Work Behaviour Among Benue State Civil Servants

Judith Ayangeawam Mase

Department of Psychology, Benue State University,
Makurdi, Nigeria

Abstract: *This study examined personality factors as predictors of counterproductive work behaviour (CWB) among Benue State civil servants. The study employed the cross-sectional survey method. Participants for the study were 420 civil servants systematically and randomly selected from 23 Ministries, Departments, and Agencies (MDAs) in the state. They were 285(67.9%) males, 127(30.2%) females, and 8(1.9%) respondents who failed to indicate their sex, with the mean age of 41.95 years and (SD=9.597). Instruments for data collection include the Counterproductive Work Behaviour (CWB) Questionnaire and the Big Five Personality Inventory (BFI). The hypothesis was tested using standard multiple regression. Results revealed that there was a significant joint influence of personality traits in the prediction of overall CWB. Independently, extraversion, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness but not agreeableness significantly predicted CWB. The study concluded that personality traits of the employees are very important in the prediction of CWB among Benue state civil servants. The study recommended that employers of labour should endeavour to determine the personality traits of their potential employees during hiring, selection and placement with particular interest in openness and extraversion traits, in order to reduce the possibility of high levels of CWBs among the employees.*

Keywords: *Personality traits, Counterproductive Work Behaviours, Benue State, Civil Servants*

I. INTRODUCTION

Counterproductive Work Behaviours (CWBs) have continued to attract the interest of organisational researchers in recent times. Due to its pervasive negative effects on the organisation, current trends in industrial and organisational psychology suggest a continuing increase in the study of counterproductive work behaviours (Levy & Tziner, 2011). According to Spector, Bauer and Fox (2010), the term counterproductive work behaviour is seen as a volitional behaviour that harms or intends to harm organisations or people in organisations. Chang and Smithikrai (2010) on their part define counterproductive workplace behaviour as a class of behaviour that acts against the interests of the organisation, which individuals, usually, consciously choose to engage in. Hafidz, Hoesni and Fatimah (2012) observe that counterproductive work behaviours affect not just the organisation, but also influence other employees, customers and suppliers. Gruys and Sackett (2003) classified these

behaviours into eleven main dimensions of theft and other related behaviours; destruction of property; misuse of information; misuse of time and resources; unsafe behaviour; poor attendance; poor quality work; alcohol use; drug use; inappropriate verbal actions; and inappropriate physical actions.

Generally, employees are expected to be loyal to their organisation, promote its vision and goals by promoting its growth and continued well-being through good conduct. Unfortunately, in the recent years, counterproductive work behaviours have become prevalent among civil servants in Nigeria and Benue State in particular. For instance, the Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC) reported that many employees in the civil service have looted their organisations thereby rendering such organisations ineffective (Ogbodo, Jimoh & Onochie, 2012). There are reports of billions of naira being embezzled by senior government officials while there are also rampant cases of public office

holders being arraigned before the court for charges of bribery and corruption (Daniel, 2015).

The most difficult thing about CWB is that in reality, its actual extent can never be ascertained because, these acts are usually hidden. Despite the costs and prevalence of counterproductive behaviours in organisations, the information related to deviance in workplace is limited.

Counterproductive Work Behaviour is an aggregated set of behaviours and not just a single type once in a while behaviour. Fleeson and Nofle (2009) asserted that, aggregated behaviours are more consistent across time and situations compared to single behaviours, and they can be predicted more reliably by personality and situational variables. Cullen and Sackett (2003) stated that personality can influence the occurrence of deviant behaviours specifically the belief components associated with the attitude towards a given negative behaviour. The big five (BFI) personality factors namely: Openness to experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism are considered in the present study to find out if they can predict the unethical and other questionable behaviours in organisations by civil servants in Nigeria and Benue State in particular.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOUR

Counterproductive workplace behaviour (CWB) is known by various names. Synonyms used in the literature for counterproductive work behaviours include antisocial behaviours (Giacalone, Riordon, & Rosenfeld, 1997), deviance (Robinson & Bennett, 1995), destructive behaviours (Murphy, 1993; Warren, 2003), misbehaviours (Southey, 2010), and bad behaviours (Griffin & Lopez, 2005). These are broad terms that represent a host of specific negative workplace behaviours including absenteeism, lateness, theft, sabotage, substance use, hostility, obstructionism, verbal aggression, and sexual harassment. According to Marcus *et al.* (2013), the content overlap between measures of workplace deviance and counterproductive work behaviour seems almost perfect, and hence, both terms are used interchangeably.

Over the years, various researchers have studied a similar set of behaviours, though they have used different terminologies depending on their theoretical focus, which include: organisational delinquency (Hogan & Hogan, 1989), organisation-motivated aggression (O'Leary-Kelly, Griffin, & Glew, 1996), organisational retaliatory behaviours (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997), workplace aggression (Baron & Neuman, 1996), workplace deviance, (Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Robinson & Bennett, 1995), revenge (Bies & Tripp, 1998), and antisocial behaviour in organisations (Giacalone & Greenberg, 1997). Earlier studies by Spector, Fox, Penney, Bruursema, Goh and Kessler (2006) named such negative acts to include direct aggression, theft, purposely failing to follow instructions or to perform work incorrectly, in the interest of violating significant organisational norms.

Many researchers define counterproductive work behaviour in different ways. According to O'Boyle Jr. (2010), counterproductive work behaviour is a collection of deliberate

behaviours that harm the organisation or its members. Chang and Smithikrai (2010) defined counterproductive work behaviour as a class of behaviours that act against the interests of the organisation which individuals, usually, consciously choose to engage in. They explained counterproductive work behaviour as voluntary or purposeful behaviours that function against the passions of the organisation. Gruys and Sackett (2003) on their part define counterproductive work behaviour as any intentional behaviour on the part of an organisational member viewed by the organisation as contrary to its legitimate interests. To Spector and Fox (2002), CWB refers to behaviour by employees that harms an organisation or its members (such as other employees, customers, suppliers etc.) and includes acts such as theft, sabotage, verbal abuse, withholding of effort, lying, refusing to cooperate, and physical assault (Penney & Spector, 2005).

A few criteria have been proposed for labeling or defining work behaviours as counterproductive. First, the behaviours should be intentional and volitional (Gruys & Sackett, 2003; Marcus & Schuler, 2004). Behaviours that lead to negative consequences but are accidental are not considered counterproductive. For example, a civil servant that deletes an important document from a work computer has not engaged in counterproductive work behaviour, provided the behaviour occurred unintentionally. Bennett and Robinson (2000) also stated that intentionally engaging in counterproductive work behaviour may indicate a motivation to violate organisational norms or may simply indicate a lack of motivation to conform to these norms.

Secondly, although the behaviours are potentially harmful, they need not actually lead to any harm (Marcus & Schuler, 2004). For example, a driver of a Permanent Secretary while under the influence of alcohol may be fortunate enough not to get into an accident. However, the seriousness and gravity of his action as counterproductive work behaviour cannot be refuted. Thirdly, the behaviour could be directed at either the organization, (e.g., poor attendance and misuse of time and resources) or other individuals within the workplace (e.g. inappropriate verbal actions) (Bennett & Robinson, 2000).

Fourthly, the perpetrators of counterproductive work behaviours should typically be organisational members. This is because unwanted behaviours from outsiders can be quite harmful, lead to negative consequences and tend to be a source of concern for organisations and their employees. Moreover, these behaviours from outsiders are sometimes harder to control than those perpetrated by organisational members. In addition, organisations are primarily concerned with controlling the behaviours of their employees (Gruys & Sackett, 2003). Fifth, the behaviours should be contrary to the legitimate interest of the organisation (Sackett, 2002). Employees may engage in behaviours that are contrary to the interest of the organisation and yet, these behaviours may not be deviant or wrong. For example, a star employee who decides to accept a better job offer in another organisation or a whistle-blower who exposes wrongdoing within an organisation are both engaging in actions that are contrary to the interest of the organisation but these actions are not considered counterproductive (Sackett, 2002).

Researchers have classified counterproductive workplace behaviour in various groups based on different views. For example, Mann, Budworth, and Ismaila, (2012) classified them into theft, destruction of property, misuse of information, misuse of time and resources, unsafe behaviour, poor attendance, poor quality work, alcohol use, drug use, inappropriate physical actions, lateness, rude and cynic behaviour to workmates etc. Gruys and Sackett (2003) grouped these behaviours into eleven broad dimensions with the negative acts that comprised them as follow:

THEFT AND RELATED BEHAVIOUR: It includes acts such as helping another person or advising them on how to take company property or merchandise; take cash or property belonging to the company; misuse of business expense account, taking cash or property belonging to a co-worker; taking office supplies from the company; taking petty cash from the company; taking cash or property belonging to a customer; give away goods or services for free; providing goods or services at less than the price established by the company; misuse of employee discount privileges.

DESTRUCTION OF PROPERTY: It includes, damaging or destroying property belonging to a coworker; defacing, damaging, or destroying property, belonging to a customer; defacing, damaging, or destroying property, equipment, or product belonging to the company; deliberately sabotaging the production of product in the company.

MISUSE OF INFORMATION: Behaviours included here are destruction or falsification of company records or documents; discuss confidential matters with unauthorised personnel within or outside the organisation; intentionally failing to give a supervisor or co-worker necessary information; providing the organisation with false information to obtain a job, lying to employer or supervisor to cover up a mistake.

MISUSE OF TIME AND RESOURCES: This encompass acts such as conducting personal business during work time; spending time on the internet for reasons not related to work; taking a long lunch or coffee break without approval; wasting time on the job; wasting company resources; use of company resources you are not authorised to use; making personal long distance calls at work; mail personal packages at work; making personal photocopies at work; use email for personal purposes; play computer games during work time; and work unnecessary overtime.

UNSAFE BEHAVIOUR: This include behaviours such as endangering yourself by not following safety procedures; endangering coworker by not following safety procedures; endangering customer by not following safety procedures; failing to read the manual outlining safety procedures.

POOR ATTENDANCE: This include being absent from work without a legitimate excuse; intentionally coming to work late; using sick leave when not really sick; leaving work early without permission; missing work without calling in.

POOR QUALITY WORK: Include acts such as intentionally performing your job below acceptable standards; intentionally doing work badly or incorrectly; intentionally doing slow or sloppy work.

ALCOHOL USE: Acts found here are coming to work under the influence of alcohol; having your performance

affected due to a hangover from alcohol; engaging in alcohol consumption on the job.

DRUG USE: this include acts such as engaging in drug use on the job, coming to work under the influence of drugs, possessing or selling drugs on company property, and having your performance affected due to a hangover from drugs.

INAPPROPRIATE VERBAL ACTION: Behaviours that are classified under this are arguing or fighting with a co-worker; yelling or shouting on the job; verbally abusing a customer; verbally abusing a co-worker; verbally abusing a supervisor; using sexually explicit language in the workplace; arguing or fighting with a supervisor; arguing or fighting with a customer.

INAPPROPRIATE PHYSICAL ACTION: Include acts such as physically attacking a co-worker; physically attacking a customer; physically attacking a supervisor; making unwanted sexual advances toward a subordinate; making unwanted sexual advances toward a co-worker; making unwanted sexual advances toward a customer.

Hollinger and Clark (1982) maintained that counterproductive workplace behaviours reduce the efficiency and job performance of its members and basically threaten the health and wellbeing of the organisations and its members. There are also psychological reactions to CWB which include feelings of depression and anxiety (Bjorkvist, Osterman & Hjelt-Back, 1994), psychosocial problems (Kaukiainen, Salmivalli, Bjorkvist & Osterman, 2001); emotional exhaustion (O'Brien & Vandello, 2005; Tepper, 2000); life dissatisfaction (Tepper, 2000); and decrements in emotional well-being (LeBlanc & Kelloway, 2002; Schat & Kelloway, 2000). Physical reactions include physical symptoms (Kaukiainen, Salmivalli, Bjorkvist & Osterman, 2001) and decrements in psychosomatic well-being (LeBlanc & Kelloway, 2002; Schat & Kelloway, 2003). According to Hoel, Einarsen and Cooper (2003), even though CWBs are more difficult to quantify, the negative psychological impact of workplace deviance can translate into reduced employee morale, higher rates of absenteeism and turnover, and lower productivity. Such losses to organisation and negative emotions to individuals will affect organisational performance (Dunlop & Lee, 2004; Harper, 1990).

PERSONALITY FACTORS

Definitions of personality are varied. However, all definitions seem to share common characteristics of personality, including individual differences, behavioural dispositions, and stability over time, and that personality can be decomposed into its specific and fundamental parts (Furnham & Heaven, 1999). Personality is made up of the characteristic patterns of thoughts, feelings, and behaviours that make a person unique. It is a complex combination of factors that has been developed over a person's entire childhood and young adulthood.

In 1936, Allport and Odbert were the first researchers to identify the set of words describing personality characteristics in the English language. Their compendium of 4,500 words has been the primary starting point of language-based personality trait research for over six decades ago (Howard & Howard, 2004). Later, Cattell (1946) reported that he had

scientifically derived 16 personality traits using factor-analytic and related statistical procedures. He believed that these factors represent the major dimensions for explaining the differences in human personality (Liebert & Spiegler, 1994). However, Fiske (1949) suggested that five, not sixteen, factors accounted for the variance in personality trait descriptors. Several other researchers (Tupes & Christal, 1961; Norman, 1963; Eysenck, 1967; Costa & McCrae, 1992) later developed a solid basis for the Big Five factor model. Many studies also confirmed that the Big Five factors emerge quite consistently in different populations of individuals, including children, college students, older adults, and speakers of different languages (Costa and McCrae, 2004; McCrae et al., 2004; Aluja et al., 2005). Furthermore, cross-cultural research of the Big Five factors is also supportive (Feldman, 2003).

According to Goldberg (1993), the five overarching domains have been found to contain and subsume most known personality traits and are assumed to represent the basic structure behind all personality traits. These five factors provide a rich conceptual framework for integrating all the research findings and theory in personality psychology (O'Connor, Brian 2002). Acronyms commonly used to refer to the five traits collectively are OCEAN, NEOAC, or CANOE. These traits are explained as follows:

CONSCIENTIOUSNESS TRAIT: This is a tendency to show self-discipline, act dutifully, and aim for achievement against measures or outside expectations. The trait shows a preference for planned rather than spontaneous behaviour. It influences the way in which we control, regulate, and direct our impulses (Costa, & McCrae 1992).

AGREEABLENESS: This is a tendency to be compassionate and cooperative rather than suspicious and antagonistic towards others. The trait reflects individual differences in general concern for social harmony. Agreeable individuals value getting along with others, they are generally considerate, friendly, generous, helpful, and willing to compromise their interests with others (Rothmann, & Coetzer 2013). They also have an optimistic view of human nature. Disagreeable individuals on the other hand place self-interest above getting along with others. They are generally unconcerned with others' well-being, and are less likely to extend themselves for other people. Sometimes their skepticism about others' motives causes them to be suspicious, unfriendly, and uncooperative.

NEUROTICISM: This dimension relates to one's emotional stability and degree of negative emotions. Neuroticism is the tendency to experience negative emotions, such as anger, anxiety, or depression. It is sometimes called emotional instability, or is reversed and referred to as emotional stability. Neuroticism is similar but not identical to being neurotic in the Freudian sense. Some psychologists prefer to call neuroticism by the term emotional stability to differentiate it from the term neurotic in a career test. According to Eysenck's (1967) theory of personality, neuroticism is interlinked with low tolerance for stress or aversive stimuli. Those that score high on neuroticism are emotionally reactive and vulnerable to stress. They are more likely to interpret ordinary situations as threatening, and minor frustrations as hopelessly difficult. Their negative emotional reactions tend to persist for unusually long periods of time,

which means they are often in a bad mood. For instance, neuroticism is connected to a pessimistic approach toward work, confidence that work impedes with personal relationships, and apparent anxiety linked with work (Fiske, Gilbert & Lindzey, 2009).

EXTRAVERSION TRAIT: Extraversion is characterized by breadth of activities (as opposed to depth), surgency from external activity/situations, and energy creation from external means (Laney, Marti, & Olsen 2002). The trait is marked by pronounced engagement with the external world. Extraverts enjoy interacting with people, and are often perceived as full of energy. They tend to be enthusiastic, action-oriented individuals. They possess high group visibility, like to talk, and assert themselves. Extraversion contrasts traits such as talkativeness, assertiveness, and activity level with traits such as silence, passivity, and reserve.

OPENNESS TRAIT: It is a general appreciation for art, emotion, adventure, unusual ideas, imagination, curiosity, and variety of experience. It reflects the degree of intellectual curiosity, creativity and a preference for novelty and variety a person has. It is also described as the extent to which a person is imaginative or independent, and depicts a personal preference for a variety of activities over a strict routine. People who are open to experience are intellectually curious, appreciative of art, and sensitive to beauty. They tend to be, when compared to closed people, more creative and more aware of their feelings. They are more likely to hold unconventional beliefs (Boileau, 2008).

One common criticism of the Big Five is that it does not explain all of human personality. Some psychologists have dissented from the model precisely because they feel it neglects other domains of personality, such as religiosity, manipulateness / machiavellianism, honesty, sexiness / seductiveness, thriftiness, conservativeness, masculinity / femininity, Snobbishness / egotism, Sense of humour, and risk-taking / thrill-seeking (Paunonen, & Jackson 2000; Paunonen, Haddock, & Keinonen, 2003). Critics also argue that the Big Five does not explain all of human personality. Specifically, Eysenck (1992) argued that two factors Agreeableness and Conscientiousness in the Big-Five representation are merely facets of the higher level construct of Psychoticism in his Psychoticism-Extraversion-Neuroticism (P-E-N) model. Others argued that the methodology used to identify the dimensional structure of personality traits, factor analysis, is not having a universally-recognized basis for choosing among solutions with different numbers of factors.

PERSONALITY AND COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOUR

Traditionally, work linking personality characteristics to CWBs has been done using common personality frameworks, such as the Big Five. However, previous research has generated mixed findings in terms of how well these "common" personality traits predict CWBs. O'Neill and Hastings (2011) investigated personality as it relates to deviant behaviours in the workplace, such as theft, absenteeism, and mistreatment of co-workers and found that that traits such as Integrity, Risk Taking, and Seductiveness, among others, explained substantial variance in workplace deviance. They

concluded that research on personality and workplace deviance needs to move beyond the Big Five to include alternative personality variables that can enhance both prediction and the development of theory regarding personality-deviance relations. Similarly, Bolton, Becker and Barber (2010) examined Big Five predictors of differential counterproductive work behaviour dimensions found that extraversion predicted theft. Intan, Siti, and Abdulrahman (2013) also explored the influence of Big Five personality traits towards counterproductive work behaviour (CWB), specifically focused on organisation (CWB-O) and individual (CWB-I). They found negative relationship between extraversion and CWB-I.

Ruiz, Pincus, and Dickinson (2003) investigated the relationships between Five-factor model domains and facets and drinking and alcohol-related problems. Their results showed that extraversion was associated with drinking. In another study, Waheeda and Hafidz (2012) looked at individual factors as antecedents of CWB, focusing on personality, locus of control, and values. Findings emerged from the study which showed that agreeableness (out of the five personality factors) was found to be negatively correlated with CWB. In a similar way, Xenoudaki and Stafyla (2012) examined contextual factors and personality traits in the exhibition of deceiving and hiding-related behaviours of employees, in post layoff environments in Greece. Results from the study suggest strong relations between the examined behaviours, and also between these behaviours and the Big Five personality traits. However, agreeableness was found to predict efficiently evasive hiding and misuse of information behaviours respectively.

In a meta-analysis, Salgado (2002) hypothesized that agreeableness, conscientiousness, and emotional stability will be valid predictors of CWB. They considered CWB to include acts such as absenteeism, accidents, deviant behaviours, and turnover. The results of the study showed that none of the five personality traits were a predictor for absenteeism and accidents. All five personality traits were a predictor for lack of turnover, and agreeableness was predictor for deviant behaviour. In another earlier and similar study by *Farhadi, Fatimah, Nasir and Wan (2012)* on agreeableness and conscientiousness as antecedents of deviant behaviour in workplace, they found a statistically significant negative relationship between workplace deviant behaviour and conscientiousness where individuals of conscientiousness personality type have fewer tendencies to be involved in workplace deviant behaviour. Another meta analysis conducted by Salgado (2001) revealed that low conscientiousness was valid predictor of deviant behaviours in the workplace as well as turnover. Yuxin, Lihong, Zhang and Ma (2011) examined the big five personality and counterproductive work behaviour (CWB) with the moderating role of perceived organisational support in Beijing, China. They found out that conscientiousness had significant predictive power on both property CWB and production CWB. Among the five personality factors, conscientiousness also had significant predictive power on general CWB.

HYPOTHESIS

Personality traits of various dimensions viz: extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness, will independently and jointly predict counterproductive work behaviour among the Benue State civil servants.

III. METHOD

DESIGN

The study employed cross-sectional survey method to investigate personality factors as predictors of counterproductive work behaviour among Benue State civil servants as a subgroup within the entire Nigeria civil service population.

PARTICIPANTS

The participants for this study were 420 civil servants drawn from the population of 23,217 civil servants in the 80 Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs) that comprised the entire Benue State Civil Service as at the time of this research.

INSTRUMENTS

The instrument for the study was questionnaire which was divided into three parts; section A, B and C. Section A contained demographic data of the respondents which include the sex, age in years, tenure, grade level, and level of education. Section B is the Big Five Personality Inventory while Section C is the Counterproductive Work Behaviour Scale.

BFI: The 44-item Big Five Personality Inventory developed by John, Donahue and Kentle (1991) was used to measure five aspects of personality traits: extraversion; agreeableness; conscientiousness; neuroticism and openness. It is scored on a Likert type scale format ranging from Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree a little=2, Neither agree or Disagree=3, Agree a Little=4 and Strongly Agree=5, with higher scores indicating higher levels of employees engagement in CWBs and vice versa. The scale had a good reliability coefficients according to the authors. In the present study, the BFI yielded the following Cronbach's alpha: extraversion (6 items)=.70; agreeableness (9 items)=.52; conscientiousness (9 items)=.58; neuroticism (7 items)=.63 and openness to experience (10 items)=.74 respectively.

COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOUR SCALE: Counterproductive work behaviour questionnaire is a standardized scale developed by Gruys and Sackett (2003) to measure counterproductive work behaviours of employee in organisations. It has 11 subscales and a total number of 66 items. It has 5 response option: No matter the circumstance, I would never engage in that behaviour = 1, I would not engage in that behaviour = 2, I would rarely engage in that behaviour = 3, In some circumstances, I would engage in that behaviour = 4, and In a wide variety of circumstances, I would engage in that behaviour = 5, with higher scores indicating high

engagement in CWB. The reliability coefficients for pilot and main study are .97 and .90 respectively.

DATA ANALYSIS

Responses of participants to the questionnaire were coded and entered into the IBM Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20.0. The standard multiple regression was used to test the independent and joint influence of personality traits (openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism) on counterproductive work behaviours.

IV. RESULTS

DVs	R	R ²	F	df	P	β	t	Sig
CWB								
Constant							21.88	.00
Extraversion						-.130	-2.43	.02
Agreeableness						.092	1.54	.13
Conscientiousness	.372	.138	12.91	5,403	.01	.180	2.93	.00
Neuroticism						.140	2.44	.02
Openness						-.259	-5.21	.00
Theft								
Constant							6.20	.000
Extraversion						-.061	-1.11	.27
Agreeableness						.070	1.14	.25
Conscientiousness	.300	.090	7.98	5,403	.01	.159	2.50	.01
Neuroticism						.111	1.88	.06
Openness						-.214	-4.19	.00
Destruction of property								
Constant							5.52	.00
Extraversion						-.237	-4.38	.00
Agreeableness						.185	3.06	.00
Conscientiousness	.335	.112	10.19	5,403	.00	.159	2.50	.01
Neuroticism						.104	1.78	.08
Openness						-.158	-3.13	.00
Information misuse								
Constant							6.39	.00
Extraversion						-.165	-3.04	.00
Agreeableness						.147	2.43	.02
Conscientiousness	.332	.111	10.01	5,403	.00	.090	1.44	.15
Neuroticism						.153	2.62	.01
Openness						-.213	-4.22	.00
Time and resource misuse								
Constant							7.35	.00
Extraversion						-.021	-.374	.71
Agreeableness						.093	1.51	.13
Conscientiousness	.274	.075	6.54	5,403	.00	.068	1.06	.29
Neuroticism						.123	2.06	.04
Openness						-.238	-4.62	.00
Unsafe Behaviour								
Constant							5.55	.00
Extraversion						-.124	-2.24	.03
Agreeableness						.115	1.86	.06
Conscientiousness	.281	.079	6.83	5,399	.00	.144	2.23	.03
Neuroticism						.078	1.30	.20
Openness						-.166	-3.20	.01
Poor attendance								
Constant							7.35	.00
Extraversion						-.125	-2.31	.02
Agreeableness						.045	0.74	.46
Conscientiousness	.337	.114	10.33	5,403	.00	.166	2.66	.01
Neuroticism						.132	2.26	.02
Openness						-.241	-4.78	.01
Poor quality work								
Constant							6.95	.00
Extraversion						-.150	-2.75	.01
Agreeableness						.018	0.29	.77
Conscientiousness	.313	.098	8.76	5,403	.00	.168	2.67	.01
Neuroticism						.107	1.83	.07
Openness						-.205	-4.02	.00
Alcohol use								
Constant							5.92	.00

Extraversion								-.098	-1.79	.07
Agreeableness								.020	0.32	.75
Conscientiousness	.297	.088	7.81	5,403	.00	.201		3.16	.00	
Neuroticism								.064	1.08	.28
Openness								-.209	-4.08	.00
Drug use										
Constant									6.34	.00
Extraversion								-.136	-2.51	.01
Agreeableness								.001	0.32	.98
Conscientiousness	.336	.113	10.24	5,403	.00	.202		3.23	.01	
Neuroticism								.112	1.93	.06
Openness								-.223	-4.41	.00
Inappropriate verbal action										
Constant									61.55	.00
Extraversion								-.122	-2.25	.03
Agreeableness								.067	1.10	.27
Conscientiousness	.324	.105	9.45	5,403	.00	.221		3.51	.00	
Neuroticism								.074	1.27	.21
Openness								-.191	-3.77	.00
Inappropriate physical action										
Constant									5.41	.00
Extraversion								-.122	-2.24	.03
Agreeableness								.053	0.88	.38
Conscientiousness	.332	.110	9.96	5,403	.00	.176		2.81	.01	
Neuroticism								.142	2.43	.02
Openness								-.208	-4.11	.00

Table 1: Standard multiple regression showing the joint and independent prediction of personality traits on overall CWB and its subscales among Benue State civil servants

Table 1 presents the joint and independent prediction of personality dimensions namely: extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness on overall CWB and its subscales. The result shows that there was a significant joint prediction of these variables in the prediction of overall CWB [R=.372, R²=.138; F (5,403) = 12.91, p<.001]. This model accounted for 13.8% of the observed variance in employee CWB, thus confirming the assumption in hypothesis 1. With regard to the various personality dimensions, openness was the most important predictor of CWB in the negative direction (β = -.259; t=-5.21; p<.01); it accounted for 25.9% of the variance in employee CWB. The result implies that the more open a person is the less likely he/she would engage in CWB. The second most important predictor of overall CWB was conscientiousness (β = .180; t=2.93; p<.05); it explained 18 % of the variance in overall CWB. This means that the more conscientious a person is the more likely he/she would engage in CWB. The third most important independent predictor was neuroticism (β = .140; t=2.44; p<.05); it accounted for 14% of the variance in CWB. The result implies that the more neurotic a person is the more likely he/she would engage in CWB. Extraversion was the least important predictor of CWB in the negative direction (β = -.130; t=-2.43; p<.05); it accounted for 13% of the variance in CWB. This shows that the more extraverted a person is the more likely he/she would engage in CWB. On the contrary however, agreeableness did not significantly predict overall CWB (β = .092; t=1.54; p>.05). Based on these results, the research hypothesis was confirmed for openness, neuroticism, extraversion, and conscientiousness but not for agreeableness.

Results from Table 1 also revealed that extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness were jointly significant predictors of theft [R=.300, R² = .090; F(5,403) = 7.98 P<.01]. The result reveals that these personality dimensions together accounted for 9% of the observed variance in employee theft. Thus, hypothesis 1 was

confirmed. In the case of independent contributions, extraversion ($\beta = -.061$; $t=-1.11$; $p>.05$), agreeableness ($\beta = .070$; $t=1.14$; $p>.05$), and neuroticism ($\beta = .111$; $t=1.88$; $p>.05$) were not significant predictors of theft. However, openness ($\beta = -.214$; $t=-4.91$; $p<.01$), and conscientiousness ($\beta=.195$; $t=2.50$; $P<.01$) individually significantly predicted theft, though, openness predicted in the negative direction. This means that the more open a person is the less likely he/she would engage in theft as a CWB; it also implies that the more conscientious a person is the more likely he/she would engage in theft as a CWB. The significant variables (openness and conscientiousness) accounted for 21.4%, and 15.9% of the observed variance in employee theft respectively. Thus, the hypothesis was confirmed only for openness and conscientiousness but not for extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism with regards to individual prediction of the outcome variable.

Result from the Table also indicated that there was a significant joint predictor of personality dimensions (extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness) in the prediction of destruction of property [$R=.335$, $R^2 =.112$; $F(5,403)=10.19$ $P<.01$]. The variables, jointly accounted for 11.2% of the observed variance in employee destruction of property, thus confirming hypothesis 1. Independently, the result revealed that conscientiousness ($\beta=-.104$; $t=1.67$; $p>.05$), and neuroticism ($\beta=.104$; $t=1.78$; $P>.05$) factors did not predict destruction of property significantly. However, extraversion ($\beta=-.237$; $t=-4.38$; $P<.001$), openness ($\beta=-.158$; $t=-3.13$ $P<.05$), and agreeableness ($\beta=.185$; $t=3.06$; $P<.05$) all individually predicted employee destruction of property significantly, though, extraversion and openness predicted in the negative direction. This implies that the more extraverted or open a person is the less likely his/her propensity to destroy the property of the organization; it also implies that the more agreeable a person is the more likely he/she would engage in destruction of property as a CWB. The significant variables (extraversion, openness and agreeableness) accounted for 23.7%, 15.8% and 18.5% of the observed variance in employee destruction of property respectively. Hypothesis 1 was therefore confirmed for extraversion, openness and agreeableness but not for conscientiousness and neuroticism.

Results from the Table again showed the predictive influence of the personality traits (extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness) jointly and independently for a dimension of CWB namely: Misuse of information. The result indicates that there was a significant joint prediction of personality traits in the prediction of misuse of information [$R=.332$, $R^2=.111$; $F(5,403)=10.01$ $P<.001$]. The personality traits dimensions jointly explained about 11.1% of the observed variance in employee information misuse, thus confirming hypothesis 1. In the case of independent prediction, conscientiousness ($\beta=.090$; $t=1.44$; $p>.05$) did not predict misuse of information significantly. However, extraversion ($\beta=-.165$; $t=-3.04$; $p<.01$), agreeableness ($\beta=.147$; $t=2.43$; $p<.05$), neuroticism ($\beta=.153$; $t=2.62$; $p<.01$), and openness ($\beta=-.213$; $t=-4.22$; $p<.01$) all were individual significant predictors of employee information misuse. Two of the significant factors namely, extraversion and openness predicted the outcome variable in the negative

direction. This means that the more extraverted or open a person is the less likely he/she would engage in information misuse as CWB. This also implies that the more agreeable or neurotic a person is the more likely his/her propensity to engage in information misuse as CWB. The significant variables (extraversion, agreeableness, neuroticism, and openness) accounted for 16.5%, 14.7%, 15.3%, and 21.3% of the observed variance in information misuse respectively, thus confirming hypothesis 1 except for conscientiousness.

The result from table 4.4.5 also revealed that extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness jointly were significant predictors of time and resource misuse [$R=.274$, $R^2=.075$; $F(5,403)=6.54$ $p<.001$]. They accounted for about 7.5% of the observed variance in employee time and resource misuse, thus confirming hypothesis 1. Independently, extraversion ($\beta =-.021$; $t= -0.37$; $p>.05$), agreeableness ($\beta =.093$; $t=1.51$; $p>.05$), and conscientiousness ($\beta =.068$; $t=1.06$; $p>.05$) traits did not predict time and resource misuse significantly. On the contrary, neuroticism ($\beta=.123$; $t=2.06$; $p<.05$), and openness ($\beta=-.238$; $t=-4.62$; $p<.01$) traits significantly predicted time and resource misuse, though openness predicted in the negative direction. The result implies that the more open a person is the less likely he/she would engage in misuse of time and resources as a CWB; it also implies that the more neurotic a person is the more likely he/she would engage in misuse of time and resources as a CWB. The significant variables (neuroticism and openness) explained about 12.3% and 23.8% of the observed variance in employee CWB factor of time and resource misuse respectively. Thus hypothesis 1 was confirmed for neuroticism and openness, but not for extraversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness.

Table 4.2.6 also presents the joint and independent prediction of personality traits dimensions on unsafe behaviour. The result in the table shows that extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness were jointly significant predictors of unsafe behaviour [$R=.281$, $R^2=.079$; $F(5,399)= 6.83$ $p<.001$]. The result revealed that these personality dimensions accounted for about 7.9% of the observed variance in employee unsafe behaviour, thus hypothesis 1 was confirmed. Independently, the result revealed that agreeableness ($\beta=.115$; $t=1.86$; $p>.05$), and neuroticism ($\beta=.078$; $t=1.30$; $p>.05$) did not significantly predict unsafe behaviour. However, extraversion ($\beta=-.124$; $t=-2.24$; $p<.05$), conscientiousness ($\beta=.144$; $t=2.23$ $P<.05$), and openness ($\beta= -.166$; $t=-3.20$; $p<.01$) all were significant predictors of unsafe behaviour, though extraversion and openness predicted in the negative direction. This implies that the more extraverted or open a person is the less likely he/she would engage in unsafe behaviour as a CWB; it also means that the more conscientious a person is the more he/she would engage in unsafe behaviour as a CWB. The significant variables (extraversion, conscientiousness and openness) accounted for 12.4%, 14.4% and 16.6% of the observed variance in employee unsafe behaviour respectively. Therefore, hypothesis 1 was confirmed for extraversion, conscientiousness, and openness but not for extraversion and conscientiousness.

The result from the table 4.2.7 shows the predictive influence of personality traits jointly and independently for

poor attendance. The result in the table shows that extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness were significant predictors of poor attendance [$R=.337$, $R^2=.114$; $F(5,403)=10.33$, $p<.01$]. The dimensions accounted for about 11.4% of the variance in employee poor attendance. Independently, only agreeableness ($\beta=.045$; $t=0.74$; $p>.05$) did not significantly predict poor attendance. However, four dimensions of the personality traits namely: extraversion, neuroticism, conscientiousness and openness were significant predictors of poor attendance. Among these, openness was the most important predictor of poor attendance in the negative direction ($\beta=-.241$; $t=-4.78$; $p<.01$). It implies that the more open an employee is the less likely he/she would engage in poor attendance as a CWB; it explained about 24.1% of the total variance in the outcome variable. The next significant predictor to openness was conscientiousness ($\beta=.166$; $t=2.66$; $p<.01$). It accounted for about 16.6% of the total variance in employee poor attendance. This means that the more conscientious a person is the more he/she would likely engage in poor attendance as a CWB. The third significant predictor was neuroticism ($\beta=.132$; $t=2.26$; $p<.05$). This means that the more neurotic a person is the more he/she would likely engage in poor attendance as a CWB; it accounted for 13.2% of the total variance. Extraversion was the least significant predictor ($\beta=-.125$; $t=-2.31$; $p<.05$) in the negative direction. This implies that the more Extraverted an employee is the less likely he/she would engage in poor attendance as a CWB; it accounted for about 12.5% of the variance in employee poor attendance. Thus hypothesis 1 was confirmed for extraversion, neuroticism, conscientiousness and openness, but not for agreeableness.

The result from table 4.2.7 also showed that extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness jointly significantly predicted poor quality work [$R=.313$, $R^2=.098$ $F(5,403)=8.76$, $p<.01$]. These dimensions jointly explained about 9.8% of the observed variance in employee poor quality work, thus confirming hypothesis 1. Independently, three of the BFI traits namely: extraversion, conscientiousness and openness were significant predictors of poor quality work. Among these three factors, openness was the highest predictor of poor quality work in the negative direction ($\beta=-.205$; $t=-4.02$; $p<.01$). This means that the more open an employee is the less likely he/she would engage in poor quality work as a CWB; it accounted for about 20.5% of the observed variance in employee poor quality work. The second predictor was conscientiousness ($\beta=.168$; $t=2.67$; $p<.01$), it accounted for 16.8% of the observed variance. This implies that the more conscientious a person is the more likely he/she would engage in poor quality work. The third and least predictor was extraversion in the negative direction ($\beta=-.150$; $t=-2.75$; $p<.01$); it implies that the more extraverted a person is the less likely he/she would engage in poor quality work. This explained 15% of the variance in the subscale. Two of the BFI traits that were not significant predictors of poor quality work were agreeableness ($\beta=.018$; $t=0.29$; $p>.05$) and neuroticism ($\beta=.107$; $t=1.83$; $p>.05$). Thus, hypothesis 1 was confirmed for extraversion, conscientiousness and openness, but not for agreeableness and neuroticism.

Also the result from table 4.2.8 shows that there is a significant joint prediction of extraversion, agreeableness,

conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness in the prediction of alcohol use [$R=.297$, $R^2=.088$; $F(5,403)=7.81$, $p<.01$]. This model explained about 8.8% of the observed variance in employee alcohol use, thus, confirming hypothesis 1. Independently, the result further revealed that two of the personality traits namely: openness and conscientiousness, significantly predicted alcohol use. Openness was the most important predictor in the negative direction ($\beta=-.209$; $t=-4.08$; $p<.01$). This result implies that the more open a person is the less likely he/she would involve in alcohol use. It accounted for about 20.9% of the variance in the outcome variable. Openness was followed by conscientiousness factor as the next important predictor ($\beta=.201$; $t=3.16$; $p<.01$); this means that the more conscientious a person is the more likely he/she would engage in alcohol use as a CWB. It explained 20.1% of the variance. Three of the factors of personality namely: extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism were not significant predictors of alcohol use ($\beta=-.098$; $t=-1.79$; $p>.05$; ($\beta=.020$; $t=0.32$; $p>.05$; ($\beta=.064$; $t=1.08$; $p>.05$) respectively. Therefore, hypothesis 1 was confirmed for openness and conscientiousness but not for extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism.

Result from the table 4.2.8 revealed that there was a significant joint prediction of personality dimensions namely: extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness in the prediction of drug use [$R=.336$, $R^2=.113$; $F(5,403)=10.24$ $P<.001$]. These dimensions jointly accounted for about 11.3% of the observed variance in employee drug use, thus, confirming hypothesis 1. Independently, the result shows that three of the factors: openness, conscientiousness, and extraversion were significant predictors of drug use. The result further revealed that openness was the most important predictor of this dimension in the negative direction ($\beta=-.223$; $t=-4.41$; $p<.01$); this result implies that the more open a person is the less likely he/she would involve in drugs use as a CWB. It explained 22.3% of the total variance in this subscale. The second most important predictor was conscientiousness ($\beta=.202$; $t=3.23$; $p<.01$); it means that the more conscientious a person is the more likely he/she would engage in drug use. It accounted for about 20.2% of the observed variance in drug use. The third significant predictor was extraversion in the negative direction ($\beta=-.136$; $t=-2.51$; $p<.05$); this means that the more extraverted an employee is the less likely he/she would involve in drugs use. It explained 13.6% of the observed variance. The result further shows that agreeableness and neuroticism were not significant predictors of drug use ($\beta=.01$; $t=-0.02$; $p>.05$); and ($\beta=.112$; $t=1.93$; $p>.05$) respectively. From this result, hypothesis 1 was confirmed for openness, conscientiousness, and extraversion, but not for agreeableness and neuroticism.

Result from table 4.2.10 also indicated that there was a significant joint prediction of extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness in the prediction of inappropriate verbal action [$R=.324$, $R^2=.105$; $F(5,403)=9.45$, $p<.001$]. These dimensions accounted for about 10.5% of the observed variance in inappropriate verbal action, thus, hypothesis 1 was confirmed. The result from the table further shows that three of the BFI traits namely: conscientiousness, openness and extraversion were significant predictors of employee inappropriate verbal action. Among

these traits, conscientiousness was the most important predictor ($\beta=.221$; $t=3.51$; $p<.01$); this implies that the more conscientious a person is the more likely he/she would engage in inappropriate verbal action as a CWB. It accounted for 22.1% of the total variance. Openness was the next important significant predictor in the negative direction ($\beta= -.191$; $t= -3.77$; $p<.01$); it means that the more open a person is the less likely he/she would engage in inappropriate verbal action as a CWB. It explained 19.1% of the total variance in the outcome variable. Extraversion was the least important significant predictor also in the negative direction ($\beta=-.122$; $t=-2.25$; $p<.05$); this result implies that the more extraverted a person is the less likely he/she would involve in inappropriate verbal action. This explains 12.2% of employee variance in the DV. On the contrary however, agreeableness ($\beta=.067$; $t=1.10$; $p>.05$); and neuroticism ($\beta=.074$; $t=1.27$; $p>.05$), were not significant predictors of this factor. Thus hypothesis 1 was confirmed for conscientiousness, openness and extraversion, but not for agreeableness and neuroticism.

The result from table 4.2.11 shows that, there was a significant joint prediction of openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness and emotional stability in the prediction of employee inappropriate physical action [$R=.332$, $R^2=.110$; $F(5,403)=9.96$, $p<.01$]. These dimensions explained 11% of the observed variance in employee inappropriate physical action, thus, confirming hypothesis 1. Independently, the result from the table further indicated that four of the BFI traits were significant predictors of inappropriate physical action. The traits were: extraversion, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness. Among them, openness was the most important significant predictor of this subscale in the negative direction ($\beta=-.208$; $t=-4.11$; $p<.01$); this implies that the more open a person is the less likely he/she would engage in inappropriate physical action as a CWB. It accounted for 20.8% of the total variance in the outcome variable. Conscientiousness was the next significant most important predictor ($\beta=.176$; $t=2.81$; $p<.01$); it means that the more conscientious a person is the more likely he/she would engage in inappropriate physical action. It explained 17.6% of the total variance in the subscale. The third most important significant predictor was neuroticism ($\beta=.142$; $t=2.43$; $p<.05$); this means that the more neurotic a person is the more likely he/she would engage in inappropriate physical action. It explained 14.2% of the total variance. The least important significant predictor was extraversion in the negative direction ($\beta=-.122$; $t=-2.24$; $p<.05$); meaning that the more extraverted a person is the less likely he/she would involve in inappropriate physical action. It accounted for 12.2%. However, agreeableness was not a significant predictor of this factor ($\beta=.053$; $t=0.88$; $p>.05$). Thus hypothesis 1 was confirmed for extraversion, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness, but not for agreeableness.

V. DISCUSSION

The result from this study revealed that personality factors jointly predicted CWB. The result implies that in concert, all the personality factors are important in the prediction of CWB among the Benue State civil servants. The finding of the

present study upholds several findings of other researchers including Jensen and Patel (2011) who in their study found that interaction of personality traits increased the prediction of CWB over and above a single trait approach. This finding is also in line with the findings of Salgado, Moscoso, and Anderson, (2013); Farhadi, Fatimah, Nasir and Wan (2012), Dalal, (2005) that personality traits, and individual differences such as employees' personal traits and abilities predicts work place deviant behaviour. The findings of this study however, disagrees with the findings of O'Neill and Hastings (2011) who found that deviance behaviour in the work place is better explained when other traits such as Integrity, Risk Taking, and Seductiveness, among others that have been overlooked are added to the Big Five personality traits.

The finding from this study also shows that personality factors independently predicted CWB, thereby confirming the second part of the hypothesis. In specific terms, the study found that extraversion trait predicted overall CWB, destruction of property, misuse of information, unsafe behaviour, poor attendance, poor quality work, drug use, inappropriate verbal action, and inappropriate physical action in the negative direction, thus this hypothesis was confirmed except for theft and alcohol use. This result implies that, extraversion personality trait is an important trait for the prediction of CWB of the civil servant. It further implied that Benue State Civil Servants who are extroverts engage minimally in CWB. It further reveals that theft and alcohol use can better be explained by other traits rather than extraversion. This finding is in line with the earlier findings by Intan, Siti, and Abdulrahman (2013). It also supports the findings by Lee, Ashton, and Shin (2001) who reported that extraversion was associated with CWB directed toward individuals. The finding of the present study however disagrees with that of Bolton, Becker and Barber (2010); Pincus and Dickinson (2003) whose result confirmed extraversion a predictor of theft, and drinking.

The agreeableness factor also significantly and positively predicted misuse of information in this study. This implies that Benue State Civil Servants who score higher on this trait have a high tendency to get involved in leaking official information meant to be secret to non authorized persons. Such employees would give out such information based on the so called trust and confidence they have in the beneficiaries. Sometimes they compromise by collecting tokens for removing certain documents in the file of an offender. Agreeableness factor also significantly and positively predicted destruction of property in the negative direction. This implies that the more agreeable a person is the less likely he/she would engage in destruction of property belonging to the organisation, colleagues, and customers. It further implies that both property and other valuables can be entrusted to employees high on agreeableness trait without fear of harm. This finding is consistent with that of Xenoudaki and Stafyla (2012) who in their study on contextual factors and personality traits in the exhibition of deceiving and hiding-related behaviours of employees, found agreeableness to predict efficiently misuse of information behaviours. The result is also similar to that of Meta analysis conducted by Salgado (2001) which revealed low agreeableness was valid predictors of deviant behaviours in the workplace.

On the other hand, agreeableness did not significantly predict overall CWB, theft, unsafe behaviour, poor attendance, poor quality work, alcohol use, drug use, inappropriate verbal and inappropriate physical action. This implies that these behaviours in the organisation may be explained by other traits but not agreeableness. It further implies that employees with agreeableness personality trait will generally be dependable. Findings of this study disagree with Bolton, Becker and Barber (2010) on the Big Five traits as predictors of differential counterproductive work behaviour dimensions. They found agreeableness to be a predictor of CWB. The result of this study however, did not correspond with the findings of Ruiz, Pincus, and Dickinson (2003) who found that facets of agreeableness were associated with drinking.

Conscientiousness significantly and positively predicted overall CWB, theft, unsafe behaviour, poor attendance, poor quality work, alcohol use, drug use, inappropriate verbal action, and inappropriate physical action with exception of destruction of property and misuse of information. This result implies that Benue State Civil Servants with this trait score high on CWB, hence, they tend to be highly involved in the listed behaviours. This further reveals that CWB that is found in this organisation is associated with employees who are considered to be organised, thorough, methodic, and, reliable. This finding is in line with Chang, and Smithikrai (2010) who found that all the five personality traits predict counterproductive work behaviours and of these, the strongest predictor of counterproductive behaviour has been found to be conscientiousness. This finding also support the findings of Yuxin, Lihong, Zhang, and Ma, (2011) where they found that among the five personality factors, conscientiousness had the most significant predictive power on general CWB. This finding is at variance with the findings of Farhadi, Fatimah, Nasir and Wan (2012) on conscientiousness as antecedents of deviant behaviour in workplace, where they reported a statistical significant negative relationship between workplace deviant behaviour and conscientiousness. This result also contradicts with that of Waheeda and Hafidz (2012) who indicated that conscientiousness (out of the five personality factors) was found to be negatively correlated to CWB.

Emotional stability significantly and positively predicted overall CWB, misuse of information, poor attendance, and inappropriate physical action. It did not however, predict theft, destruction of property, unsafe behaviour, poor quality work, alcohol use, drug use, and inappropriate verbal action. This implies that employees who score high on this trait get involved in CWB like revealing organisations information to unauthorized persons, absenting themselves from work or coming to work late, or leaving before time without permission, and engaging in physical fight with others. This finding is in line with Yuxin, Lihong, Zhang, and Ma (2011) who found that among the five personality factors, neuroticism had the most significant predictive power on general CWB. Finding of this study also agreed with that of Richards and Schat (2010) that one's feeling or emotion also predicts the likelihood of counterproductive work behaviours occurring. It also support the findings of Intan, Siti, and Abdulrahman (2013) who showed positive relationships among employees with high neuroticism. The result of this study on CWB and poor attendance disagreed with that by Salgado (2002) where

the meta-analysis revealed that none of the five personality traits was a predictor for absenteeism and accidents.

Openness trait significantly and negatively predicts CWB and all its subscales. This implies that the higher the score the lower the tendency of employees to engage in CWB. By implication therefore, Benue State Civil Servants are creative, curious to learn new things and enjoy new experiences, they like accepting new technology to enhance performance, and imagine within them what will move the organisation forward. This result further implies that these employees do not or minimally engage in CWB and that CWB exhibited in this organisation will be explained by other personality factors and not openness. The result of this study agreed with that by Ozer and Benet-Martínez, (2006); Soto and Jackson, (2013) on one hand that openness to experience is an important predictor of intellectual outcomes and highly open individuals tend to perform better on tests of intelligence and creativity compared with their less open peers; and disagreed with it on the other hand that, open employees are more likely to engage in drug use. Furthermore, the result of this study disagrees with findings by earlier researchers. For example, Bolton, Becker and Barber (2010) who found that openness to experience predicted production deviance, Intan, Siti, and Abdulrahman (2013) who found positive relationships with openness to experience and CWB.

VI. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this study, it is concluded that personality traits of the employees' viz. extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness are very important in the prediction of CWB among Benue state civil servants. More importantly is the fact that CWBs are predicted by specific personality traits with openness and extraversion as the highest predictors in the negative direction, while conscientiousness predicted in the positive direction.

Employers of labour should therefore, endeavour to determine the personality type of their potential employees during hiring, selection and placement in order to reduce the possibility of high levels of CWBs among their employees. Employees who are open and extraverted should be preferred in hiring, selection and placement with the civil service especially for sensitive positions and roles in order to curtail the level of CWB in the workplace.

REFERENCES

- [1] 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.
- [2] Baron, R. A. & Neuman, J. H. (1996). Workplace violence and workplace aggression; Evidence on their relative frequency and potential causes. *Journal of Aggressive Behaviour*. 22, 161-173.

- [3] Bennett, R. J. & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 349-360.
- [4] Bies, R. J. & Tripp, T. M. (1998a). The many faces of revenge: The good, the bad, and the ugly. In R.W. Griffin, A. O'Leary-Kelly, & J. Collins (Eds.), *Dysfunctional behavior in organisations, Vol. 1: Violent behaviours in organisations*. Vo 1. 23: 49-68. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- [5] Bjorkqvist, K., Osterman, K. & Hjelt-Back, M. (1994). Aggression among university employees. *Journal of Aggressive Behavior*, 20, 173-184.
- [6] Boileau, S. N. (2008). *Openness to experience, agreeableness, and gay male intimate partner preference across racial lines*. Ann Arbor, MI: ProQuest LLC.
- [7] Bolton, L. R., Becker, L. K. & Barber, L. K. (2010). Big Five trait predictors of differential counterproductive work behaviour dimensions. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 49, 537-541.
- [8] Cattell, R. B. (1946). *The description and measurement of personality*. Yonkers, New York: World Book.
- [9] Chang, K. & Smithikrai C. (2010). Counterproductive behaviour at work: An investigation into reduction strategies. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 21(8), 1272-1288.
- [10] Costa, P. T. & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- [11] Costa, P. T. & R. R. McCrae, (2004). A Contemplated Revision of the NEO Five- Factor Inventory. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 36, 587-596.
- [12] Cullen, M. J. & Sackett, P. R. (2003). *Personality and counterproductive workplace behaviour*, in M.R. Barrick, A.M. Ryan (Eds), Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 150-182.
- [13] Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organisational citizenship behaviour and counterproductive work behaviour. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 1241-1255.
- [14] Daniel, S. (2014, May 08). EFCC traces N200m to prisons accountant. <http://www.vanguardngr.com/2014/05/efcc-traces-n200m-prisons-accountant/>
- [15] Daniel, S. (2015, July 03). N195b pension scam: EFCC arrests Maina's secretary. Newspaper. <http://www.vanguardngr.com/2015/07/n195b-pension-scam-efcc-arrests-mainas-secretary/>
- [16] Dickinson, K.A. & Pincus, A.L. (2003). Interpersonal analysis of grandiose and vulnerable narcissism. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, 17, 188-207.
- [17] Dunlop, P. D. & Lee, K. (2004). Workplace deviance, organisational citizenship behaviour, and business unit performance: The bad apples do spoil the whole barrel. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 25, 67-80.
- [18] Eysenck, H. J. (1967). Personality patterns in various groups of businessmen. *Occupational Psychology* 41, 249-250.
- [19] Eysenck, H. J. (1992). *Four ways five factors are not basic*. *Personality and Individual Differences* 13: 667-673.
- [20] Farhadi, H., Fatimah, O., Nasir, R. & Wan, S. W. S. (2012). Agreeableness and Conscientiousness as Antecedents of Deviant Behaviour in Workplace. *Asian Social Science*, 8(9) <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ass.v8n9p2>.
- [21] Feldman, R.S. (2003). *Essentials of Understanding Psychology*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- [22] Fiske, D. W. (1949). Consistency of the factorial structures of personality rating from different sources. *Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology*, 44, 329-344.
- [23] Fiske, S. T., Gilbert, D. T. & Lindzey, G. (2009). *Handbook of Social Psychology*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- [24] Fleeson, W. & Nofle, E. E. (2009). In favor of the synthetic resolution to the person-situation debate. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 43(2), 150-154.
- [25] Furnham, A., & Heaven, P. (1999). *Personality and Social Behaviour*. New York: Arnold.
- [26] Giacalone, R. A. & Greenberg, J. (1997). *Antisocial behavior in organisations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- [27] 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
- [28] Goldberg, L. R. (1993). "The structure of phenotypic personality traits". *American Psychologist*, 48(1), 26-34.
- [29] Griffin, R. W. & Lopez, Y. P. (2005). "Bad behaviour" in organisations: A review and typology for future research. *Journal of Management*, 31, 988-1005.
- [30] Gruys, M. L. & Sackett, P. R. (2003). Investigating the dimensionality of counterproductive work behaviour. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 11, 30-42.
- [31] Hafidz, S. W. M., Hoesni, S. M. & Fatimah, O. (2012). The Relationship between Organisational Citizenship Behaviour and Counterproductive Work Behaviour. *Asian Social Science*, 8(9), 32-37.
- [32] Harper, D. (1990). Spotlight abuse-save profits. *Industrial Distribution*, 79, 47-51.
- [33] Hoel, H., Einarsen S. & Cooper, C. (2003). Organisational effects of bullying. In Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D., Cooper, C. (Eds.). *Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace: International perspectives on research and practice*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- [34] Hogan J. & Hogan, R. (1989). How to measure employee reliability. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 273-279.
- [35] Hollinger, R. C. & Clark, J. P. (1982). Employee deviance: A response to the perceived quality of the work experience. *Work and Occupations*, 9 (1), 97-114.
- [36] Howard, P. J. & Howard, J. M. (2004). *The Big Five Quickstart: An Introduction to the Five-Factor Model of Personality*. North Carolina: Center for Applied cognitive studies
- [37] Intan, N. M., Siti, Z. S. & AbdulRahman, 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.
- [38] Jensen, J. M. & Patel, P. C. (2011). Predicting counterproductive work behaviour from the interaction of personality traits. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 51, 466-471.

- [39] John, O. P., Donahue, E. M. & Kentle, R. L. (1991). *The Big Five Inventory – Versions 4a and 54*. Berkeley: University of California, Berkeley, Institute of Personality and Social Research.
- [40] Kaukiainen, A., Salmivalli, C., Bjorkqvist, K. & Osterman, K. (2001). Overt and covert aggression in work settings in relation to the subjective well-being of employees. *Aggressive Behaviour*, 27, 360-371
- [41] Laney, Marti Olsen (2002). *The Introvert Advantage*. Canada: Thomas Allen & Son Limited. pp. 28, 35. ISBN 0-7611-2369-5.
- [42] Leblanc, M. M. & Kelloway, E. K. (2002). Predictors and outcomes of workplace violence and aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 444-453.
- [43] Levy, T. & Tziner, A. (2011). When destructive deviance in the workplace becomes a liability: A decisional behavioural model. *Quality & Quantity: International Journal of Methodology*, 45 (1), 233–239.
- [44] Liebert, R. M. & Spiegler, M. D. (1994). Personality strategies and issues. California: Brooks/Cole.
- [45] Marcus, B. & Schuler, H. (2004). Antecedents of counterproductive behaviour at work: A general perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(4), 647-660.
- [46] Marcus, B., Taylor, O. A., Hastings, S. E., Sturm, A., & Weigelt, O. (2013). The structure of counterproductive work behavior a review, a structural meta-analysis, and a primary study. *Journal of Management*, XX (X), 1-31.
- [47] McCrae, R. R. & Costa, P. T. Jr. (2004). A contemplated revision of the NEO Five Factor Inventory. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 36, 587–596
- [48] Norman, W. T. (1963). "Toward an adequate taxonomy of personality attributes: Replicated factor structure in peer nomination personality ratings". *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 66 (6): 574–583.
- [49] O’Boyle, Jr. E. H. (2010). *A test of the general CWB-OCB emotion model*. A Dissertation for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, Virginia Commonwealth University.
- [50] O’Leary-Kelly, A. M., Griffin, R. W. & Glew, D. J. (1996) Organisation-motivated aggression: A research framework. *Academy of Management Review*, 21, 225–253.
- [51] O’Neill, T. A., & Hastings, S. E. (2011). Explaining workplace deviance behavior with more than just the “BigFive.” *Personality and Individual Differences*, 50, 268-273.
- [52] O’Brien, K. E. & Vandello, J. (2005). *Development and validation of the workplace hostile attribution bias scale*. Poster session presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organisational Psychology, Los Angeles, CA.
- [53] O’Connor, B. (2002). A Quantitative Review of the Comprehensiveness of the Five-Factor Model in Relation to Popular Personality Inventories. *Assessment*, 9(2), 188–203.
- [54] Ogbodo, J. A., Jimoh, A. M. & Onochie, B. C. (08 March, 2012). Panel finds N151b pension fraud. *The Guardian Newspaper*. 29(2), 124.
- [55] Ozer, D. J. & Benet-Martinez, V. (2006). Personality and the prediction of consequential outcomes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 57, 401-421.
- [56] Paunonen, S. V., Haddock, G., Forsterling, F. & Keinonen, M. (2003). Broad versus Narrow Personality Measures and the Prediction of Behaviour Across Cultures. *European Journal of Personality* 17, 413–433.
- [57] Paunonen, S.V. & Jackson, D. N. (2000). What Is Beyond the Big Five? Plenty! *Journal of Personality*, 68, 821–835.
- [58] Penney, L. M. & Spector, P. E. (2005). Job stress, incivility, and counterproductive workplace behavior (CWB): The moderating role of negative affectivity. *Journal of Organisational Behavior*, 26 (5), 777-796.
- [59] Richards, D. A. & Schat, A. C. H. (2010). Attachment at (not to) work: applying attachment theory to explain individual behaviour in organisations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1037/a0020372
- [60] Robinson, S. & Bennett, R. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviours: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(1), 100-108.
- [61] Rothmann, S., E. P. & Coetzer. (2013). "Thebig five personality dimensions and job performance". *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology* 29.
- [62] Ruiz, M. A., Pincus, A. L., & Dickinson, K.A.(2003). NEO PI–R predictors of alcohol use and alcohol-related problems. *Journal of personality assessment*, 81(3), 226–236
- [63] Sackett, P. R. (2002). The structure of counterproductive work behaviours: Dimensionality and relationships with facets of job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10, 5-11.
- [64] Salgado J. F. (2002). The Big Five personality dimensions and counterproductive behaviours. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10, 117–125.
- [65] Salgado, J. F., Moscoso, S. & Anderson, N. (2013). Personality and counterproductive work behavior. In N. D. Christiansen & R. P. Tett (Eds.), *Handbook of personality at work* (pp. 606-632). New York: Routledge
- [66] Salgado, J.F., Viswesvaran, C., & Ones, D.S. (2001). Predictors used for personnel selection: An overview of constructs, methods and techniques. In N. Anderson, D.S. Ones, H.K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial, work and organizational psychology: Vol. 1. Personnel psychology* (pp. 165 – 199). London: Sage.
- [67] Schat, A. C. & Kelloway, E. K. (2000). The effects of perceived control on the outcomes of workplace aggression and violence. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 4, 386-402.
- [68] Skarlicki, D. P. & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: the roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(3), 434-443.
- [69] Soto, C. J. & Jackson, J. J. (2013). Five-factor model of personality. In D. S. Dunn (Ed.), *Oxford Bibliographies in Psychology*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. <http://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo>
- [70] Spector, P. E. & Fox, S. (2002). Counterproductive work behaviour and organisational citizenship behaviour: Are

- they opposite forms of active behaviour? *Applied Psychology: an International Review*, 59 (1), 21–39.
- [71]Tepper, B. J. (2000).Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(1), 100–108.
- [72]Tupes, E. C. & Christal, R. E. (1961). Recurrent personality factors based on trait ratings. *Technical Report ASD-TR-*, 61-97. Lackland Air Force Base, TX: Personnel Laboratory, Air Force Systems Command.
- [73]Waheeda, J. & Hafidz, I. (2012) Individual differences as antecedents of counterproductive work behaviour. . *Asian Social Science*; 8,(13)220 – 228.
- [74]Xenoudaki , C. & Stafyla, A. (2012). Contextual Factors and Personality Traits in the Exhibition of Deceiving and Hiding-Related Behaviours of Employees, in Post Layoff Environments in Greece. International Conference on Enterprise Systems, Accounting and Logistics. <http://www.icesal.org/2012%20PROCEEDINGS/docs/K21.pdf>. 30/8/14
- [75]Yuxin, L., Lihong, Z., Zhang L. & Ma, L. (2011). The big five personality and counterproductive work behavior (CWB): The moderating role of perceived organisational support. http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/xpl/articleDetails.jsp?tp=&arnumber=5975057&url=http%3A%2F%2Fieeexplore.ieee.org%2Fxppls%2Fabs_all.jsp%3Farnumber%3D5975057. 30/8/14.

IJIRAS