

The Relationship Between Personality Traits, Deviant Behavior and Workplace Incivility

Nurul-Azza Abdullah, Aina Nurin Muhamad Nasruddin, Daniella
Maryam Mokhtar

Psychology and Human Well-Being Research Centre, Faculty of Social Sciences and
Humanities, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi, Selangor.

To Link this Article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v11-i3/8465>

DOI:10.6007/IJARBSS/v11-i3/8465

Published Date: 12 March 2021

Abstract

Rude, rough, and disrespectful behavior has been experienced by most individuals every day, especially at work. These types of behaviors are categorized into workplace incivility and deviant behavior. Personality traits are one of the characteristics that tend to influence a person's behavior at work. Therefore, this study aimed to identify the relationship between personality traits and workplace incivility and deviant behavior. This study is a quantitative study, where data is collected using a three-part questionnaire which are demographics, personality inventory and workplace behavior. The study sample consisted of 97 employees of private organizations around the state of Selangor and the Federal Territory of Kuala Lumpur. Data were then analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software. Pearson's correlation test and multiple regression tests were carried out to achieve the research's objectives. The results showed that there was a significant relationship between personality traits and workplace deviant behavior and incivility. The results also showed that personality traits significantly predict workplace deviant behavior and incivility. The insights gained can help organizations in hiring new employees or identifying possible causes for unwanted issues within the organization.

Keyword: Personality, Deviant Behavior, Incivility, Psychology, Workplace

Introduction

Most employees in an organization have the experience of being treated rudely or disrespected by their colleagues whether consciously or not. Such behavior is called workplace incivility. According to Miner and Cortina (2016), specific examples of rudeness in the workplace include neglecting someone, making derogatory comments, insulting or shouting at an individual, refusing to communicate orally and speaking in an unprofessional manner to an individual.

As many as 98 percent of employees have been estimated to be impolite in the workplace with 50 percent experiencing it on a weekly basis (Porath & Pearson, 2013). This should not

be the norm in an organization and should be curbed so as not to get worse, for example, the victim may behave deviant in the workplace if experiencing the matter continuously. Meanwhile, deviant behavior in the workplace refers to the voluntary behavior of individuals who violate organizational norms and threaten the well-being of the organization, members of the organization, or both (Robinson & Bennett, 1995).

Examples of such behaviors include theft, sabotage, vandalism, embezzlement, harassment, and drug use (Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Gruys & Sackett, 2003; Robinson & Bennett, 1995; Sackett & DeVore, 2001; Spector et al., 2006). Untreated deviant behavior can lead to failure and paralysis of the entire organizational performance (Dunlop & Lee, 2004; Bolin & Heatherly, 2001). Many past studies have been done to understand the resulting factors of politeness and deviant behavior in the workplace including employee personality, stress and workload, leadership ethics, and more.

Personality consists of the characteristics of thought patterns, feelings, and behaviors that make a person unique (Eysenck, 1967). The five personality traits used in the study were openness, prudence, extraversion, agreement, and neuroticism. The personality trait of openness has been described as the depth as well as the complexity of an individual's life and mental experience (John & Srivastava, 1999). An example of the nature of an individual who has this trait is fond of trying new, bold, and creative things. The prudent trait refers to the way a person controls, regulates, and directs impulses (Johnson and Ostendorf, 1993) and acts in a socially acceptable way (John & Srivastava, 1999). Extraversion traits are individuals who like to socialize and interact with the public reflecting the level of social harmony of an individual with others. Next, personality traits of neuroticism or low emotional stability refer to a person's tendency to experience negative feelings (Johnson and Ostendorf, 1993). Individuals with these high neuroticism traits may be irritable, tend to feel uncomfortable with themselves as well as self-doubt (Lebowitz, 2016).

Several previous studies have confirmed that the five Big Five personality traits are consistent when applied to different populations including populations of children, students, and adults (McCrae, 2004; Aluja et al., 2005). These personality traits are one of the factors of decency and deviant behavior in the workplace that have been focused on in previous studies. Politeness in the workplace is completely separate from physical violence and aggression (Itzkovich & Heilbrunn, 2016). However, the adverse effects of immorality in the workplace are almost the same as the effects of other negative behaviors such as deviant behavior, aggression, and so on even though the intensity of these impolite behaviors is lower. Porath and Pearson (2009) found that 80 percent of employees report loss of time due to concern about a rude incident and 48 percent report they intentionally reduce the effort in doing their job. This shows that rudeness in the workplace has a detrimental effect on the mental state of an employee and can germinate even worse if left alone.

Disrespectful in the workplace is a vague behavior, in the sense that not everyone thinks a certain something is rude, one rude thing to a person may be seen as acceptable by the other person. As a result, politeness in the workplace may be ignored only by leaders in the organization (Lewis & Malecha, 2011). But, everyone can fall victim to this whether they experience it from colleagues, employers or customers and clients if working in a sector that offers services to the public. Researchers see immodesty in the workplace as compared to

low-intensity stress, such as disorders that occur in daily life (Lim & Lee, 2011). Politeness in the workplace is also not necessarily aimed at a particular individual. For example, when an employee throws garbage everywhere in the lounge, anyone who wants to use it has to tidy up the place. Past studies have mostly focused on the effects of immodesty in the workplace compared to the causes of such behavior, especially in Malaysia.

Furthermore, deviant behavior in the workplace has long been studied around the world including Malaysia, but it is still a serious problem in the organization. According to Omar, Awang and Manaf (2012), the performance and integrity of civil servants in Malaysia are still problematic. Many researchers use different terms to replace deviant behavior in the workplace, such as unproductive behavior (Spector et al., 2010), antisocial behavior (Giacalone et al., 1997), misconduct (Vardi & Weiner, 1992), behavior destructive (Murphy, 1993), and more. Deviant behavior or unproductive behavior in the workplace is considered one of the three main dimensions of job performance (Rotundo & Sackett, 2002). Therefore, deviant behavior has a huge impact on the employees of the organization so that it can affect the performance of employees and result in losses for an organization. Millions of dollars are lost each year as a result of deviant behavior at work (Johnson & Indvik, 2001). In 2010 alone, the U.S.A. suffered losses of \$ 15.9 billion due to theft by employees (Hollinger & Adams 2010). Furthermore, a worldwide survey study was conducted in 32 countries in North America, Asia Pacific, and Europe estimating that more than a third of losses could be attributed to theft by employees (Bamfield, 2007).

A study conducted by Coffin (2003) found that at least one-third of individuals in an organization have been involved in stealing activities in their organization and 95 percent are found to have stolen once in their lives. The results of the study show that an individual is very easy to do deviant behavior in the workplace and easily influenced by personal factors that are their personality. In addition, employees who fall victim to deviant behavior will experience physical and psychological pain, compromised self-esteem and increase self-doubt in the workplace (Farhadi et al. 2012). Therefore, employees will always feel disturbed in the workplace, always be under stress and will not focus on the tasks that need to be completed. The adverse effects of this deviant behavior are almost the same as the effects of rudeness in the workplace which both have a negative impact on employees and organizations, but deviant behavior is clearer in terms of behavior and more physically involved employees. Researchers have identified that deviant behavior results in adverse effects such as the intention to quit work, absenteeism, frustration, abuse of materials and privileges, stealing, sexual harassment, and bias (Chirasha & Mahapa 2012; Appelbaum et al. 2007; Lawrence & Robinso 2007; Bolin & Heatherly 2001).

Research Problem

Most of the existing research is conducted in Western countries namely in North America and Europe (Smithikrai 2008). Therefore, there is still a lack of evidence and empirical studies on deviant behavior in the workplace in Asian countries especially, Malaysia (Alias, Rasdi, Ismail & Samah 2013; Farhadi et al. 2012). Deviant behavior in Malaysia is still in a worrying situation, especially the symptoms of corruption despite various efforts by the government and agencies such as the Malaysian Anti-Corruption Commission (MACC). On 26 to 27 August 2019, the 22nd national level of Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) Conference and Exhibition (COSH 2019) themed 'Driving OSH excellence Based on Integrity for the Future' was

held at the Kuala Lumpur Convention Center (KLCC) as a mistake an effort to call on employees to improve the integrity of their work.

Berita Harian (2019) reports that the Chairman of the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) Tan Sri Lee Lam Thye said, "The issue of integrity in this country is at an alarming level, can even lead to more accidents at work" when giving a speech at the event pre-launch of COSH 2019. Therefore, studies need to be done more widely and extensively so that these problems can be understood more deeply and the factors can be identified to facilitate efforts to eradicate them. Most studies on deviant behavior in the workplace focus on the consequences of deviant behavior and there is little research focusing on predictors of deviant behavior in the workplace (Piquero & Moffit, 2012; Wei & Si, 2013). According to studies performed by Dwi Hastuti, Abdullah, and Zulkarnain (2017), namely personality factors as predictors of deviant behavior among civil servants found that personality traits of extraversion, neuroticism, and openness have a positive relationship with deviant behavior in the workplace. Meanwhile, prudent personality traits have a significant negative relationship with deviant behavior in the workplace and consent traits do not have a significant relationship with deviant behavior in the workplace.

However, several previous studies have results that are not in line with the results of such studies such as the discovery of a significant negative relationship between consent traits and deviant behavior in the workplace agreed by Mount et al. (2006), Salgado (2002) and Graziano and Eisenberg (1997). Therefore, the relationship between personality and deviant behavior should be studied in a larger or different sample to obtain more accurate research results among Malaysian society in particular. Furthermore, the Consultant Psychiatrist of the Chancellor Tuanku Muhriz Hospital, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (HCTM UKM) and UKM Specialist Center (UKMSC), Associate Professor Dr. Suzaily Wahab said, "There are many causes that can trigger changes in a person's mental health. It can be driven by the work environment, friends, employers, or family as well as in certain work environments, the effect will be worse" (Metro Daily 2019).

Unhealthy workplace environments such as frequent workplace politeness can contribute to the mental health problems of employees in the organization as it further affects their psychology. One of the factors of rudeness in the workplace that needs to be studied further is the personality factor of employees. For example, the traits of neuroticism are associated with anxiety, pessimism, stress, fear, depression, and unstable emotions. Thus, individuals with high neuroticism traits are prone to negative emotional states, tend to show poor adjustments, and often express attitudes toward their colleagues (LePine & Van Dyne 2001). Empirically, individuals high in the trait of neuroticism are found to react excessively to threatening stimuli and feel nervous in all sorts of situations (Teng & Liu 2013). Individuals with high neuroticism traits can be rude in the workplace whether consciously or not and cause coworkers to experience negative emotions just like them.

Literature Review

Deviant Behavior at Workplace

Deviant behavior in the workplace differs in two dimensions namely minor versus serious and interpersonal opposite organization. Thus, employee deviant behavior is seen to have four different categories namely productive deviant, property deviant, political deviant and

personal deviant (Robinson & Bennett 1995). The study of Robinson and Bennett (1995) has formed a typology of deviant behavior that identifies the dimensions under deviant behavior and also explains the differences between deviant categories and the relationship between those categories.

Furthermore, a study conducted by Li Chen, Choon Jin, and Chan Yin Fah (2016) found that extraversion personality traits and neuroticism have a significant positive relationship with deviant behavior in the workplace. This study was conducted in six volunteer organizations, namely emergency assistance centers around the Klang Valley, Malaysia with a total of 200 study subjects. Furthermore, the results of this study are in line with the findings of previous studies that personality traits especially extraversion and neuroticism positively correlate with interpersonal deviant and work deviant (Santos & Eger 2014; Kozako et al. 2013) showing that individuals have high scores for traits such personalities are more likely to engage in deviant behavior in the workplace.

The results of a study conducted by Dwi Hastuti, Abdullah, and Zulkarnain (2017) that is the personality factor as a predictor of deviant behavior among civil servants also got parallel results. Personality traits of extraversion, neuroticism, and openness have a positive relationship with deviant behavior in the workplace. Meanwhile, prudent personality traits have a significant negative relationship with deviant behavior in the workplace and consent traits do not have a significant relationship with deviant behavior in the workplace. This study was conducted on 264 civil servants around Pekanbaru, Indonesia. The results of this study consent trait contradict the findings of a study conducted by Farhadi, Fatimah, Nasir and Wan Shahrazad (2012) in the study "Agreeableness and Conscientiousness as Antecedents of Deviant Behavior in Workplace" conducted on 212 government officials in Malaysia have found traits consent has a significant negative relationship with deviant behavior in the workplace.

The discovery of a significant negative relationship between consent traits and deviant behavior in the workplace was agreed upon by Mount et al. (2006), Salgado (2002), and Graziano and Eisenberg (1997). The results of this study also found that there is a significant and negative relationship between prudent traits and deviant behavior in the workplace. These results indicate that if an individual has low prudential traits, the individual is more inclined to engage in deviant behavior at work than individuals with high prudential traits. The findings of Farhadi, Fatimah, Nasir, and Wan Shahrazad (2012) are also supported by a study conducted by Kimly Le, M. Brent Donnellan, Sarah K. Spilman, Olivia Pavlov Garcia, and Rand Conger (2014) that personality traits of prudence and consent have significant and negative relationships with unproductive work behaviors. This study was conducted over a long period of time i.e. personality traits were measured while the study subject was still adolescent and unproductive work behavior was measured 18 years later when the study subject was in his mid-30s. The similarity of the results of this study with previous studies despite different time periods shows that the relationship of personality with unproductive work behavior is quite constant.

A study was conducted by Aida Abdullah and Sabitha Marican (2016) focusing on management employees in the federal ministry Malaysia with a total of 410 respondents entitled The Effects of Big-Five Personality Traits on Deviant Behavior. The results of the study

found that the results are slightly different from the above studies, namely the personality traits of prudence and openness have a significant and negative relationship with both dimensions of deviant behavior in the workplace, namely interpersonal deviant and organizational deviant. However, the mean score for organizational deviation is higher than interpersonal deviation. The significant negative relationship between openness traits and deviant behavior in the workplace contradicts the results of a study by Dwi Hastuti, Abdullah and Zulkarnain (2017) who found that openness traits have a significant and positive relationship with deviant behavior in the workplace. However, various factors such as demographic factors need to be taken into account because the study was conducted in two different countries, namely in Indonesia and Malaysia.

Overall, past studies have found a significant relationship between personality traits and deviant behavior in the workplace. These findings are consistent with the research hypothesis formed that there is a significant relationship between personality traits and deviant behavior in the workplace.

Workplace Incivility

A study conducted by Rasidah Arshad and Ida Rosnita Ismail (2018) showed that high personality traits of neuroticism among employees were found to be more strongly and positively associated with impolite in the workplace compared to low levels. The study was conducted in nine private organizations in Malaysia where most of the work carried out in the organization is in teams and the total number of study subjects is 108 people. Therefore, the results of the study could not be generalized to a larger population because the study sample was small. According to a study conducted by Laura Batista and Thomas G. Reio, Jr. (2019) entitled Occupational stress and instigator workplace

incivility as moderated by personality: A test of occupational stress and workplace incivility model, the results of the study found that the personality traits of prudence and consent weaken the relationship between stress and impoliteness in the workplace while the traits of neuroticism and extraversion strengthen the relationship of stress and decency in the workplace. The respondents of this study were 206 employees from the healthcare industry. Therefore, the hypothesis of this study is parallel that there is a significant relationship between personality traits and politeness in the workplace.

Studies on the relationship between politeness in the workplace and personality traits are still few because most previous studies have examined the consequences and effects of immorality in the workplace and not the factors. According to a study conducted by Milha Shabir, Muhammad Abrar, Sajjad Ahmad Baig and Mehwish Javed (2014) entitled The contribution of workplace incivility and psychological capital toward job stress, workplace decency has a significant relationship with work stress. Furthermore, this study found that high psychological capital strengthens the relationship between stress and immodesty in the workplace. The study was conducted on 100 employees from public and private organizations in Faisalabad, Pakistan. Also, a study conducted by Ida Rosnita Ismail, June ML Poon, and Rasidah Arshad (2018) entitled Effects of workplace incivility, negative affectivity and hurt feelings on coworker helping has found that the more often an individual faces impolite in the workplace, the less the willingness of the individual to extend assistance to the perpetrators of immorality in the workplace. The study also found that individuals are reluctant to assist

because they feel hurt by the perpetrators of indecency in the workplace. The data of this study were collected from 463 employees of public organizations in Malaysia.

Subsequently, a study conducted by Tara C. Reich and M. Sandy Hershcovis (2014) entitled *Observing workplace incivility* found that individuals who witness immorality in the workplace are also influenced by their negative views on the perpetrators of immorality in the workplace and more likely to punish the perpetrator when there are job-related opportunities such as giving him more difficult work. Therefore, the consequences of rudeness in the workplace not only affect the individual victims and perpetrators but also affect the witnesses of the incident, especially in terms of emotions. Disrespect in the workplace often occurs in public because the majority of individuals feel impolite in the workplace is a trivial matter especially perpetrators such as making comments that demean and belittle the victim. According to a study conducted by M. Sandy Hershcovis, Babatunde Ogunfowora, Tara C. Reich, and Amy M. Christie (2017) entitled *Targeted workplace incivility: The roles of belongingness, embarrassment, and power* found that there is a strong positive relationship between politeness in place work and embarrassment when a perpetrator is a person of high position or more powerful than the victim. The study also found that rudeness in the workplace can result in the victim having a sense of social isolation from co-workers.

Method

The study population consists of employees of private organizations around the state of Selangor, Malaysia, and the Federal Territory of Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. The State of Selangor and the Federal Territory of Kuala Lumpur were chosen because it is a powerhouse national economy and has a large number of organizations compared to other states in Malaysia. The sampling method is the selection of a group of individuals from a population is used because it is difficult to involve the entire population in a short time. Cluster random sampling was performed in this study. Private organizations were randomly selected clusters by industry because the list of private organizations for the states of Selangor and Kuala Lumpur failed to be obtained. Then, an email containing permission forms, info about the research conducted, and the importance of the study is sent to the human resource managers of these organizations. Since the total population could not be identified, the researchers used a Raosoft calculator to calculate the minimum number of samples required in the study. The total margin of error that researchers can accept is $\pm 10\%$ for a large population of over 5000 people. Therefore, the minimum sample number required in this study is 96 people.

The research instrument is a self-report that uses a questionnaire containing four parts. The questionnaire was formed online through Google Forms. There is a statement on the front page of the questionnaire that says that the respondent answered the questionnaire voluntarily and has the right to stop at any time and is considered to permit the use of data in research it continues to answer the form until the end. The first part of this form requires respondents to complete their demographic information including gender, age, race, marital status, and duration of employment in the organization. The second part consists of the following scales:

1. "Big Five Inventory" (BFI) (Goldberg 1993)
2. Devian Behavior at Work (Bennett & Robinson 2000)
3. Workplace Incivility (Cortina et al. 2001)

Result

Workplace Incivility with Deviant Behavior at Work

There was a weak but significant positive relationship between deviant behavior and impolite in the workplace ($r = 0.253^*$, $p < 0.05$). Subsequent studies have found that there is a significant positive relationship between the experience of rudeness in the workplace with deviant behavior in the workplace. This suggests that the more individuals experiencing rudeness in the workplace, the higher the likelihood of individuals behaving in the workplace. Berry C. and colleagues (2007) have stated that individuals tend to engage in deviant behavior in the workplace if they are treated unfairly or feel abused. Furthermore, studies conducted by Shabir, Abrar, Baig, and Javed (2014) have found that workplace decency has a significant relationship with work stress. Individuals who experience impolite in the workplace regularly may experience stress in the workplace as well as the possibility of venting their anger on co-workers or engaging in deviant behaviors that may be detrimental to the organization. The justification, victims of bullying in the workplace have been found to have an increase in absenteeism as well as the probability of quitting (Radliff, 2014).

The absence factor may also be due to the embarrassment experienced by the victim if the perpetrator is a high-ranking person or more powerful than the victim at work (Hershcovis et al., 2017). Researchers have found that the adverse effects of impolite in the workplace have a strong relationship with deviant behavior in the workplace so that it can motivate an employee to quit work. Based on the descriptive analysis, there was no significant difference between sample age and workplace decency and deviant behavior. However, the researchers found that the average mean score of deviant behavior and impolite in the workplace for the younger sample (20 years to 40 years) was higher than the older (40 years to 60 years). The findings of the study show that more individuals behaving deviant in the workplace say that they also experience rudeness in the workplace over and over again. These findings are also in line with the results of a study by Berry and colleagues (2007) who said that deviant behavior is more common among younger workers than older or older workers. Disrespect in the workplace is more common among young workers may be due to a lack of experience in employment or lower job positions compared to older workers.

Personality and Workplace Incivility

Assumptions of multiple regression analysis between Big Five personality traits and workplace decency were tested. Standard residue analysis was conducted and found that the study data did not contain outliers (Residue Std. Mean = -1.638, Residue Std. Max = 2.837). In addition, the assumption of data coherence has been tested and the results show multicollinearity is not a problem (Extraversion, Tolerance = 0.634, VIF = 1.577; Consensus, Tolerance = 0.688, VIF = 1.453; Prudence, Tolerance = 0.664, VIF = 1.506; Neurotism, Tolerance = 0.582, VIF = 1.717; Openness, Tolerance = 0.652, VIF = 1.533). The study data also meet the assumption of independent errors (Durbin-Watson value = 1.610).

Multiple regression analysis was performed to see if the Big Five personality traits namely extraversion traits, consent, prudence, neuroticism, and openness predict impolite in the workplace. A significant regression relationship was found ($F(5, 91) = 0.021$, $p < 0.05$) with a value of 0.133 using the enter method. As many as 8.6% of Big Five personality traits predict impolite in the workplace.

The results of the study found that only extraversion personality traits predicted significant workplace decency ($\beta = .0.254$, $t(96) = 2.2.077$, $p < 0.05$). Multiple regression analysis was performed to see if the Big Five personality traits namely extraversion traits, consent, prudence, neuroticism, and openness predict impolite in the workplace. A significant regression relationship was found ($F(5, 91) = 0.021$, $p < 0.05$) with a value of 0.133 using the enter method. As many as 8.6% of Big Five personality traits predict impolite in the workplace. The results of the study found that only extraversion personality traits predicted significant workplace decency ($\beta = .0.254$, $t(96) = 2.2.077$, $p < 0.05$).

Pearson Correlation Analysis has found that there is a significant negative relationship between extraversion traits and agreement with impolite in the workplace. It indicates the presence of extraversion traits and consent will reduce the likelihood of an individual experiencing rudeness in the workplace. These findings have been supported by the results of the study of Naimon E. C. and colleagues (2013) that individuals with high consent traits are seen very rarely to see a vague act as rude or impolite. Thus, individuals with high consensual traits are more likely to see the good in the behavior of others and not take heart with any disrespectful actions. Researchers believe that individuals with these high-level traits of resentment do not harbor resentment or recall the rude things they go through in the workplace but instead focus on building good interpersonal relationships with co-workers.

In turn, high extraversion traits also reduce the experience of rudeness in the workplace. According to Watson and Clark (1997), extroverted individuals spend more time in social situations and find interpersonal interactions to be beneficial. Thus, individuals with high extraversion traits see social interaction as something good and fun. They tend to dominate a conversation or discussion and are highly regarded by colleagues.

Extroverted individuals are rarely in situations that could cause them to receive less polite treatment at work. On the other hand, individuals with low extraversion traits or introverts are more likely to remain silent and observe their surroundings. They are more sensitive and sensitive to the service of others to them. Thus, introverted individuals are more likely to experience rudeness in the workplace or to feel that they are being treated rudely.

Correlation analysis also found that there was a significant positive relationship between neuroticism traits and impolite in the workplace. The results of this study are supported by a study conducted by Rasidah and Ida (2018) who found that high traits of neuroticism have a strong positive relationship with politeness in the workplace compared to low traits of neuroticism. Individuals with high neuroticism traits are people who are full of anxiety and have a less stable emotional state. Individuals like this are more likely to see the world with a negative outlook and judge things badly for example the way others interact with them is considered rude. Therefore, they assume that they go through more experience of rudeness in the workplace than others. Researchers also argue that individuals with high neuroticism traits often exhibit significant anxiety behaviors and have low self-confidence. Indirectly, they will look weak and are an easy target for co-workers or employers to make them victims of rudeness in the workplace. Furthermore, individuals with these high neuroticism traits can inadvertently cause discomfort to co-workers with less stable emotional states. They may deliberately not invite individuals with this high neuroticism trait to eat at the table during breaks for example or ignore the individual's opinion in the discussion.

Moreover, correlation analysis has found that there is no significant relationship between prudence and openness traits with impolite experience in the workplace. Although prudent traits have no direct relationship with rudeness in the workplace, prudent traits can be a moderator to the relationship of other personality traits with rudeness in the workplace. According to Krishnan S. (2016), the relationship between extraversion traits and neuroticism with cyber decency through work email increases with the presence of prudent traits. Ultimately, Big Five personality traits do not necessarily have to do with politeness in the workplace separately because it also has an impact by moderating the relationship of other traits with politeness in the workplace. The second research hypothesis that there is a significant relationship between personality traits and politeness in the workplace is acceptable.

The results of the multiple linear regression analysis have found that the Big Five personality trait predicts impolite in the workplace significantly by 8.6%. Therefore, the fourth study hypothesis is accepted. The small value may be due to the extraversion personality trait is the only personality trait that has a significant regression relationship with impolite in the workplace. One of the reasons extroverts are less polite in the workplace is that they have more good interpersonal relationships in the workplace than introverts. Therefore, if there are individuals who act rudely towards extroverted individuals, the story may be known to others. In addition, the Malay culture also plays a role in the community which has a strong community spirit. Be polite, considerate, and courteous are among the characteristics that are often associated with traditional Malay society (Pastor et al. 2000). In the Malay community that extroverts are viewed from the standpoint of good love socializing with full manners. As such, the extraversion traits of the study sample predict a decrease in the experience of impolite in the workplace.

Personality and Deviant Behavior at Work

The assumption of multiple regression analysis between Big Five personality traits and deviant behavior in the workplace has been tested by researchers. Standard residue analysis was conducted and found that the study data did not contain outliers (Residue Std. Mean = -2.011, Residue Std. Max = 3.089).

In addition, the assumption of data coherence has been tested and the results show multicollinearity is not a problem (Extraversion, Tolerance = 0.634, VIF = 1.577; Consensus, Tolerance = 0.688, VIF = 1.453; Prudence, Tolerance = 0.664, VIF = 1.506; Neuroticism, Tolerance = 0.582, VIF = 1.717; Openness, Tolerance = 0.652, VIF = 1.533). Study data also meet the assumption of independent errors (Durbin-Watson value = 1.752).

Multiple regression analysis has been used to predict deviant behavior in the workplace based on Big Five personality traits namely extraversion traits, consent, prudence, neuroticism, and openness. Significant regression relationships were found using the enter method ($F(5,91) = 11.365$, $p < 0.05$) with a value of 0.384. As many as 35.1% of Big Five personality traits predict deviant behavior at work.

If we look at personality traits separately, only consent traits ($\beta = -0.493$, $t(96) = -4.972$, $p < 0.05$) and prudence traits ($\beta = -0.255$, $t(96) = -2.527$, $p < 0.05$) are have a significant regression relationship with deviant behavior in the workplace.

The results of the study have found that there is a significant relationship between Big Five personality traits and deviant behavior in the workplace. Each of the Big Five personality traits namely extraversion traits, consent, prudence, neuroticism, and openness had a significant relationship ($p < 0.05$) with deviant behavior in the workplace. The traits of extraversion, consent, frugality, and openness have a significant negative relationship with deviant behavior. It means that when such personality traits are high, individuals have a lower probability of deviant behavior in the workplace. The trait of neuroticism was found to have a significant positive relationship with deviant behavior in the workplace. It shows that the likelihood for individuals to behave deviant in the workplace is higher if their neuroticism traits are high.

The results of this study have obtained similar results and support some of the findings of previous studies, including the study conducted by Farhadi, Fatimah, Nasir, and Wan Shahrzad (2012) who said that consent traits have a significant negative relationship with deviant behavior in the workplace. A study conducted in 2014 by Kimdy Le, M., and colleagues also obtained the same study results that the personality traits of prudence and consent have a significant and negative relationship with unproductive work behavior. According to Aida Abdullah and Sabitha Marican (2016), they have found that the personality traits of prudence and openness have a significant and negative relationship with both dimensions of deviant behavior in the workplace, namely interpersonal deviant and organizational deviant in line with the results of this study.

Also, the researchers found that there were some discrepancies in the results of the study with previous studies. According to Chen, Jin, and Fah (2016), personality traits of extraversion and neuroticism have a significant positive relationship with deviant behavior in the workplace. Although the neuroticism trait in this study got the same result that there is a significant positive relationship, the extraversion trait obtained the opposite result that the extraversion trait was found to have a significant negative relationship with deviant behavior in the workplace. However, the study conducted by Hastuti, Abdullah, and Zulkarnain (2017) got the same results with the study that the extraversion traits, neuroticism, and openness have a significant positive relationship with deviant behavior in the workplace. Meanwhile, prudence traits have a significant negative relationship with deviant behavior in the workplace. Researchers argue that the difference may be due to the findings of the survey respondents who did not cross the Malaysian culture as 94.8% of respondents were Malays.

Therefore, personality differences between the various races of Malaysians have impacted the results of this study. The community is very concerned about manners in everyday interactions with taught to be cautious in speaking so as not to hurt the feelings of others (Pastor et al. 2000). Extraversion trait is seen as a good personality trait among Malays and thus has a significant negative association with deviant behavior in the workplace. A strong grasp of Islam has influenced the culture of the Malays and the identity of the Malays in Malaysia. Most of the community tend to have a sense of shame and rarely to quarrel with others in the crowd. This can be seen through the mean score of the consent traits of the study sample which has the highest score compared to other personality traits. The majority of the Malay community that places a high value on manners is less likely to express their disagreement with others and more obedient. According to Mahathir (1970), it is common for the Malays to give way to others first by standing on the side.

Furthermore, the third research hypothesis that personality traits influence deviant behavior in the workplace is accepted based on the results of multiple linear regression analysis. A total of 35.1% of Big Five personality traits predict deviant behavior in the workplace even though only two personality traits, namely consent and prudence traits, have a significant regression relationship with deviant behavior in the workplace. Such a significant relationship is supported by a long-term study (Kimdy Le et al. 2014) which has measured the personality traits of study subjects during adolescence and unproductive work behaviors of study subjects were measured when subjects were in their mid-30s. The findings of the study which found that the traits of consent and prudence have a significant negative relationship with unproductive work behavior have shown a relatively stable relationship even over a long period of time. Researchers argue that employees with low consent traits are more likely to behave deviant because they are more likely to have disagreements with others for example by assuming rules in the office are trivial.

High prudence traits indicate that an individual is ambitious and values achievement in something. The findings of the study have shown that high prudential traits will reduce the likelihood of the presence of deviant behavior in the workplace. Based on the descriptive analysis, the prudence trait is one of the three highest personality traits of the study sample according to the mean score. Nevertheless, the analysis is contrary to the stereotypes that are often associated with the community. Crouch (1996) says that the community prefers to hang out and chat free of hard work. The researchers found the results of this study have proved inaccurate stereotypes are based on a sample consisting of a majority of the community with only 2.1% Chinese and 3.1% are other. Meanwhile, researchers can see prudential traits predicting deviant behavior in the workplace significantly because the individual who obtains a high prudence score is an achievement-oriented person. They are motivated workers high to achieve their career goals and advance the organization. Therefore, these individuals should want the best for their organization and avoid all things that can cause harm. Such behavior is the opposite of deviant behavior in the workplace.

Corresponding Author

Daniella Maryam Mokhtar

Nurul-Azza Abdullah

Email: nurulazza@ukm.edu.my

References

- Abdullah, A., & Marican, S. (2016). The Effects of Big Five Personality Traits on
Abdullah, F. Z., & Bustaman, F. L. (2011). Personality Profile of F&B Staff in Malaysia.
Australian Journal of Business and Management Research. 1, 9, 24-30.
- Adeoti, M. O., Shamsudin, M. F., & Chong, W. Y. (2017). Workload, work pressure and
interpersonal deviance in academia: The mediating role of neutralization. *International
Journal of Human Resource Studies*. 7, 4, 1-22.
- Agwa, A. M. F. (2018). Workplace Deviance Behaviors. *Leadership*. 25-38.
- Alias, M., Rasdi, M. R., Ismail, M., & Abu Samah, B. (2013). Predictors of workplace deviant
behaviour: HRD agenda for Malaysian support personnel. *European Journal of Training
and Development*. 37, 2, 161-182.
- Arshad, R., & Ismail, I. R. (2018). Effects of Workplace Incivility, Negative Affectivity and Hurt
Feelings on Coworker Helping. *Jurnal Pengurusan*. 52, 33- 45.

- Arshad, R., & Ismail, I. R. (2018). Workplace incivility and knowledge hiding behavior: Does personality matter? *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*. 5, 3, 278-288.
- Baharom, M. N., Sharfuddin, M. D. K., & Iqbal, J. (2017). A Systematic Review on the Deviant Workplace Behavior. *Review Public Administration Management*. 5, 3, 231.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thoughts and actions: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (2001). Social Cognitive Theory: An Agentic Perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*. 52, 1, 1–26.
- Batista, L., & Reio, T. G. J. (2019). Occupational Stress and Instigator Workplace Incivility as Moderated by Personality: A Test of an Occupational Stress and Workplace Incivility Model. *Journal of Organizational Psychology*. 19, 2, 38-49.
- Berry, C., Ones, D., & Sackett, P. (2007). Interpersonal Deviance, Organizational Deviance and Their Common Correlates: A Review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 92, 410-424.
- Bolton, L. R., Becker, L. K., & Barber, L. K. (2010). Big Five trait predictors of differential counterproductive work behavior dimensions. *Personality and Individual Differences*. 49, 5, 537–541.
- Chernyak-Haia, L., Kimb, S. E., & Tziner, A. (2018). Gender Profiles of Workplace Individual and Organizational Deviance. *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*. 34, 1, 46-55.
- Collins, N. R., & Rogers, B (2017). Growing Concerns with Workplace Incivility. *Workplace Health & Safety*. 65, 11, 564-564.
- Cortina, L. M., Magley, V. J., Williams, J. H., & Langhout, R. D. (2001). Incivility in the Workplace: Incidence and Impact. *Journal of occupational health psychology*. 6, 64-80.
- Deviant Behavior. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 219: 19-25.
- Elliott, A. C., & Woodward, W. A. (2007). *Statistical analysis quick reference guidebook with SPSS examples 1st ed*. London: Sage Publications.
- Farhadi, H., Fatimah, O., Nasir, R., & Shahrazad, W. S. (2012). Agreeableness and Conscientiousness as Antecedents of Deviant Behavior in Workplace. *Asian Social Science*. 8, 9.
- Ghasemi, A., Zahediasl, S. (2012). Normality Tests for Statistical Analysis: A Guide for Non-Statisticians. *Internationa Journal Endocrinol Metab*. 10, 2, 486-9.
- Guay, R., Choi, D., Oh, I., Mitchell, M., Mount, M., & Shin, K. (2015). Why People Harm the Organization and Its Members: Relationships among Personality, Organizational Commitment, and Workplace Deviance. *Human Performance*. 29, 1.
- Hastuti, D., Noor, M. N., Osman, A., & Lubis, Z. (2017). Personality factors as predictor of workplace deviant behavior among civil servants. *Journal of Applied Management*. 15, 3, 363-370.
- Hee, O. C. (2014). Validity and Reliability of the Big Five Personality Traits Scale in Malaysia. *International Journal of Innovation and Applied Studies*. 5, 4, 309-315.
- Hershcovis, M. S., Ogunfowora, B., Reich, T. C., & Christie, A. M. (2017). Targeted workplace incivility: The roles of belongingness, embarrassment and power. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 38, 7, 1057-1075.
- IKozakoa, I. N., Safin, S. Z., & Abdul Rahim, A. R. (2013). The Relationship of Big Five Personality Traits on Counterproductive Work Behaviour among Hotel Employees: An Exploratory

- Study. International Conference on Economics and Business Research 2013 (ICEBR 2013). *Procedia Economics and Finance*. 7, 181-187.
- Ismail, I. R. , June, M. L. P., & Arshad, R. (2018). Effects of workplace incivility, negative affectivity and hurt feelings on coworker helping. *Jurnal Pengurusan*. 52, 33-45.
- John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big-Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.). *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*. 2: 102–138. New York: Guilford Press.
- Kowalski, R. M., Toth, A., & Morgan, M. (2017). Bullying and cyberbullying in adulthood and the workplace. *The Journal of Social Psychology*. 158, 1, 64–81.
- Le, K., Brent, D. M., Spilman, S. K., Garcia, O. P., & Conger, R. (2014). Workers behaving badly: Associations between adolescent reports of the Big Five and counterproductive work behaviors in adulthood. *Personality and Individual Differences*. 61-62, 7–12.
- Leiter, M. P., Peck, E., & Gumuchian, S. (2015). Workplace Incivility and its Implications for Well-Being. *Mistreatment in Organizations*. 13, 107-135.
- Lim, L. C., the, C. J., & Chan, Y. F. (2016). A preliminary study of the effects of personality traits on workplace deviance in the voluntary sector. *International Review of Management and Marketing*. 6, 7, 6-10.
- Mastor, K. A., Jin, P., & Cooper, M. (2000). Malay Culture and Personality. *American Behavioral Scientist*. 44, 1, 95–111.
- Mazni, A., & Roziah, M. R. (2011). Towards developing a theoretical model on the determinants of workplace deviance among support personnel in the Malaysian public service organizations. 12th International Conference on Human Resource Development Research and Practice Across Europe. The University of Gloucestershire. Cheltenham, England.
- Moore, D. S., & McCabe, G. P. (1999). *Introduction to the Practice of Statistics*, 3rd ed. New York: W. H. Freeman.
- Naimon, E. C., Mullins, M. E. & Osatuke, K. (2013). The effects of personality and spirituality on workplace incivility perceptions. *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion*. 10, 1, 91-110.
- Narayanan, K., & Murphy, S. E. (2017). Conceptual Framework on Workplace Deviance Behavior: A Review. *Journal of Human Values*. 23, 3, 218–233.
- Pallant, J. (2007). *SPSS survival manual, a step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for windows*. 3 ed. 179-200. Sydney: McGraw Hill.
- Radliff, K. (2014). *Physical and verbal bullying*. In J. Lipinski & L. M. Crothers (Eds.), *Bullying in the workplace: Causes, symptoms, and remedies*. New York: Taylor and Francis.
- Rahim, A., & Cosby, D. M. (2016). A model of workplace incivility, job burnout, turnover intentions, and job performance. *Journal of Management Development*. 35, 10, 1255–1265.
- Reich, T. C., & Herscovis, M. S. (2014). Observing workplace incivility. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.
- Robinson, B. (1995). A Typology of Deviant Workplace Behaviors: A Multidimensional Scaling Study. *The Academy of Management Journal*. 38, 2, 555-572.
- Robinson, B. (2000). Development of a Measure of Workplace Deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 85, 3, 349-360.
- Shabir, M., Abrar, M., Baig, S. A., & Javed, M. (2014). The Contribution of Workplace Incivility and Psychological Capital toward Job Stress. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*. 4, 1-17.

- Sintiong, M., & Morshidi, A. (2015). Workplace Incivility and Turnover Intention among Bank Employees in Sabah. *Persidangan Transformasi Sosial Ke-2*. UPEB & FKSW Universiti Malaysia Sabah.
- Syed, A. R., Rehman, K. U., & Kitchlew, N. (2018). Impact of Perceived Leadership Style on Employees' Work Stress: Moderating and Mediating Role Big 5 Personality Traits. *Paradigms: A Research Journal of Commerce, Economics, and Social Sciences*. 12, 1, 6-15.
- Terlecki, S. A. (2011). Exploring Individual and Organizational Level Antecedents of Experienced Workplace Incivility. Degree of Master Thesis. Faculty of the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga.
- Thompson, M. J., & Barry. (2011). I Know What You Did: The Effects of Interpersonal Deviance on Bystanders. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*. 16(1): 80-94.
- Vagharseyyedin, A. S. (2015). Workplace incivility: a concept analysis. *Contemporary Nurse*. 50, 1, 115–125.
- Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1997). Extraversion and Its Positive Emotional Core. *Handbook of Personality Psychology*. 767-793. Academic Press: USA.