

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

The Counterproductive Cultural Behaviors in Indonesian Higher Education

Supriadi Supriadi ¹ & Amirul Mukminin ²

Abstract

The purposes of this research were to examine the indicators of the counterproductive cultural behaviours (CCBs) and to examine the essence of the direct and the indirect roles of the concepts of culture openness theory, and interpersonal counterproductive work behaviours, and contextual performance in human resource management in improving the contextual performance of education staff in Indonesian tertiary institutions. The data analysis method used in this research was correlational with sampling techniques using a non-probability sampling approach with purposive sampling technique on four variables and six dimensions with independent variables, namely culture openness with aesthetic dimensions, tolerance, and depth in the context of openness to experience. Furthermore, the interpersonal counterproductive work behaviour variables have dimensions focused on task, personal, and intentional behaviours. The dependent variable is counterproductive cultural behaviour. The findings indicated that the test results had proven that not all indicators on each variable were significantly different from the different geographical researchers and the previous inventors. However, from the umpteenth indicators, 32 indicators were feasible to use. This concept has an essential role in the development of new constructs and theories based on the openness and counterproductive work behaviour concept at the level of HRM management.

Keywords: Culture Openness, Interpersonal Counterproductive Work Behavior, Counterproductive Cultural Behavior, Contextual Performance

Introduction

A high culture of openness is paramount for education staff to carry out their strategic roles according to organizational goals. An educational staff must have the ability of creative imagination and high curiosity about the changes that occur in the work environment. According to Porter et al. (2017), culturally open individuals tend to see others more like themselves regardless of their attributes. Porter et al. (2017) found that a high culture of openness pays attention to and values social information, which is relevant to cultural

1 Department of Management, Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Islam Sumatera Utara, Indonesia
Email: adysupriadi@fe.uisu.ac.id

2 The Graduate School, Universitas Jambi, Indonesia
Email: amirul.mukminin@unja.ac.id



This journal is licensed under a creative common Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0. It is accredited to the University of Gondar, College of Social Sciences and Humanities.

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.4314/erjssh.v11i1.9>

and aesthetic business compared to other types of information when they make social decisions. In further research, investigating whether cultural openness or related aspects can facilitate the formation of successful interpersonal relationships among different individuals is recommended. The research for the future is the same as suggested by Woo et al. (2014) to investigate how situational factors influence the relationship between the narrow nature of openness and organizational performance (Hough & Oswald, 2008). Counterproductive work behaviour variables are also included in the research framework to assess deviant workplace behaviour (Dalal, 2005; Miles et al., 2002) and specifically for counterwork productive behaviour individuals (CWB-I) and counterwork productive behaviour for organizations (CWB-O). Furthermore, Ho (2012) distinguished Interpersonal counterproductive work behaviours (ICWBs) into behaviours that inhibit other worker's task performance (ICWB that focuses on tasks), and personal matters (ICWB that focus on people). Based on his findings, for future research, Ho suggested that it reflects and includes "intentional" items in expressions to be consistent with the counterproductive work behaviour (CWB) conceptualization as intentional or not intentional.

Based on the description and the explanation above, counterproductive cultural behavior research has two strong foundations; first, there is a need to examine the culture of openness in facilitating different interpersonal relationships on performance. Second, the context of interpersonal counterproductive work behaviors is the person's behavior in the workplace related to other personnel in carrying out organizational goals. Thus, it is necessary to follow up on the discussion of openness and counterproductive work behavior from several studies about aspects of culture and interpersonal focus on contextual performance. The purposes of this research were to examine the indicators of the counterproductive cultural behaviours (CCBs) and to examine the essence of the direct and the indirect roles of the concepts of culture openness theory, and interpersonal counterproductive work behaviours, and contextual performance in human resource management in improving the contextual performance of education staff in Indonesian tertiary institutions.

Literature Review

Personality dimensions

Griffin and Hesketh (2004) argued that people with openness to experience are also portrayed as imaginative, sensitive to aesthetics, independent thinkers, and tolerant of ambiguity who can accept new ideas, experiences, and perspectives. In their research, which explores the actual construct of openness to experience and its influence on performance criteria, they include aesthetics in the latter sub-dimension because experience seems to be internal, even though it is generated from the external environment. Griffin and Hesketh (2004) showed that aesthetics negatively affects adaptive performance, which is an extension of contextual performance. Likewise, studies conducted by Denis et al. (2010) revealed that personality has revealed limitations in the capacity of aspects of personality to predict task and contextual performance. According to Jalalkamali et

al. (2016), contextual performance refers to the personal efforts of employees who are not directly related to their primary tasks. -Tasks are essential because they form an organizational, social, and psychological background and can facilitate the activities and processes of the task (Werner, 2000). According to Jalalkamali et al. (2016), the most appropriate for the assessment and evaluation of work values is the opinion. Ros et al. (1999) stated cognitive (intrinsic), instrumental (extrinsic), social/altruistic, and prestige values. Another case with the results of research conducted by Shang et al. (2016) found that the relationship among employee openness task performance and contextual performance was not significant overall, but in Table VIII Regression model 2 (personality traits and contextual performance) page 247 shows significant openness to contextual performance.

Lee et al. (2010) stated that the relationship between caution and job performance will be stronger for people with high agreeableness than those with low hospitality. Previously, the researchers hypothesized a negative relationship between perceptions of organizational politics and contextual performance. While other researchers also hypothesized a negative relationship between organizational political perceptions and contextual performance, Lee et al. (2010) showed that the political interaction and personality dimensions of agreeableness explain several significant variants in the interpersonal facilitation aspect of contextual performance. Finally, Lado and Alonso (2017) stated that agreeableness is a predictor of contextual performance. These findings indicated that there is a need to consider situations and people as antecedents of contextual performance. Meanwhile, Kumar et al. (2009) interpreted the Big Five directly according to the Big Five size of the personality model. One such measure is openness to experience, which refers to the number of interesting interests and the depth of interest being pursued. Additionally, Darr and Kelloway (2016) explained the similarities between curiosity/ breadth; Drasgow et al. (2012) stated that curiosity, and Hough and Ones (2001) between complexity and depth; however, there is only one personality measure in the two aspects; and depth are the aspects that are rarely checked. Therefore, Darr and Kelloway (2016) described the aspect of depth in the introspective, reflecting on enjoying one's own life and behavior. In the research construct, Wang et al. (2007) stated introspection is divided into introspection, spontaneity, vision, and values to feeling from work that is related to contextual performance. Statistically, the results are positively related.

Work behaviors

The meta-analysis of the validity of the six aspects of openness in predicting work behavior by Woo et al. (2014) stated that there is a need based on a literature review and a consensus of material experts to classify openness measures by building taxonomies into the IPIP scale Depth (Goldberg et al., 2006), IPIP Imagination, OPQ Behavioral and OPQ conceptual to measure depth. In contextual research conducted by Truxillo et al.

(2012) believed that respondents will see older workers higher in contextual performance than younger workers. Based on this, they hypothesized that older workers would be considered more positive in contextual performance than younger workers. Furthermore, Zhao and Jung (2018) explained that 50 International Personality Item Pool (IPIP) items (Goldberg et al., 2006) were used to measure the Big Five on personality trait factors. Example items include “I have a clear imagination” (openness to experience). Openness to experience describes the breadth, depth, originality, and complexity of mental life and individual experiences (John et al., 2008). Founders with a high value in openness to experience may be better able to solve problems, which means if there are problems that affect the quality of the relationship, they will have a better solution than others in the same situation. In another case, Zhao and Jung (2018) and Hogan and Holland (2003) who used socio-analytic theory to understand individual differences in the performance of people at work, found that the big five factors were positively related to different aspects of contextual performance. Therefore, each of the Big Five factors can be stated to be analyzed in various types of performance. Based on this, Zhao and Jung (2018) again broke down and assessed each of the Big Five personality traits of its founders because each of them can affect the different contextual performance of an organization. The results showed that openness to experience had the greatest impact on perceived network relations. However, the results of the ANCOVA examination stated that there was no difference in the scale of contextual performance measurement between organizational citizenship behavior of individual (OCB-I) felt for older and younger workers, but there are older workers who are considered more positive in terms of organizational citizenship behavior of organization (OCB-O) than younger workers.

Responding to this, Ho (2012) proposed a new perspective that is more nuanced in conceptualizing interpersonal counterproductive work behaviors (ICWBs) and differentiates them into behaviors that inhibit task performance in other workers (focusing on ICWBs tasks) and personal (focusing on ICWBs in ICWBs people). Furthermore, it implies examining specific forms of CWBs and their causes. With these findings, they stated that the originality of their research was the first to distinguish ICWBs from being task-focused and focused. Meanwhile, Hu et al. (2016) stated that transactional leaders are to achieve minimum standards, and transformational (team-oriented) leaders inspire unexpected performance. Transactional leaders focus on tasks, marked by contingents with prizes (a clear division of tasks for target performance and rewards for achieving them) with exception management (concentration of attention on mistakes and failures). In a different case, Gunawardena and Galahiti (2016) found that the effects of bullying at work on one’s work performance were subjective and differed according to the emotional intelligence state of the individual. This finding is different from Nielsen et al. (2009), who argued that exposure to workplace bullying tends to influence outcomes related to work and health. Likewise, the findings from Jackson et al. (2002) have shown that bullying in the workplace disrupts the psychological and physical health of its victims and negatively affects the welfare and efficiency of employees because negative effects and physical

symptoms keep an employee from working at the optimal level.

Methods

Research design and respondents examine the indicators of the counterproductive cultural behaviours (CCBs) and to examine the essence of the direct and the indirect roles of the concepts of culture openness theory, and interpersonal counterproductive work behaviours, and contextual performance in human resource management in improving the contextual performance of education staff in Indonesian tertiary institutions. The population of this research was the educational staff (administrative staff, academic support staff, and library staff) males/females, juniors/seniors, etc., at colleges and private universities in Medan city.

The respondents in this study were all educational staff at private universities in Medan City with the following characteristics: (1) universities in the form of universities, managed by private parties in Medan City. (2) Respondents were people who were legally educational staff at a university that met the characteristics of this study. While the characteristics of educational staff were (a) as legal educational staff, both in the status of permanent employees and private contracts, (b) they had worked as educational staff at the university for at least 2 years, (c) were not in a retirement period, (d) were not on long leave, and (e) were not involved in a criminal case or serving a sentence. Based on these criteria, there were 1344 educational staff of 18 universities.

Table 1. Population of the study

No	Universities	Educational Staff
1	University A	117
2	Universitas B	327
3	University C	81
4	University D	56
5	University F	110
6	University G	66
7	University H	41
8	University I	66
9	University J	36
10	University K	45
11	University L	50
12	University M	55
13	University N	87
14	University O	29
15	University P	71
16	University Q	51
17	University R	31
18	University S	25
Total		1344

To obtain the sample of the study, we used the following formula,

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N e^2}$$

n : the number of sample

N : the number of population

e : The tolerable error in sampling is 0.05

Based on the formula, the final sample of the study is 308.

Table 1. Sample of the study

No	Universities	Educational Staff
1	University A	27
2	Universitas B	75
3	University C	19
4	University D	13
5	University F	25
6	University G	15
7	University H	9
8	University I	15
9	University J	8
10	University K	10
11	University L	11
12	University M	13
13	University N	20
14	University O	7
15	University P	16
16	University Q	12
17	University R	7
18	University S	6
Total		308

Data Collection and Analysis

Data collection through questionnaires contains a list of questions that were filled in by respondents to obtain data in the form of respondent responses related to the variables studied. There were 116 items of questionnaire in this study, namely, cultural openness in the aesthetic dimension (Indicators X1-X9), tolerance (X10-X18) and depth of experience (X19-X27), interpersonal counterproductive work behavior in the task dimension (X28-X38), interpersonal counterproductive work behavior in the personal dimension (X39-X49), interpersonal counterproductive work behavior in the intentional behavior dimension (X50-X59), counterproductive cultural behavior (Y60-Y78) which is a reflection of interpersonal and organizational deviations, reflection of proactive personality (Y79-Y82), reflection of individualism and collectivism (Y83-Y99), and contextual performance (Y100-Y116). To analyze the data, we used the Structural Equation Model (SEM) with the help of the Analysis of Moment Structure (AMOS) program which is useful

for this study.

Findings and Discussion

Test validity with the Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) test by measuring whether the construct (indicator) is able or not to reflect its latent variables. The results of testing culture variables openness, counterproductive work behavior interpersonal, counterproductive cultural behavior, and contextual performance were stated to meet the criteria with a Critical Ratio (CR) value > 1.96 and Probability (P) < 0.05 . With the sign *** is significant < 0.001 ; with a loading factor value > 0.70 . Whereas the validity test through the convergent validity test, which tests the construct (indicator) on the culture openness variable whether it has a high proportion of variance or not. Based on the test results, the culture openness variable meets the criteria with "Loading Factor" or "Standardized Loading Estimate" > 0.5 ., as in Table 2 below.

Regression Weights: (Group number 1 - Default model)			Estimate	S.E.	C.R.
CO9	<---	Cultural Openness	0.863	0.185	4.669
CO15	<---	Cultural Openness	0.692	0.175	3.95
CO14	<---	Cultural Openness	0.791	0.2	3.948
CO10	<---	Cultural Openness	1.019	0.215	4.739
CO11	<---	Cultural Openness	1.217	0.302	4.034
CO12	<---	Cultural Openness	1.137	0.262	4.347
CO3	<---	Cultural Openness	1		
CO13	<---	Cultural Openness	1.153	0.276	4.185
ICWB26	<---	Interpersonal Counterproductive Work Behavior	0.835	0.208	4.009
ICWB34	<---	Interpersonal Counterproductive Work Behavior	1.192	0.304	3.915
ICWBI33	<---	Interpersonal Counterproductive Work Behavior	1.708	0.366	4.664
ICWBI32	<---	Interpersonal Counterproductive Work Behavior	1.205	0.277	4.356
ICWBI31	<---	Interpersonal Counterproductive Work Behavior	1.344	0.302	4.443
ICWBI18	<---	Interpersonal Counterproductive Work Behavior	1		
ICWBI20	<---	Interpersonal Counterproductive Work Behavior	1.111	0.249	4.468
ICWBI24	<---	Interpersonal Counterproductive Work Behavior	1.022	0.267	3.829
CCB44	<---	Counterproductive Cultural Behavior	0.971	0.228	4.264
CCB52	<---	Counterproductive Cultural Behavior	0.94	0.198	4.759
CCB51	<---	Counterproductive Cultural Behavior	1.162	0.275	4.218
CCB45	<---	Counterproductive Cultural Behavior	1.474	0.332	4.442
CCB46	<---	Counterproductive Cultural Behavior	0.993	0.234	4.241
CCB47	<---	Counterproductive Cultural Behavior	1.236	0.314	3.94
CCB55	<---	Counterproductive Cultural Behavior	1.253	0.294	4.268
CCB36	<---	Counterproductive Cultural Behavior	1		
CP62	<---	Contextual Performance	0.852	0.231	3.687
CP63	<---	Contextual Performance	1.151	0.264	4.355
CP64	<---	Contextual Performance	0.932	0.24	3.888
CP56	<---	Contextual Performance	1		
CP57	<---	Contextual Performance	1.109	0.269	4.115
CP60	<---	Contextual Performance	0.958	0.254	3.772
CP50	<---	Contextual Performance	0.867	0.225	3.846

Table 2. The Construct Validity

Whereas validity tests through convergent validity tests, namely testing the construct (indicator) on culture variables openness, counterproductive interpersonal work behavior, counterproductive cultural behavior, and contextual performance, whether or not it has a high proportion of variance. The test results show that the culture variable openness meets the criteria with “loading factor” or “standardized loading estimate” > 0.5, which is described in Table 3.

Table 3. The Convergent Validity

Standardized Regression Weights: (Group number 1 - Default model)			Estimate
09	<---	Cultural Openness	0.838
015	<---	Cultural Openness	0.708
014	<---	Cultural Openness	0.72
010	<---	Cultural Openness	0.822
011	<---	Cultural Openness	0.714
012	<---	Cultural Openness	0.773
013	<---	Cultural Openness	0.77
013	<---	Cultural Openness	0.755
WB26	<---	Interpersonal Counterproductive Work Behavior	0.728
WB34	<---	Interpersonal Counterproductive Work Behavior	0.715
WBI33	<---	Interpersonal Counterproductive Work Behavior	0.859
WBI32	<---	Interpersonal Counterproductive Work Behavior	0.806
WBI31	<---	Interpersonal Counterproductive Work Behavior	0.834
WBI18	<---	Interpersonal Counterproductive Work Behavior	0.749
WBI20	<---	Interpersonal Counterproductive Work Behavior	0.794
WBI24	<---	Interpersonal Counterproductive Work Behavior	0.706
WB44	<---	Counterproductive Cultural Behavior	0.754
WB52	<---	Counterproductive Cultural Behavior	0.817
WB51	<---	Counterproductive Cultural Behavior	0.734
WB45	<---	Counterproductive Cultural Behavior	0.782
WB46	<---	Counterproductive Cultural Behavior	0.763
WB47	<---	Counterproductive Cultural Behavior	0.716
WB55	<---	Counterproductive Cultural Behavior	0.758
WB36	<---	Counterproductive Cultural Behavior	0.778
62	<---	Contextual Performance	0.706
63	<---	Contextual Performance	0.839
64	<---	Contextual Performance	0.74
56	<---	Contextual Performance	0.729
57	<---	Contextual Performance	0.769
60	<---	Contextual Performance	0.738
59	<---	Contextual Performance	0.719
66	<---	Contextual Performance	0.752

The reliability test with the construct reliability test, which tests the reliability and consistency of the data, meets the criteria if construct reliability > 0.7. Construct reliability values between 0.6 to 0.7 can still be accepted provided that the construct validity (indicator) is good. The test results show that all constructs are above 0.7. Validity test with the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) test, which is a confirmatory test by looking at the average of variance extracted between indicators of a latent variable. Eligible if AVE > 0.5. All AVE results in this research were > 0.5. Validity test with discriminant validity test to measure how far an indicator (construct) is really different from other indicators (construct). This test has met the criteria with the square root value of AVE higher than the correlation value between latent variables as in Table 4 below.

Table 4. The Average Variance Extracted (AVE)

Variable		Standar Loading		Measurement	Construct	Variance	Discriminat
		SL	SL ²	error (ej) = (1-SL ²)	Reliability	Extracted (AVE)	Validity
					(SSL) ² /((SSL) ² +ej)	SSL ² /((SSL) ² +Sej)	√ AVE
Cultural	CO9	0.838	0.702	0.298			
Openness	CO15	0.708	0.501	0.499			
	CO14	0.72	0.518	0.482			
	CO10	0.822	0.676	0.324			
	CO11	0.714	0.510	0.490			
	CO12	0.773	0.598	0.402			
	CO3	0.77	0.593	0.407			
	CO13	0.751 +	0.564 +	0.436 +			
			6.096	4.662	3.338	0.918	0.583
Interpersonal	ICWB26	0.728	0.530	0.470			
Counterproductive Work Behavior	ICWB34	0.713	0.508	0.492			
	ICWBI33	0.859	0.738	0.262			
	ICWBI32	0.806	0.650	0.350			
	ICWBI31	0.834	0.696	0.304			
	ICWBI18	0.749	0.561	0.439			
	ICWBI20	0.795	0.632	0.368			
	ICWBI24	0.706 +	0.498 +	0.502 +			
		6.190	4.813	3.187	0.923	0.602	0.776
Counterproductive Cultural Behavior	CCB44	0.755	0.570	0.430			
CCB52	0.817	0.667	0.333				
CCB51	0.735	0.540	0.460				
CCB45	0.782	0.612	0.388				
CCB46	0.763	0.582	0.418				
CCB47	0.716	0.513	0.487				
CCB55	0.758	0.575	0.425				
CCB36	0.778 +	0.605 +	0.395 +				
		6.104	4.664	3.336	0.918	0.583	0.764
Contextual Performance	CP62	0.706	0.498	0.502			
CP63	0.839	0.704	0.296				
CP64	0.75	0.563	0.438				
CP56	0.729	0.531	0.469				
CP57	0.769	0.591	0.409				
CP60	0.738	0.545	0.455				
CP59	0.719	0.517	0.483				
CP66	0.752 +	0.566 +	0.434 +				
		6.002	4.515	3.485	0.912	0.564	0.751

The test results in Tables 2, 3, and 4 in each variable, namely the openness culture variable that there were 9 indicators adopted from Woo et al. (2014), it had a loading factor below 0.7 which caused the indicator not to work on the measurement model so it did not fit the criteria to be developed. Whereas in the interpersonal count-reproductive work behavior variable of 12 indicators which were a combination of the indicators of Ho (2012) and Fox and Spector (1999); while for the counterproductive culture behavior variable 12 indicators were adapted from Bennett and Robinson (2000); Bateman and Crant (1993) and Triandis et al. (1986) as well as contextual performance variables of 4 indicators adopted from Carlos and Rodrigues (2016).

This research examined whether the indicators adopted from Bateman and Crant (1993); Bennett and Robinson (2000); Carlos and Rodrigues (2016); Fox and Spector (1999); Ho (2012); Triandis et al. (1986); and Woo et al. (2014) on each variable by the conditions and climate in private universities in Indonesia for further empirical testing. It needs to generalize these indicators according to the conditions and circumstances in progress. Therefore, the test results have proven that not all indicators on each variable are significantly different from the geographical results of the studies of various researchers and previous inventors. However, of the umpteenth indicators, 32 indicators were feasible to use. It is in line with Black et al. (2013) when specifying the number of indicators per construct. It recommends the use of four indicators whenever possible; having three indicators per construct is acceptable, particularly when other constructs have more than three, and constructs with more than three indicators should be avoided.

These findings contribute to the follow-up of the reduction of new concepts based on the synthesis results of openness culture and counterproductive work behavior that calls for further research into deviant behavior. It had previously been stated that both concepts require new concepts to answer and resolve deviant behavior problems. The new concept offered to address this problem gap is Counterproductive Cultural Behaviors (CCBs), which are also novels in articles written by Supriadi et al. (2019). This finding is in line with Barney et al. (2011), which stated that one of the implications of a maturity theory is declared critical, located when followed by revitalization or decline (Sarkum et al., 2017). Therefore, the concept of Counterproductive Cultural Behaviors (CCBs) is a new concept that has fulfilled the requirements and deserves to be continued in further research. Denis et al. (2010) revealed that personality has limitations in the capacity of aspects of personality to predict task and contextual performance. The initial derivation of the Theory of Planned Behavior by Ajzen (1985) defined the intention (and other theoretical constructs) in trying to do certain behaviors and not about actual performance. This theory was born from an extension of the Theory of Reasoned Action by Fishbein and Ajzen (1977) which is needed for the limitations of the original model in dealing with behavior, wherein people have control to intend incomplete. The theory of Planned Behavior has an open principle to include additional predictors if it can be shown, that it captures the variance proportion in intention or behavior that is significant after the flow

of theoretical variables is considered. In general, Ajzen (1991) stated that this theory is supported by empirical evidence where the intention to perform various types of behavior can be predicted with high accuracy of attitudes towards behavior, subjective norms, and perceptions of behavior control and this intention, together with perceptions of behavioral control, as well as explaining considerable variance in actual behavior but the Theory of Reasoned Action according to Fox and Spector (1999) explained that the active component of the formation of attitudes or behavioral responses to the cognitive component yearns for an explanation of the variance in attitudes and behaviors. Therefore, these findings require further testing of each indicator on Counterproductive Cultural Behaviors (CCBs) on a broader empirical basis so that they are appropriate and can be used as a reference in future research.

Conclusion

Testing indicators on the new concept of Counterproductive Cultural Behaviors and the essence of the direct and indirect roles of the concepts of cultural openness, interpersonal counterproductive work behaviors, and contextual performance in Human Resource Management (HRM) perspective as Human Resource (HR) manager's strategy to anticipate and overcome the low or narrow culture of openness and counterproductive work behavior which occurs in the workplace to improve the contextual performance tested in the teaching staff of private tertiary institutions in Indonesia. The test results show that it has been proven that not all indicators on each variable are significantly different from the different geographical researchers and previous inventors. However, from the overall indicators adopted 32 indicators are feasible to use. Therefore, this finding requires further testing to prove the validity of the 32 indicators is feasible on each variable that forms the new concept of CCBs empirically and more broadly so that it is appropriate and can be a reference for the concept of CCBs can be the latest findings so that the further research can be referred to in future studies. Testing the indicators of this new concept is very important in developing theories based on openness and counterproductive work behavior at the level of HRM management.

References

- Ajzen, I. (1985). *Behavioral interventions: Based on the theory of planned behavior, in action control: From cognition to behavior*. New York: Springer-Verlag
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211.
- Barney, J. B., Ketchen Jr, D. J., & Wright, M. (2011). The future of resource-based theory: Revitalization or decline?. *Journal of Management*, 37(5), 1299–1315.
- Bateman, T. S., & Crant, J. M. (1993). The proactive component of organizational behavior. A measure and correlates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14(2), 103–118.
- Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(3), 349–360.
- Carlos, V. S., & Rodrigues, R. G. (2016). Development and validation of a self-reported measure of job performance. *Social Indicators Research*, 126(1), 279–307.
- Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1241–1255.
- Darr, W., & Kelloway, E. K. (2016). Sifting the Big Five: Examining the criterion-related validity of facets. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 3(1), 2–22.
- Denis, P. L., Morin, D., & Guindon, C. (2010). Exploring the capacity of NEO PI-R facets to predict job performance in two French-Canadian samples. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 18(2), 201–207.
- Drasgow, F., Stark, S., Chemyshenko, O. S., Nye, C.D., Hulin, C. L., & White, L. A. (2012). *Development of the Tailored Adaptive Personality Assessment System (TAPAS) to support army selection and classification decisions*. Drasgow Consulting Group Urbana IL.
- Fishbein, M. E. & Ajzen, I. (1977). *Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*. Addison Wesley
- Fox, S., & Spector, P. E. (1999). A model of work frustration-aggression, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20(6), 915–931.
- Goldberg, L. R., Johnson, J. A., Eber. H. W., Hogan, R., Ashton, M. C., Cloninger, C. R., & Gough, H. G. (2006). The international personality item pool and the future of public-domain personality measures. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40(1), 84–96.
- Griffin, B. and Hesketh, B. (2004). Why openness to experience is not a good predictor of job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 12(3), 243–251.
- Gunawardena, W. A. M. S. U. & Galahitiyawa, N. W. K. (2016). The role of emotional intelligence in workplace bullying and individuals' work performance. *Sri Lankan Journal of Management*, 21(1), 2-38.
- Ho, V. T. (2012). Interpersonal counterproductive work behaviors: Distinguishing between

- person-focused versus task-focused behaviors and their antecedents. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 27(4), 467–482.
- Hogan, J., & Holland, B. (2003). Using theory to evaluate personality and job-performance relations: A socioanalytic perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(1), 100–112.
- Hough, L. M., & Ones, D. S. (2001). *The structure, measurement, validity, and use of personality variables in industrial, work, and organizational psychology*. SAGE Publications.
- Hough, L. M., & Oswald, F. L. (2008). Personality testing and industrial–organizational psychology: Reflections, progress, and prospects. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1(3), 272–290.
- Hu, Y. Y., Parker, S. H., Lipsitz, S. R., Arriaga, A. F., Peyre, S. E., Corso, K. A., ...& Greenberg, C. C. (2016). Surgeons' leadership styles and team behavior in the operating room. *Journal of the American College of Surgeons*, 222(1), 41–51.
- Jackson, D., Clare, J., & Mannix, J. (2002). Who would want to be a nurse? Violence in the workplace—a factor in recruitment and retention. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 10(1), 13–20.
- Jalalkamali, M., Ali, A. J., Hyun, S. S., & Nikbin, D. (2016). Relationships between work values, communication satisfaction, and employee job performance. *Management Decision*, 54(4), 796–814.
- John, O. P., Naumann, L. P., & Soto, C. J. (2008). Paradigm shift to the integrative Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and conceptual issues. *Theory and Research*, 3(2), 114–158.
- Kumar, K., Bakhshi, A., & Rani, E. (2009). Linking the Big Five personality domains to Organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Psychological Studies*, 1(2), 73–81.
- Lado, M., & Alonso, P. (2017). The Five-Factor model and job performance in low complexity jobs: A quantitative synthesis. *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 33(3), 175–182.
- Lee, Y. H., Yang, L. S., Wan, K. M., & Chen, G. H. (2010). Interactive effects of personality and friendship networks on contextual performance. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 38(2), 197–208.
- Miles, D. E., Borman, W. E., Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2002). Building an integrative model of extra role work behaviors: A comparison of counterproductive work behavior with organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10(1-2), 51–57.
- Nielsen, M. B., Skogstad, A., Matthiesen, S. B., Glase, L., Aaslad, M. S., Notelaers, G., & Einarsen, S. (2009). Prevalence of workplace bullying in Norway: Comparisons across time and estimation methods. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 18(1), 81–101.
- Porter, C. M., Parrigon, S. E., Woo, S. E., Saef, R. M., & Tay, L. (2017). Cultural and intellectual openness differentially relate to social judgments of potential work

- partners. *Journal of Personality*, 85(5), 632–642.
- Ros, M., Schwartz, S. H., & Surkiss, S. (1999) 'Basic individual values, work values, and the meaning of work. *Applied Psychology*, 48(1), 49–71.
- Sarkum, S., Pramuka, B. A., & Suroso, A. (2017). Dynamic marketing through engagement: Answering the role of marketing functions. *International of Marketing, Communication and New Media*, 5(9), 5–23.
- Shang, K.-C., Chao, C.-C., & Lirn, T.-C. (2016). The application of personality traits model on the freight forwarding service industry. *Maritime Business Review*, 1(3), 231–252.
- Supriadi, Dalimunthe, R. F., Lumbanraja, P., & Tarmizi, H. B. (2019). A study of counterproductive culture behavior: The preliminary a new concept. *Quality - Access to Success*, 20(172), 69–73.
- Triandis, H. C., Bontempo, R., Betancourt, H., Bond, M., Leung, K., Brenes, A., ...& de Montmollin, G. (1986). The measurement of the ethical aspects of individualism and collectivism across cultures. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 38(3), 257–267.
- Truxillo, D. M., McCune, E. A., Bertolino, M., & Fraccaroli, F. (2012). Perceptions of older versus younger workers in terms of Big Five facets, proactive personality, cognitive ability, and job performance. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 42(11), 2607–2639.
- Wang, H., Xu, P., & Qian, H. (2007). Spiritual quotient effects on research performance of Ph. D Candidates: A demonstration analysis. *International Conference on Wireless Communications*, 4461–4464.
- Werner, J. M. (2000). Implications of OCB and contextual performance for human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review*, 10(1), 3–24.
- Woo, S. E., Chernyshenko, O. S., Longley, A., Zhang, Z. X., Chiu, C. Y., & Stark, S. E. (2014). Openness to experience: Its lower-level structure, measurement, and cross-cultural equivalence. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 96(1), 29–45.
- Zhao, L., & Jung, H. B. (2018). 'The winning personality: Impact of founders' personality traits and firms' network relationships on Chinese apparel new venture performance. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 24(2), 553–573.