

The Influence of Job Stress on Counterproductive Work Behavior with Neuroticism Personality as a Moderator Variable in State Civil Apparatus in Pekanbaru

Ifi Anjely Rahmadhani¹, Hijriyati Cucuani^{2*}
Universitas Islam Negeri Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau
e-mail: 1ifianjelyy.r@gmail.com, 2hijriyati.cucuani@uin-suska.ac.id
*corresponding author

Abstract. The suboptimal performance of employees results in more cases of CWB. In many studies, CWB is often associated with work stress. Personality was also tested as a determining factor in the relationship between the two. In the big five personalities, neurotic personality are relatively consistent in strengthening the influence of work stress on work CWB compared to the other four personality types. This study aims to determine whether work stress influences CWB and whether neuroticism can moderate work stress on CWB on the State Civil Apparatus in Pekanbaru. The sampling technique uses quota sampling with a sample size of 147 employees who have worked for at least one year. The data will be collected by using Spector's Counterproductive Work Behavior checklist, IPIP-BFM-50 and the work stress scale. Data were analyzed using the Process by Andrew F. Hayes v4 for the SPSS tool. The results show that work stress affects CWB and neuroticism cannot moderate the effect of work stress on CWB. This research is expected to contribute to scientific knowledge and assist management in preventing and minimizing counterproductive work behavior, especially in establishing a conducive work situation and determining the proper employee criteria for recruitment.

Keywords: CWB, moderate, neuroticism, work stress

Unggah:	Revisi:	Diterima:
20-04-2024	23-05-2024	03-06-2024

Introduction

The negative performance of some officials in Indonesia is still a problem especially for government agencies. According to Kompas.com, 35 percent of ASN in the country has low performance. (Kompas, 2022). During 2021, there were six PNSs in Pemprov Riau who were dismissed disrespectfully. In addition, according to the chief representative of the Ombudsman of RI Province Riau that there are about 100 to 200 reports each year. (Ombudsman, 2022). It is known that the most frequently received reports relate to employee affairs, labour and defence (Ombudsman, 2022).

Public Ombudsman records the most complaints about public services in Pekanbaru. The Anti-Corruption Commission (Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi/KPK) recorded the total state losses due to corruption in the financial sector reached Rp.45,06 trillion during 2016-2021 (Rizki, 2022). On August 30, 2022, it was reported by the Alliance of Students and Youth (AMPR) of Riau Province that there were four alleged corruption crimes that took place in BAPENDA Pemko Pekanbaru (Akmal, 2022).

Several cases of violations have caused government officials to get mockery from the public. These violations or negative behaviours are called counterproductive behaviour. Intended counterproductive behaviour can give a negative impact on the organization and members of the organization so that the negative image of employees is inevitable. (Fox, Spector & Miles, 2001).

Fox, Spector and Miles (2001) revealed that counterproductive work behavior is behavior that has detrimental effects on the organization and its members. This can include actions such as aggression and theft or passive actions such as intentionally not following instructions or doing work incorrectly (Fox, Spector, & Miles, 2001). Counterproductive work behavior (CWB) is the opposite of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). OCB is reflected by coming to work carefully or on time and applies every day, while CWB is reflected by absenteeism and tardiness (Spector & Fox, 2002).

Counterproductive work behavior based on its form is divided into five dimensions, which are harassment of other people, production irregularities, sabotage, theft and withdrawal which consists of behavior that limits the amount of time worked (Spector, et al., 2006). Meanwhile, CWB is also divided based on targets, namely CWB-O and CWB-I (Robinson & Bennett, 1995; Fox & Spector, 2005). What is meant by CWB-O is behavior that threatens or endangers the organization, such as theft and withdrawal. Meanwhile, CWB-I is behavior that threatens or endangers individuals in the workplace, such as ridiculing, slandering fellow co-workers and ridiculing co-workers (Yoseanto, 2017).

Christine (2014) suggests that CWB can cause large potential losses, so it is very important not to ignore this behavior. Actions need to be taken to prevent the occurrence of CWB in the workplace, because this not only has an impact on the workplace, but also on employee welfare and performance (Christine, 2014). Therefore, it is necessary to know

the CWB of ASN in Government Agencies to avoid lack of prosperity and decreased employee performance which can have an impact on the workplace.

Job stress is one of the most common factors associated with CWB (Sprung, 2011). Fox, Spector and Miles (2001) revealed that work stress has repeatedly been proven to be related to the occurrence of deviance behavior. Research conducted by the American Psychological Association shows that between 2007- 2010 around 70% of Americans surveyed considered work to be one of the main causes of stress (Sonnentag & Frese, 2013). A survey conducted in 2009 by the American Psychological Association showed that approximately 40% of American adults reported that they were stressed and tense during the workday (Sonnentag & Frese, 2013). Apart from that, a survey conducted by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) regarding work stress and depression in 2018 obtained 595,000 cases with a prevalence rate of 1,800 per 100,000 workers. In Indonesia, as reported by kompas.com, a survey conducted by PPM Management found that 80% of workers experienced symptoms of stress ranging from moderate to severe levels (Karunia, 2020).

Work stress can influence employee behavior and is the basis for anger, frustration, irritation and intolerance (Alias, et al., 2014). Such negative emotional states will lead to various forms of inappropriate behavior, as proposed by Spector and Fox (2002) that individuals react to stressful work conditions that produce negative emotions will cause them to develop negative behavior.

Cullen and Sackett (2003) revealed that when employees experience job stress at work, CWB becomes one way to overcome it, meaning that when employees experience stress and do not have effective coping strategies such as problem-focused treatment to change the stressful situation, they tend to be involved in CWB.

Although stressors can cause CWB, individual differences in personality may also influence a person's tendency to engage in counterproductive behavior (Sprung, 2011). It is possible that there are certain aspects of personality that can play a role in a person's involvement in CWB. In fact, personality has repeatedly been linked to CWB (Sprung, 2011). Personality aspects have a main and moderating effect on the occurrence of CWB. Certain personality traits can worsen or improve the relationship between work stressors

and CWB (Sprung, 2011). Personality traits are the basic foundation of personality that underlies a person's thoughts, feelings and behavior (Barrick & Mount in Rustiarini, 2014).

The big five personality consists of extraversion, conscientiousness, agreeableness, neuroticism and openness to experience (Hough & Ones, 2001). Big five personality describes the basic dimensions of normal personality (Karappuiya, 2017). The literature review shows that the big five personalities have been found quite frequently in CWB research and among the five aspects, extraversion and neuroticism are the strongest in all studies. Conscientiousness is next in line for stability and there is little empirical evidence for agreeableness and even less for openness to experience (Ostendorf & Angleitner, 1992).

The existence of different personalities between one individual and another causes each individual to have a different perception of the work stress they experience (Rustiarini, 2014). Excessive work stress causes emotional stability disorders such as depression, restlessness and anxiety, which has a negative effect on work behavior (Rustiatini, 2014). In this study, researchers chose neuroticism personality as a moderator variable which also explains the influence of work stress on CWB. In research conducted by Chusnah (2022), neuroticism can strengthen the influence of work stress on CWB. Individuals with high neuroticism tend to have difficulty controlling themselves when there is a source of work stress, causing CWB to occur (Chusnah, 2022). Neuroticism is one of the personality dimensions of the big five personality, which is identical to anxiety, insecurity, self-consciousness and temperament (McCrae & Costa in Hartati, 2018).

Therefore, the aim of this research is to examine the influence of work stress on counterproductive work behavior with neuroticism personality as a moderator variable in the State Civil Service in Pekanbaru. Researchers want to see the size of the employee's tendency to develop neuroticism traits based on scores obtained from the subject's responses to items that measure neuroticism from the big five personality scale.

Method

This research uses a quantitative approach method. Research locations in five different government agencies. The sampling technique in this research is quota sampling with a total of 147 employees who have worked for at least one year. By using quota

sampling, researchers can set the desired target number or quota, making it easier for researchers because they can determine based on the location that will be the research site.

Data collection in research uses a scale. The measuring tools used are the counterproductive work behavior checklist or Spector which was adapted into Indonesian by Cucuani (2022), the IPIP-BFM-50 which was compiled by Akhtar & Azwar (2019), and the work stress scale developed by Wulansari based on stress aspects. work proposed by Robbins and Judge (2017). Data were analyzed using the Process by Andrew F. Hayes v4 for SPSS tool.

Result

Table 1.
Linearity Testing

Variable	F	Linierity Sig	Annotation
CWB and Work Stress	43.867	.000	Linier
CWB and <i>Neuroticism</i>	28.546	.000	Linier

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the research data can be considered to be linear.

Tabel 2.
T-Test

Variable	B	P
Work Stress	4,008	.000
<i>Neuroticism</i>	3,036	.003

Based on the table above, the results show that the significance of the work stress variable is 0.000 and the neuroticim variable is 0.003, which means that work stress and neuroticism have a partially significant relationship with CWB.

Tabel 3.
F-Test

Model	F	P
1 Regression	23.217	.000
Residual		
Total		

Meanwhile, an F value of 23,217 was obtained with a significance value of 0.000 (p<0.05).

Table 4.
Hypotesis Testing

Variable	R	P	Annotation
Work Stress →CWB	0,4954	0,000	Significant
Work Stress*Neuroticism →CWB	0,0033	0,5786	Not Significant

Based on the table above using the Process v4 Program. by Hayes obtained for the first hypothesis with an R value of 0.495 and a p value of 0.000, which means that work stress and CWB are significantly correlated with a positive relationship direction so that H1 in this study is accepted. Then for the second hypothesis, an R value of 0.0033 and a p value of 0.5786 were obtained, which means there is no significant relationship between the interaction of work stress and neuroticism with CWB. Neuroticism as a moderator variable is considered unable to moderate the influence of work stress on CWB in State Civil Service (ASN) in Pekanbaru. Therefore, H2 in this study is rejected.

Table 5.
Categorization Testing

Variable	Categorization	Frequency	Presentage
Work Stress	Very Low	11	7.5%
	Low	29	19.8%
	Average	65	44.2%
	High	29	19.7%
	Very High	13	8.8%
CWB	Very Low	0	0%
	Low	56	38.1%
	Average	44	29.9%
	High	26	17.7%
	Very High	21	14.3%
Neuroticism	Very Low	11	7.5%
	Low	28	19%
	Average	59	40.1%
	High	37	25.2%
	Very High	12	8.2%

Based on the categorization of the data above, it can be seen that the majority of research subjects had work stress in the moderate category (44.2%). Meanwhile, the CWB of most research subjects was in the low category (38.1%) and neuroticism was in the medium category (40.1%).

Table 6.
Correlation Matrix

Contracts	Work Stress	Neuroticism	CWB
Work Stress	1		
<i>Neuroticism</i>	.462**	1	
CWB	.442**	.399**	1

Based on the results of the table above, it can be seen that there is a correlation between work stress and CWB and neuroticism and CWB, which means that there is a significant correlation between the variables that are linked.

Discussion

Research conducted by Ma and Li (2019) states that work stress can predict CWB in a positive direction. From the research conducted, it is known that work pressures faced by individuals at work, such as workload and interpersonal stress, can cause changes in individual emotions and behavior. When faced with stress, individuals are susceptible to negative emotions such as anxiety and tension. These emotional changes can cause individuals to carry out certain inappropriate behavior or can be called CWB.

Research conducted by Clercq, Haq and Azeem (2019) states that employees who are under pressure in the organization and lack well-being are more likely to vent their negative emotions on things that can harm the organization directly or indirectly. Direct CWB includes spending office finances for personal gain whereas indirect CWB includes ignoring coworkers or speaking ill of their colleagues or leaders. Clercq, Haq and Azeem (2019) in their research also explained that the experience of stress caused by the work environment makes employees feel frustrated and this will lead to negative behavior in the workplace. Employees can release the frustration they feel by causing harm either directly to the organization or indirectly by targeting individual members of the organization itself (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997).

In this research, neuroticism as a moderator variable has no role or does not moderate the influence of work stress on CWB. These results are in line with the findings of Edward (2017). In research conducted by Edward (2017) stated that neuroticism does not predict CWB-O and CWB-I. Edward (2017) stated that this could happen because of the effect of self-awareness which eliminates anger, causing neuroticism to have an

insignificant relationship with CWB. Chen and Spector (1992) also suggested that anger is correlated with CWB, but on the other hand, self-awareness consists of aspects of guilt that can reduce anger. As a result, although certain aspects such as anger may be positively related to CWB, other aspects such as self-consciousness may be negatively related to CWB (Chen & Spector, 1992; Tangney, Wagner, Hill-Barlow, Marschall & Gramzow, 1996).

In particular, employees with low levels of conscientiousness or high levels of neuroticism are more likely to engage in CWB because the tendency of these employees is to engage in CWB in response to even minor job stressors. However, this does not apply to employees who have good coping efforts. Employees who have coping efforts to deal with pressure from work have a high threshold so they only engage in CWB as a response if they experience very extreme work stress.

Based on the categorization table, more than 80% of subjects experienced work stress in the moderate category, which could possibly come from work pressure. Johan and Yusuf (2022) stated that work stress can arise as a result of the inability to meet job demands caused by a lack of ability, motivation and direction. Affective events theory is a theoretical mechanism regarding the influence of work stress on CWB. Increased individual stress can lead to negative emotional reactions such as anger, frustration and fatigue which can influence employee behavior which has the potential to cause CWB (Suroso et al, 2020). When employees feel that their workload is increasing and causing stress, there is potential for them to vent their stress on negative things.

In the neuroticism variable, there were 54.4% of research subjects in the high category. Neuroticism in several previous findings is known to have a role in moderating work stress and CWB (Bowling and Eschleman, 2010; Mahdi et al, 2018; Chsunah, 2022). Individuals with neuroticism personality traits are not confident in their abilities to carry out their duties, this causes them to easily feel stressed and depressed in the work environment. Neuroticism is expected to have a role as a moderator of the influence of work stress on CWB, but even though neuroticism is in the high category, in this study neuroticism does not have a strong role in influencing individuals with work stress on CWB. The statement expressed by Bowling and Eschleman (2010) is that individuals may

not be involved in CWB because they have a good level of coping efforts in dealing with work stress so that individuals with high awareness or coping efforts will not be involved in CWB.

Conclusion

The conclusion that can be drawn from this research is that work stress experienced by employees can influence their counterproductive behavior or CWB. The higher the perceived work stress, the greater the tendency for CWB. In addition, neuroticism as a moderator variable has not been proven to moderate work stress and CWB. The interaction between job stress and neuroticism shows that neuroticism does not have a role in the influence of job stress on CWB.

Suggestion

In the discussion of this research, it is stated that how personality moderates work stress on CWB may be influenced by coping strategies. Researchers suggest that further research can consider coping strategy variables in order to get a better explanation of how stress and stress coping influence employee behavior.

References

- Akhtar, H., & Azwar, S. (2019). Indonesian Adaptation and Psychometric Properties Evaluation of the Big Five Personality Inventory: IPIP-BFM-50. *Jurnal Psikologi Vol.46 No.1*, 32-44.
- Akmal, J. (n.d.). *RMOL.ID*. Retrieved Agustus 30, 2022, from AMPR Provinsi Riau Laporkan 4 Dugaan Korupsi di Bapenda Pemkot Pekanbaru: <https://hukum.rmolid/read/2022/08/30/545584/ampr-provinsi-riau-laporkan-4-dugaan-korupsi-di-bapenda-pemkot-pekanbaru>
- Bowling, N. A., & Eschleman, K. J. (2010). Employee Personality as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Work Stressors and Counterproductive Work Behavior. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology Vol 15 No 1*, 91-103.
- Chen, P. Y., & Spector, P. E. (1992). Relationship of Work Stressors with Agression, Withdrawal, Theft, Substance Use: An Exploratory Study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 177-184.
- Christine, Y. (2014). *The Reality of Counterproductive Work Behaviors*. The University of Auckland.
- Chusnah, I. K. (2022). *Pengaruh Work Stressor terhadap Counterproductive Work Behavior dimoderasi Neuroticism*. Malang: Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang.
- Clercq, D. D., Haq, I. U., & Azeem, M. (2019). *Time-related work stress and counterproductive work behaviour: Invigorating roles of deviant personality trait*. Pakistan: Personnel Review.

- Edward. (2017). *An Examination of Predictors of Counterproductive Work Behaviors: Personality Traits and Transformational Leadership*. Washintong Sq: San Jose State University.
- Fox, S., & Spector, P. E. (2005). The Stressor-Emotion Model of Counterproductive Work Behavior. *American Psychological Association*, 151-174.
- Fox, S., Spector, P. E., & Miles, D. (2001). Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) in Response to Job Stressors and Organizational Justice: Some Mediator and Moderator Tests for Autonomy and Emotions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 59, 291-309.
- Hartati, T., Tommy, P., & Suyasa, Y. (2018). Pengujian Neuroticism Sebagai Moderator Pada Hubungan Antara Sensitivitas Atasan Dengan Perilaku Kerja Kontraproduktif Bawahan. *Jurnal Muara Ilmu Sosial Humaniora dan Seni Vol 2 No 2*, 606-617.
- Johan, P., & Yusuf, A. (2022). Counterproductive work behavior, job stress, trait emotional intelligence and person organization fit among employees of leasing industry in Indonesia. *Intangible Capital*, 18(2), 233-246.
- Karunia, A. M. (2020). KOMPAS.COM. Retrieved Juni 05, 2020, from Survei PPM Manajemen: 80 Persen Pekerja Mengalami gejala Stres Karena Khawatir Kesehatan: <https://money.kompas.com/read/2020/06/05/133207026/survei-ppm-manajemen-80-persen-pekerja-mengalami-gejala-stres-karena-khawatir>.
- Karunia, A. M., & Ika, A. (2022, Juli 21). 35 Persen ASN di RI Kinerjanya Rendah, BKN: Seperti "Kayu Mati" karena Malas. Retrieved from Kompas: https://money.kompas.com/read/2022/07/21/142000926/35-persen-asn-di-ri-kinerjanya-rendah-bkn--seperti-kayu-mati-karena-malas#google_vignette
- Karuppuiya, S. (2017). *Work Values, Personality Traits and Career Success*. Universiti Sains Malaysia.
- Ma, L., & Li, W. (2019). The Relationship between Stress and Counterproductive Work Behavior: Attachment Orientation as a Moderate. *Open Journal of Social Science*, 413-423.
- Mahdi, S., Ibrahim, M., & Armia, S. (2018). The Role of Negative Emotions on the Relationship of Job Stress and Counterproductive Work Behavior (Research on Public Senior High School Teachers). *International Journal of Asian Social Science Vol 8 No 2*, 77-84.
- Ombudsman. (2022, Maret 10). *Ini Aduan Yang Paling Banyak Diterima Ombudsman Riau Hingga Maret*. Retrieved from Ombudsman RI: <https://ombudsman.go.id/perwakilan/news/r/pwkmedia--ini-aduan-yang-paling-banyak-diterima-ombudsman-riau-hingga-maret-2022>
- Ombudsman. (2022, Desember 08). *Kepala Perwakilan Ombudsman RI Provinsi Riau Serah Terima Jabatan*. Retrieved from Ombudsman RI: <https://ombudsman.go.id/news/r/kepala-perwakilan-ombudsman-ri-provinsi-riau-serah-terima-jabatan>
- Ones, D. S., & Hough, L. M. (2001). The Structure, Measurement, Validity and Use of Personality Variables in Industrial, Work and Organizational Psychology. In D. O. N. Anderson, *Handbook of Industrial, Work and Organizational Psychology Vol.1*. London: SAGE.

- Ostendorf, F., & Angleitner, A. (1992). *On the generality and comprehensiveness of the five factor model of personality: Evidence for five robust factors in questionnaire data*. New York: Caprara GV, van Heck GL.
- Rizki, M. J. (2022, Juni 16). *Ini Modus-modus Korupsi Berkaitan dengan Sektor Jasa Keuangan*. Retrieved from <https://www.hukumonline.com/berita/a/ini-modus-modus-korupsi-berkaitan-dengan-sektor-jasa-keuangan-lt62aad3b105f79/>
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2017). *Organizational Behavior*. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.
- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(2), 555-572.
- Rustiarini, N. W. (2014). Sifat Kepribadian Sebagai Pemoderasi Hubungan Stres Kerja dan Perilaku Disfungsional Audit. *Jurnal Akuntansi dan Keuangan Indonesia Vol.11 No.1*, 1-19.
- Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the Workplace: The Roles of Distributive, Procedural, and Interactional Justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology Vol 82 No 3*, 434-443.
- Sonnentag, S., & Frese, M. (2013). Stress in Organizations. *Handbook of Psychology, Second Edition, edited by Irving B. Weiner*, 560-592.
- Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2002). An emotion-centered model of voluntary work behavior, Some parallels between counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Resource Management Review 12*, 269-292.
- Spector, P. E., Fox, S., Penney, L. M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A., & Kessler, S. (2006). The dimensionality of counterproductivity: Are all counterproductive behaviors created equal? *Journal of Vocational Behavior 68*, 446-460.
- Sprung, J. M., & Jex, S. M. (2011). *Work Locus of Control as a Moderator of the relationship between Work Stressors and Counterproductive Work Behavior*. Ohio: Bowling Green State University.
- Suroso, A., Timea, G., & Ade, A. I. (2020). Work Stress and Counterproductive Work Behaviour. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change Vol 14 Issue 12*, 1334-1346.
- Tangney, J. P., Wagner, P. E., Hill-Barlow, D., Marschall, D. E., & Gramzow, R. (1996). Relation of Shame and Guilt to Constructive Versus Destructive Responses to Anger Across the Lifespan. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology Vol 70 No 4*, 797-809.
- Yoseanto, B. L. (2017). Gambaran Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) PT X (Perusahaan Konstruksi di Jakarta). *Jurnal Muara Ilmu Sosial, Humaniora, dan Seni Vol.1 No. 2*, 456-464.