

# **Predicting Counterproductive Work Behaviors: Examining the Role of Spiritual Intelligence and Personality Traits in Public and Private Sector Organizations**

**Neha Jain**  
**The NorthCap University**

**Anushri Rawat**  
**Eastern Michigan University**

*Counterproductive work behaviors are intentional and harmful behaviors directed either towards the organization or towards its people. This study attempts to examine the role of two antecedent variables, spiritual intelligence (SQ), and personality based on the Big Five Personality dimensions (extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness) in predicting the occurrence of counterproductive work behaviors. Two dimensions of counterproductive work behaviors: rating and self-indulgence were used in this study based on the tool developed by Jain & Singh (2020). A sample of 351 employees working in both public (170) and private (181) sector organizations in India was taken for the purpose of the study. Mean, correlational analysis and multiple hierarchical regressions were carried out to test the hypotheses. Significant results were found for both personality and spiritual intelligence (SQ) in predicting counterproductive work behaviors across both public and private sector organizations. The two antecedent variables significantly improved the model's predictive power, for both public and private sector organizations, though to a lesser extent in the private sector. No difference was found based on gender.*

*Keywords: Counterproductive Work Behaviours (CWB), Spiritual Intelligence (SQ), personality*

## **INTRODUCTION**

Counterproductive work behaviours refer to voluntary actions by employees that harm organizations, clients, coworkers, or supervisors. Examples of CWB include tardiness, absenteeism, bullying, harassment, overworking, cyber loafing, breakdowns in communication, and theft. Counterproductive work behaviors can take many forms, and its impact on organizations can be significant. There are several causes and factors leading to counterproductive work behaviors. These factors can be classified into three categories: individual, organizational, and environmental. Individual factors include personality traits, psychological ownership, job satisfaction and other individual differences such as levels of intelligence quotient (IQ), emotional intelligence (EQ) and spiritual intelligence SQ etc. Organizational factors include leadership, rigid rules and procedures, and lack of training etc and environmental factors include stressful work environments and lack of psychological safety (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997). Understanding these factors can help organizations identify and address the root causes of counterproductive work behaviors and develop

strategies to prevent it. The consequences and impact of counterproductive work behaviors can be significant for both individuals and organizations. Counterproductive work behaviors can result in financial, personal, and organizational costs. Victims of counterproductive work behaviors may experience a depletion in work resources, such as unfair resource allocation and lack of support from colleagues and supervisors. Counterproductive work behaviors can also undermine the goals and objectives of an organization, leading to decreased productivity, increased turnover, and decreased profits. By understanding the causes of counterproductive work behaviors, organizations can take steps to mitigate the negative effects of this behaviour and promote a healthier and more productive work environment.

This study aims to explore the role played by two individual level variables, spiritual intelligence (SQ) and personality in increasing or decreasing the propensity of an employee in indulging in various counterproductive work behaviours. Can we predict the occurrence of these behaviours on the basis of the levels of SQ a person has and the prominent personality traits of an employee? can workplace spirituality as a construct help reduce deviant behavior in the workplace, leading to greater stability and even improvements in employee performance? (Astuti & Maryati, 2020). The next section will explore these constructs in further detail.

### **Spiritual Intelligence**

Throughout history, the notion of intelligence has evolved, starting with its initial conception as General Mental Ability (GMA) and later expanding to include social intelligence, cultural intelligence, business intelligence, emotional intelligence, and spiritual intelligence. Spiritual intelligence (SQ), specifically addresses the challenges of finding meaning and value in life, offering a broader and more profound context for our actions.

The inherent spirituality of human beings is widely accepted due to their innate inclination to question their very existence. This spiritual intelligence imbues their actions with a profound sense of purpose. Comprised of two essential components, spiritual intelligence plays a pivotal role in our personal growth (Zohar & Marshall, 2000). The first component, known as the vertical component, encompasses all that is sacred, divine, or ultimate, igniting a deep longing within us to be guided by these higher forces. The second component, referred to as the horizontal component, involves acts of service and benevolence towards our fellow beings. Spiritual intelligence equips individuals with the ability to approach all situations with compassion and wisdom, irrespective of the circumstances. It empowers us to question the circumstances we find ourselves in and to acknowledge the actions and mistakes that have led us there. This intelligence not only enables us to recognize existing values but also facilitates the creative discovery of new values. The indications of a highly developed spiritual intelligence are as follows :(a) An individual's capacity to be flexible (actively and spontaneously adaptive); (b) A high degree of self-awareness; (c) Capacity to face suffering; (d) Capacity to face and transcend pain; (e) The quality of being inspired by vision and values; (f) Reluctance to cause unnecessary harm; (g) Tendency to see the connections between diverse things (being holistic); (h) A marked tendency to ask "why? Or what if?" questions and to seek "fundamental" answers; and (i) Being "field independent"- possessing a facility for working against convention (Zohar & Marshall, 2000).

Wigglesworth (2004) categorized all skills into four main categories. Each skill within these categories is assigned a proficiency level ranging from 1 to 5, allowing for progression from level 1 to level 5. Even after reaching level 5, there is still room for further growth and development. The first category is Self-Awareness of Higher Self/Ego, which includes awareness of personal worldview, understanding life's purpose/mission, recognition of values hierarchy, complexity of inner thoughts, and awareness of the ego self/higher self. The second category is Universal Awareness, which involves understanding the interconnections of all life, awareness of different worldviews, broad perception of time, recognition of limitations, familiarity with spiritual laws, and experience of transcendental oneness. The third category is Higher self/ Ego self-mastery. This encompasses commitment to spiritual growth, keeping higher self in charge, living your purpose and values, sustaining your faith and seeking guidance from spirit. The fourth category is Social Mastery/Spiritual Presence which includes being a wise and effective spiritual

teacher/mentor, a wise and effective change agent, makes compassionate and wise decisions, a calming, healing presence and being aligned with the ebb and flow of life.

An individual high on spiritual intelligence tends to be more creative in various aspects and spans of his life. Spiritual intelligence further helps an individual to deal with various challenges in life. Often spiritual intelligence and religion are understood as being the same, but a person high on spiritual intelligence may or may not be religious rather he would practice any religion without narrowness and prejudice.

Spiritual intelligence is also a tool that assists us in our interpersonal relationships and in our day-to-day life. It helps us to fill the gap between “us” and the “other”. It enables us to eventually realize our full potential by overcoming our ego and realizing the potentialities that are hidden within us. An example which is often given to explain this is by physicist Michio Kaku (1994) in his book “Hyperspace” where he gives an instance of a family of goldfish. One of the goldfish takes a giant leap that raises the fish above the level of the water in the bowl. This fish exclaims with excitement as it realizes the world outside the bowl. It now knows that there exists something else except water and the fish recontextualizes and transforms its view of reality. These kinds of experiences happen with humans and spiritual intelligence recontextualizes and transforms them. These perceptual experiences alter the meaning and existential substance in the lives of human being.

At the workplace, spiritual intelligence has immense relevance. It gives rise to the ability in an individual to remain calm and focused when faced with a problem. In a more direct role spiritual intelligence gives rise to personal security that helps in increasing personal effectiveness of an employee. It helps an individual to realize his/her full potential in the form of hidden talents, character traits, personal qualities etc. and this realization gives rise to a conscious thought of developing these talents which in turn leads to a stable sense of personal security. Further this sense of personal security helps in reducing the levels of stress, as one has confidence in one’s own abilities. Individuals with developed spiritual intelligence have this innate and intrinsic sense of stability. At another level spiritual intelligence helps the employees in building relationships and understanding interpersonal interactions. We postulate that an individual high on spiritual intelligence would be in touch with his wholeness, would trust his own abilities and potentialities, would be stable in his actions and emotions and thus would be less likely to engage in counterproductive work behavior. It is hypothesized that SQ will be negatively correlated with counterproductive work behaviors.

## **Personality**

The second variable that we examine in this study is the role of personality in influencing counterproductive work behaviors. Personality as a construct refers to “dynamic organization inside the person of psychophysical systems that create the person’s characteristic patterns of behavior, thoughts and feelings” (Allport, 1937). One of the popular measures of personality in recent years is the Big Five Inventory (Costa & McCrae, 1992) which measures five personality traits i.e. extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness. We believe that certain kind of personalities may be more prone to indulging in negative behaviors. Gatewood and Field (1998) examined honesty/ integrity tests in personnel selection. These tests generally include dimensions of conscientiousness as it is considered to be the best predictor of personality. Barrick and Mount (1991) found a validity coefficient of  $r = .23$  between conscientiousness and job proficiency. Later personality testing started including other four dimensions of agreeableness, neuroticisms, extraversion and emotional stability under the name of “Big Five personality factors”. Research so far has delineated five mechanisms by which personality can influence counterproductive work behavior.

First and foremost, personality can affect counterproductive work behavior by being the direct determinant of counterproductive work behaviors. This refers to the biological reasons that are innate to an individual and can later trigger counterproductive work behaviors. The most important trait found to be linked to counterproductive work behaviors is extraversion and impulsivity. Impulsivity has been found to be a predictor of alcohol, marijuana, cigarette and psychedelic drug use (Watson & Clark, 1993), juvenile

delinquency (Robins, John, Caspi, Moffitt & Stouthamer-Loeber, 1996) verbal slurs and coercive actions (Baumeister, Heatherton, & Tice, 1994).

A second mechanism by which personality can influence counterproductive work behaviors is via attitudes. Personality traits indirectly affect counterproductive work behaviors by influencing our attitudes towards those behaviors. According to the theory of reasoned action (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975; Ajzen, 2001) our attitudes towards a behavior are the product of two things. First, is our belief about the consequences of engaging in a given behavior, and second is our evaluation of the desirability of the consequences of that behavior. These two elements are multiplied to obtain an individual's overall attitude towards a behavior. Behavioral intentions are the best predictor of an individual's behavior. Accordingly, putting theory into action, a given counterproductive work behavior is more likely to be performed, all other things being equal, if a person believes that the behavior is widespread. Personality traits also influence the motivation to comply with workplace norms, which further influences, the behavioral intention equation. Two personality traits found to influence subjective behavioral norms are the elements of dutifulness in the dimension of conscientiousness and the element of compliance in the dimension of agreeableness. Thus, holding attitude towards coming late for work being constant, low levels of compliance and dutifulness will increase the likelihood of an individual engaging in this counterproductive work behavior.

The third mechanism by which personality can lead to counterproductive work behaviors is as being a determinant of moods. It has been found that increased positive emotionality is positively related to positive moods at work and these positive moods are related to number of helping behaviors classified as organizational citizenship behaviors (George, 1991). Positive moods on the other hand have been found to be linked to helping behaviors as these moods facilitate perceiving people in a positive frame of mind and this in turn leads to mutual attraction between the individuals (George & Brief, 1992). People falling on the other end of the spectrum i.e. who are low on positive emotionality are more prone to indulge in counterproductive work behaviors. These individuals experience traits of sluggishness and drowsiness, which in turn leads to absenteeism, high turnover rates, production deviance etc. People high on negative emotionality experience sadness, anger and contempt. These states have been found to be linked with aggressive and passive counterproductive work behaviors.

The fourth mechanism by which personality can lead to counterproductive work behavior is as a moderator of perceptions of organizational events and those perceptions leading to counterproductive work behaviors. Individual personality differences lead to different perceptions of the same events. Unjust organizational events may be perceived as being just by few. These perceptions of injustice are related to theft (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997), retaliatory behavior (Skarlicki, Folger & Tesluk, 1999) withdrawal and other counterproductive work behaviors.

Lastly, personality acts as a moderator of cognitive and emotional reactions to perceived environmental events. Individuals with high impulsivity, low extraversion and low conscientiousness are more likely to engage in counterproductive work behavior. The personality trait of neuroticism gives a vulnerability that predisposes an individual to react negatively towards stress (Spielberger, Gorsuch & Lushene, 1970). Individuals high on negative affect may respond to stressful work situations by indulging in retaliatory work behaviors and reducing effort on work related tasks. Skarlicki et al., (1999) found that individuals low in agreeableness and high on negative affect had the strongest relationship between perceptions of injustice and retaliatory behavior by employees. Strutton and Lumpkin (1992) found that pessimists react to work stress by increasing the number of non-work-related activities such as sleeping, chatting, eating and drinking. Individuals high on neuroticism react to stress by withdrawing from the situation. Individuals high on extraversion react to stress by having a problem-based coping (Vollrath, Banholzer, Caviezel, Fischli & Jungo, 1994) and individuals high on conscientiousness react to stress by actively planning to it. We hypothesize that the five personality traits i.e. extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness, will exhibit differing tendencies to engage in counterproductive work behaviors.

## METHOD

### Sample

The sample consisted of 351 employees from organizations in Delhi and National Capital region (NCR) in India. Two private sector organizations (n = 181), one from telecom sector and one from finance sector, and 2 public sector (n = 170) organizations, one from telecom sector and one from finance sector, were included. Informed consent was taken from each respondent. For the final analyses, we combined both private sector and public sector organizations (telecom and finance) as the initial analysis indicated that there were no differences.

### Procedure

The respondents were contacted by the researchers at their workplaces. After explaining briefly the purpose of the study, participants' informed consent was taken. Participants were provided with the survey questionnaire, and respondents took approximately 30 minutes to complete it.

### Measures

#### *Spiritual Intelligence (SQ)*

Spiritual intelligence was measured using the Spiritual Intelligence Questionnaire developed by Singh and Jain (2009). Out of 34 statements in the questionnaire, 18 were taken for this study. The responses were measured on a five-point Likert scale where 1 stood for "strongly disagree" and 5 stood for "strongly agree". Cronbach alpha for the scale was found to be .79. Some of the sample questions include, "Every suffering teaches me something positive about life" and "Flexibility is one of the virtues of a good human being."

#### *Personality*

Personality was measured using the Big Five Inventory (BFI) developed by John and Srivastava (1999). The inventory consists of 44 statements measuring five dimensions of personality i.e. extraversion (Cronbach alpha .56; 8 statements), agreeableness (Cronbach alpha .49; 9 statements), conscientiousness (Cronbach alpha .65; 9 statements), neuroticism (Cronbach alpha .58; 8 statements) and openness (Cronbach alpha .64; 10 statements). The responses were taken on a 5 point Likert scale where 1 stood for "strongly disagree" and 5 stood for "strongly agree". Some of the sample questions include, "I am someone who is talkative" and "I am someone who is reserved".

#### *Counterproductive Work Behavior*

Counterproductive work behavior was measured using the survey developed by Jain & Singh (2009). The first dimension signifies the extent to which one thinks a particular behavior is counterproductive (Rating of counterproductive work behavior) and the second dimension gauged the likelihood of the respondent to indulge in that behavior (Self). Cronbach alpha for the first dimension is .92 and for the second dimension is .93. The responses for both the questions were taken on a four-point rating scale where 1 stood for "great extent", 2 stood for "less", 3 stood for "lesser", and 4 stood for "not at all". One sample question is as follows: "Rohan, a senior manager, promised a promotion and a pay hike to a junior employee in order to retain him. When the time came, he denied having made any such promise." Respondents were asked to rate the following questions: "To what extent do you think this behavior is counterproductive?" and "What is the likelihood that you would indulge in similar behavior if you were in a similar situation?"

## RESULTS

To test the predictability of occurrence of counterproductive work behaviors correlational analysis, mean, and hierarchical regressions were done. In the next section these results are presented.

**Mean**

Table 1 presents the means of all the variables for both public and private sector organizations. It also shows the t value. The obtained results show significant t values for personality dimension of extraversion and conscientiousness. This indicates that there is significant difference between the means of two sectors on only these two variables.

**TABLE 1  
MEANS RATINGS AND T VALUES FOR THE VARIABLES FOR BOTH SECTORS**

| <b>Variables</b> | <b>Public</b> | <b>Private</b> | <b>t</b> |
|------------------|---------------|----------------|----------|
| SQ               | 3.87          | 3.93           | -1.058   |
| Ext              | 3.13          | 3.03           | -1.905*  |
| Agree            | 3.33          | 3.53           | -1.094   |
| Con              | 3.32          | 3.28           | -2.155*  |
| Neu              | 3.13          | 2.80           | 0.513    |
| Open             | 3.44          | 3.35           | -0.559   |
| CWB(R)           | 2.12          | 1.54           | 1.778    |
| CWB(S)           | 2.65          | 2.29           | -0.580   |

\*p <.05. \*\*p <.01

SQ = Spiritual intelligence, Ext = Extraversion, Agree = Agreeableness, Con= Conscientiousness, Neu = Neuroticism, Open = Openness, CWB(R)= Counterproductive work behavior (Rating), CWB(S)= Counterproductive work behavior (Self).

**Correlational Analysis**

Table 2 shows the correlations between all the variables and counterproductive work behaviors for public sector organizations. The results show significant and negative correlations between the rating of counterproductive work behavior and SQ (-.329\*\*), and the personality dimension of openness (-.334\*\*). Similarly, the self dimension of counterproductive work behavior was found to be positively and significantly correlated to personality dimensions of agreeableness (.336\*\*), and conscientiousness (.313\*\*). Correlations between personality dimensions of extraversion, neuroticism and both the dimensions of counterproductive work behavior were not significant.

Table 3 shows the correlations between both the dimensions of counterproductive work behavior and all the variables for private sector organizations. Significant negative correlations were found between the rating of counterproductive work behavior and spiritual intelligence (-.299) and the personality dimension of agreeableness (-.147\*).

**TABLE 2  
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOR (CWB) AND OTHER VARIABLES FOR PUBLIC SECTOR ORGANIZATIONS**

| <b>Variables</b>     | <b>CWB(R)</b> | <b>CWB(S)</b> |
|----------------------|---------------|---------------|
| 1. SQ                | -.329**       | .017          |
| 2. Extraversion      | -.089         | .136          |
| 3. Agreeableness     | -.061         | .336**        |
| 4. Conscientiousness | -.038         | .313**        |
| 5. Neuroticism       | -.064         | -.048         |
| 6. Openness          | -.334**       | .054          |

\*p <.05. \*\*p <.01

**TABLE 3**  
**CORRELATIONS BETWEEN COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOR (CWB) AND OTHER VARIABLES FOR PRIVATE SECTOR ORGANIZATIONS**

| Variables            | CWB(R)  | CWB(S) |
|----------------------|---------|--------|
| 1. SQ                | -.299** | .122   |
| 2. Extraversion      | -.070   | -.003  |
| 3. Agreeableness     | -.147*  | .352** |
| 4. Conscientiousness | .004    | .387** |
| 5. Neuroticism       | .085    | -.030  |
| 6. Openness          | -.042   | .347** |

\*p <.05. \*\*p <.01

On the self dimension of counterproductive work behavior, significant positive correlation was found on personality dimensions of agreeableness (.352\*\*), conscientiousness (.387\*\*) and openness (.347\*\*).

#### Regression Analysis

Hierarchical regression was carried out in order to see the predictors of both dimensions of counterproductive work behavior. Table 4, 5, 6 and 7 show the results. Variables in the analysis are entered in two steps. In step 1, gender was entered as a control variable. In step 2, the antecedent variables i.e. spiritual intelligence (SQ) and the five personality variables were entered. Table 4 shows the predictors of the rating dimension of counterproductive work behavior. The obtained results show the value of R<sup>2</sup> to be .000 showing no role of gender. The overall prediction increased to 66.8% when the antecedent variables were entered.

**TABLE 4**  
**COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOR (RATING) REGRESSED ON PREDICTOR VARIABLES FOR PUBLIC SECTOR ORGANIZATIONS**

| Variables              | Model 1 | Model 2 |
|------------------------|---------|---------|
| Gender                 | .008    | -.101   |
| Spiritual Intelligence |         | -.303   |
| Extraversion           |         | .267    |
| Agreeableness          |         | -.373   |
| Conscientiousness      |         | .044    |
| Neuroticism            |         | .444*   |
| Openness               | -.101   |         |
| R                      | .008    | .818    |
| R <sup>2</sup>         | .009    | .668    |

p <.05. \*\*p <.01

Table 5 shows the predictors for the rating dimension of counterproductive work behavior for private sector organizations. The results show significant role of the personality dimensions of agreeableness and conscientiousness. The overall prediction of the rating dimension of counterproductive work behavior increased from 7% to 27%.

Table 6 shows the predictors for the self dimension of counterproductive work behavior for public sector organizations. The results show no role of the control variable of gender, and the results show 27.9% prediction from antecedent variables to 34.7% on entering the context variables. Table 7 shows the predictors for the self dimension of counterproductive work behavior for private sector organizations. The

results show significant role of agreeableness and conscientiousness. The overall prediction raised from 2% to 23.6%.

**TABLE 5**  
**COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOR (RATING) REGRESSED ON PREDICTOR**  
**VARIABLES FOR PRIVATE SECTOR ORGANIZATIONS**

| Variables              | Model 1 | Model 2 |
|------------------------|---------|---------|
| Gender                 | -.086   | -.097   |
| Spiritual Intelligence |         | -.330** |
| Extraversion           |         | .002    |
| Agreeableness          |         | -.076   |
| Conscientiousness      |         | .197*   |
| Neuroticism            |         | .048    |
| Openness               | -.055   |         |
| R                      | .281    | .465    |
| R <sup>2</sup>         | .079    | .217    |

p <.05. \*\*p <.01

**TABLE 6**  
**COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOR (SELF) REGRESSED ON PREDICTOR**  
**VARIABLES FOR PUBLIC SECTOR ORGANIZATIONS**

| Variables              | Model 1 | Model 2 |
|------------------------|---------|---------|
| Gender                 | -.009   | .019    |
| Spiritual Intelligence |         | -.476   |
| Extraversion           |         | -.320   |
| Agreeableness          | 0.594   |         |
| Conscientiousness      |         | .125    |
| Neuroticism            |         | -.124   |
| Openness               |         | .233    |
| R                      | .009    | .528    |
| R <sup>2</sup>         | .000    | .279    |

\*p <.05. \*\*p <.01

**TABLE 7**  
**COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOR (SELF) REGRESSED ON PREDICTOR**  
**VARIABLES FOR PRIVATE SECTOR ORGANIZATIONS**

| Variables              | Model 1 | Model 2 |
|------------------------|---------|---------|
| Gender                 | -.099   | -.090   |
| Spiritual Intelligence |         | -.114   |
| Extraversion           |         | -.064   |
| Agreeableness          |         | .220*   |
| Conscientiousness      |         | .270**  |
| Neuroticism            | .000    |         |
| Openness               |         | .133    |
| R                      | .145    | .451    |
| R <sup>2</sup>         | .021    | .203    |

\*p <.05. \*\*p <.01



## DISCUSSION

The main objective of the study was to predict the propensity of an employee to indulge in counterproductive work behaviors. In the present study, this was done by examining the role of two antecedent variables, spiritual intelligence (SQ) and personality. The first hypothesis proposed a negative correlation between SQ and counterproductive work behavior. As predicted, the results in both public and private sectors show a significant negative correlation between spiritual intelligence and counterproductive work behaviors. This is in line with our hypothesis and suggests that respondents high on SQ are less likely to engage in counterproductive work behaviors. Zohar and Marshall (2000) argued that spiritual intelligence is extremely applicable at the work place. It gives emotional stability and an inner faith in one's own capabilities. Individuals high on this variable would think about the consequences before indulging in any negative behavior. The self dimension of counterproductive work behavior was not found to be significantly related to spiritual intelligence for both public and private sector organizations. A plausible explanation is that this outcome may be influenced by the cultural norms prevalent in Indian organizations, where certain negative behaviors are so widely accepted that they are no longer viewed as counterproductive. As a result, even individuals with high spiritual intelligence may engage in negative behaviors due to group norms. Future research is needed to explore these potential explanations further, particularly in the context of public sector organizations.

The second hypothesis proposed that big five personality dimensions would relate differently with counterproductive work behavior. In private sector organizations, negative correlation was found between the personality dimension of agreeableness and the rating of counterproductive work behavior. Agreeableness refers to personality trait that includes attributes such as kindness, affection, altruism and prosocial behavior. Results suggest that employees high on the trait of agreeableness would be low on counterproductive work behavior and vice versa. This finding is consistent with previous research. Agreeableness has been found to be associated with aggression (Costa, McCrae, & Dombroski, 1989). The opposite pole of agreeableness is antagonism. Therefore, individual's low on agreeableness tend to be hostile and aggressive in nature (Costa et al, 1989). On the second dimension of counterproductive work behavior, counterproductive self, significant positive correlation was found between agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness. Conscientiousness refers to an individual's tendency to be hard working, orderliness, conformity and self control (Hogan & Ones, 1997). On the other hand, openness refers to an individual's tendency to appreciate art, be innovative and creative and to be open to experiences. Results suggest that individuals high on the dimension of agreeableness, conscientiousness and openness were high on counterproductive work behavior. Research in the field suggests that the dimensions of conscientiousness, emotional stability and agreeableness are the strongest predictors of counterproductive work behavior (Cullen & Sacket, 2003; Ones, Viswesvaran & Schmidt, 2003). Salgado (2002) conducted a meta-analysis of the Big Five personality dimensions and counterproductive work behavior. Results suggested that conscientiousness best predicted a composite measure of deviant behavior such as theft, property deviance and abuse. In public sector organizations, results show a significant negative correlation between the personality dimension of openness and the rating of counterproductive work behavior. Thus, individuals high on this dimension would be low on counterproductive work behavior. On the counterproductive work behavior self-dimension, agreeableness and conscientiousness were found to be positively and significantly correlated to counterproductive work behavior. Research suggests that conscientiousness predicts overall performance, supervisor's willingness to retire and employee absenteeism (Fallon, Avis, Kudisch, Gornet & Frost, 2000). Conscientiousness is related to both positive and negative workplace behaviors. The self-control dimension of conscientiousness is most strongly related to counterproductive work behavior. In the present study, a positive correlation between these two dimensions and counterproductive work behavior was obtained unlike the negative correlations found in past research. Here in our research the obtained results are non-intuitive which could be due to some degree of measurement error. This is an inherent part of the measurement process. These findings also suggest that there are other factors which play a role in the occurrence of counterproductive work behavior. These factors could be both personal and organizational. At personal level, peer pressure, demographic variables, and

individual perceptions all play an important role. At the organizational level, various contextual factors need to be examined in future research.

The study also examined the predictors of counterproductive work behaviors, SQ and personality, across public and private sector organizations. Hierarchical regression analysis showed an interesting pattern of results. For the rating dimension of counterproductive work behavior, the results suggest an increase in prediction from 0% in step one when only gender as a control variable is entered to 66.9% in step 2 when both spiritual intelligence and personality variables are entered for public sector organizations. For private sector organizations, the results suggest significant beta values for SQ. In this case, the prediction value raised from 7% to 27.2%. For the self-dimension of counterproductive work behavior in public sector, gender was found to play no role in predicting counterproductive work behaviors. The prediction increased from 0% in step 1 to 34.7% in step 2. Significant beta values were obtained for SQ, personality dimensions of agreeableness and conscientiousness for the self-dimension of counterproductive work behavior in private sector organizations. Prediction value in step 1 was 21% and it decreased to 20% in step 2.

The results of the study suggest an interesting relation among the variables included. In public sector organizations, for the rating dimension of counterproductive work behaviors, the inclusion of spiritual intelligence and personality traits significantly improves the model's ability to predict counterproductive work behaviors. This suggests that these variables are strong predictors of counterproductive work behaviors in the public sector. On the self-dimension of counterproductive work behaviors, the results indicate that spiritual intelligence and personality traits are important predictors of self-reported counterproductive work behaviors in the public sector, with gender having no predictive power.

In private sector organizations, the results on the rating dimension of counterproductive work behavior show that gender has some predictive power, but the addition of spiritual intelligence and personality traits notably improves the prediction of counterproductive work behavior in the private sector. On the self-dimension of counterproductive work behavior, although the prediction value slightly decreases, the significant beta values for spiritual intelligence and personality traits suggests these are important factors. The reduction in  $R^2$  might indicate multicollinearity or other complexities in the data. The addition of spiritual intelligence and personality traits significantly improves the model's predictive power, for both public and private sector organizations, though to a lesser extent in the private sector. Despite a slight decrease in the explained variance, significant predictors include SQ and personality traits, suggesting these are key factors in understanding counterproductive work behaviors.

The results show differences across public sector organizations and the two dimensions of counterproductive behaviors included in the study. An attempt has been made to provide some explanations for these differences. Overall, the study highlights the critical role of spiritual intelligence and personality traits in predicting counterproductive work behaviors across both public and private sectors, with variations in the magnitude of their impact. Gender, on its own, does not appear to be a significant predictor, especially in the public sector.

## REFERENCES

- Ajzen, I. (2001). Nature and operation of attitudes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 27–58.
- Allport, G.W. (1937). *Personality: A psychological interpretation*. Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Astuti, R.J., & Maryati, T. (2020). The effect of workplace spirituality on workplace deviant behaviour and employee performance: The role of job satisfaction. *Journal of Asian Finance Economics and Business*, 7(12), 1017–1026.
- Barrick, M.R., & Mount, M.K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 1–26.
- Baumeister, R.F., Heatherton, T.F., & Tice, D.M. (1994). *Losing control: How and why people fail at self-regulation*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Costa, P.T., & McCrae, R.R. (1992). *NEO PI-R. Professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.

- Costa, P.T., Jr., McCrae, R.R., & Dembroski, T.M. (1989) Agreeableness versus antagonism: Explication of a potential risk factor for CHD. In A. Siegman, & T.M. Dembroski (Eds.), *In search of coronary-prone behavior: Beyond Type A* (pp. 41–63). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cullen, M.J., & Sackett, P.R. (2003). Integrity testing in the workplace. In J.C. Thomas (Ed.), *Comprehensive Handbook of Psychological Assessment* (Volume II/O Assessment). New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Fallon, J.D., Avis, J.M., Kudisch, J.D., Gornet, T.P., & Frost, A. (2000). Conscientiousness as a predictor of productive and counterproductive behaviors. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 15*, 339–349.
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Beliefs, attitude, intention and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*. Reading, MA: Addison- Wesley.
- Gatewood, R.D., & Field, H.S. (1998). *Human resource selection*. NY: Harcourt Brace College.
- George, J.M. (1991). State or trait: Effects of positive mood on prosocial behaviors at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*, 299–307.
- George, J.M., & Brief, A.P. (1992). Feeling good – doing good: A conceptual analysis of the mood at work-organizational spontaneity relationship. *Psychological Bulletin, 112*, 310–329.
- Hogan, J., & Ones, D.S. (1997). Conscientiousness and integrity at work. In R. Hogan, J.A. Johnson, & S.R. Briggs (Ed.), *Handbook of personality psychology*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press, Inc.
- Jain, N., & Singh, P. (2009). *Development of Spiritual Intelligence Questionnaire*. (Under publication).
- 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* (2nd ed., pp. 102–139). New York: Guilford Press.
- Kaku, M. (1994). *Hyperspace: A Scientific Odyssey Through Parallel Universes, Time Warps, and the Tenth Dimension*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ones, D.S., Viswesvaran, C., & Schmidt, F.L. (1993). Comprehensive meta-analysis of integrity test validities: Findings and implications for personnel selection and theories of job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 679–703.
- Robins, R.W., John, O.P., Caspi, A., Moffitt, T.E., & Stouthamer-Loeber, M. (1996). Resilient, overcontrolled, and under controlled boys: Three replicable personality types. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*, 157–171.
- Salgado, J.F. (2002). The big five personality dimensions and counterproductive behaviors. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 10*, 117–125.
- Skarlicki, D.P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*, 434–443.
- Skarlicki, D.P., Folger, R. & Tesluk, P. (1999). Personality as a moderator in the relationship between fairness and retaliation. *Academy of Management Journal, 42*, 100–108.
- Strutton, D., & Lumpkin, J. (1992). Relationship between optimism and coping strategies in the work environment. *Psychology Reports, 71*, 1179–1186.
- Vollrath, M., Banholzer, E., Caviezel, C., Fischli, C., & Jungo, D. (1994). Coping as a mediator or moderator of personality in mental health? In B. De Raad, W.K.B. Hofstee, & G.L.M. Van Heck, *Personality psychology in Europe* (Issue 5, pp. 262–273). Tilburg, The Netherlands: Tilburg University Press.
- Watson, D., & Clarke, L.A. (1993). Behavioural disinhibition versus constraints: A dispositional perspective. In Wegner, D.M., & Pennebaker, J.W. (Eds.), *Handbook of mental control* (pp. 506–527). Upper Saddle NJ: Prentice Hall River.
- Wigglesworth, C. (2004). *Spiritual Intelligence and why it matters?* Paper presented at International Spirit at Work Award Selection Committee, USA.
- Zohar, D., & Marshall, I. (2000). *SQ: Spiritual Intelligence, the Ultimate Intelligence*. Bloomsbury Paperbacks.