"HEXACO personality domains and deviant behavior in Nigerian public universities"

AUTHORS	Grace Obalade (iD)
	Adefemi A. Obalade (iD)
	Vuyokazi Mtembu (iD)

NUMBER OF REFERENCES	NUMBER OF FIGURES	NUMBER OF TABLES
60	0	4

Grace Obalade, Ph.D. in Human
Resource Management, School of
Management, IT and Governance,
College of Law and Management
Studies, University of Kwazulu-Natal,
South Africa.

Adefemi Obalade, Ph.D., Senior
Lecturer, Department of Finance,
Faculty of Economic and Management
Sciences, University of the Western
Cape, South Africa. (Corresponding
author)

Vuyokazi Mtembu, Ph.D., Senior
Lecturer, Graduate School of Business
and Leadership, College of Law and
Management Studies, University of
Kwazulu-Natal, South Africa.

Grace Obalade (South Africa), Adefemi Obalade (South Africa), Vuyokazi Mtembu (South Africa)

HEXACO PERSONALITY DOMAINS AND DEVIANT BEHAVIOR IN NIGERIAN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

Abstract

Workplace deviance is one of the significant problems in Nigerian public universities. This study aims to investigate the impact of HEXACO personality factors (honesty-humility, emotionality, and agreeableness (H-HEA)) on deviant workplace behavior in public universities in Southwestern Nigeria. The choice of the institutions (Ekiti State University, University of Lagos, and the Federal University of Akure) in the Southwestern region was based on purposive sampling. Simple random sampling was employed to select academic and non-academic staff. The study adopted a quantitative research design and employed Pearson correlation and multiple regression analysis to analyze and test the hypotheses. The findings revealed that the H-HEA domain of personality traits negatively correlates with organizational and interpersonal deviance. Secondly, H-HEA personality traits have a negative effect on organizational and interpersonal deviance. Overall, the results of the regression analyses suggest that the H-HEA HEXACO domains of personality traits individually reduces the organizational and interpersonal forms of deviance. Based on the findings, the human resource departments of these institutions can curb workplace deviance by giving preference to candidates or individuals with high scores in H-HAE personality traits. This will go a long way in curtailing the vices of workplace deviance in Southwestern Nigeria public universities.

Keywords	honesty-humility, emotionality, agreeableness, organizational deviance, interpersonal deviance, deviant behavior
JEL Classification	M12, M51, M54, D23

INTRODUCTION

Workplace deviance is one major problem present-day organizations face (Kalemci et al., 2019). It is referred to as dysfunctional behavior because it harms the organization in many ways. For instance, it may lead to failure to achieve organizational goals, inhibit fellow employees, and hamper productivity, procedures, and profitability (Chernyak-Hai et al., 2018). Due to the adverse effect of workplace deviance, the attention of both academics and practitioners has been drawn to its antecedents, as efforts at managing deviance may only be effective if the underlying cause is examined (Robbins & Judge, 2007).

Individual characteristics such as personality have a link with workplace deviance. For example, individual factors comprise personality traits, personal philosophy or values, individual differences, and attitudes (Rogojan, 2009). A critical predictor is personality traits, which have been found to report a higher criterion-related validity when matched with other predictors of workplace deviance (Berry et al., 2007). Larsen and Buss (2005, p. 4) define individual personality traits as "the set of psychological traits and mechanisms within the indi-

vidual that are organized and relatively enduring and that influence his or her interactions with and adaptations to the intrapsychic, physical, and social environments." Individual personality can predict their reactions toward co-workers and the organization, regardless of their experiences and perception of the organization.

Workplace deviance in public institutions has been described as a nationwide problem in Nigeria (Dike, 2017). Higher institutions in Nigeria are characterized by intentional and voluntary acts that violate organizational standards. "Cases of sexual harassment, embezzlement, forging of certificates, irregular attendance of classes/official duties, extortion, admission fraud, sex for the grade, impersonation, money for the grade, examination misconduct, distortion of records, admission fraud, among others, have been reported and established among employees in the Nigerian university system" (Obalade & Mtembu, 2023, p. 1). Thus, this study is a timely reaction to the call for urgent solutions to the menace of workplace deviance confronting public universities in Nigeria.

1. LITERATURE REVIEW

According to Soutter et al. (2020), factors such as the belief, attitude displayed, motivation, and values are measures of an individual personality. These personality measures can be used to describe an individual as being gentle, sincere, and talkative. Furthermore, Costa and McCrae (1995) suggest that personality influences individuals' feelings, thoughts, and behaviors, and these patterns are relative. Specifically, McCrae (2000) posits that due to the relative stability of these patterns, an individual's personality is considered consistent and predictable over time as they develop into adulthood. Understanding why individuals differ in these behavioral traits and the consequences of such differences has been a major concern for personality psychologists (Lee, 2012). The ability of a personality trait to influence human behavior across varying circumstances has made it a relevant topic across disciplines (Anglim & O'Connor, 2019).

After critical analyses, personality scholars have consented that the big five personality traits include most personality variances. This big five personality domain includes conscientiousness, agreeableness, neuroticism (sometimes referred to as emotional stability), openness to experience (sometimes referred to as intellect or imagination), and extraversion (Greenberg, 1993; Saucier, 1994; Pletzer et al., 2019). John et al. (2008) have linked the journey to the big five to Cattell's (1943) findings. The HEXACO model of personality traits suggests a sixth domain of personality traits as against the predominantly big five traits concep-

tually accepted by scholars. Based on the lexical approach, re-analyses of data have offered support for the six culturally replicable domains of personality (Saucier, 2009; Ashton et al., 2014; Schmitt et al., 2007). The HEXACO is an acronym for six personality traits: honesty-humility, emotionality, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience (Ashton et al., 2014).

Some similarities and differences exist between the big five and the HEXACO domains. The extraversion, openness to experience, and conscientiousness domains of the HEXACO are highly comparable to the big five domains (conscientiousness, agreeableness, neuroticism, openness to experience, and extraversion). On the other hand, the remaining three domains (honesty-humility, emotionality, and agreeableness) significantly differ from the big five domains of neuroticism and agreeableness (Ashton & Lee, 2008; Pletzer et al., 2019). More specifically, HEXACO emotionality and agreeableness are a rotated variant of big five neuroticism and agreeableness (Ashton et al., 2014). That is, some adjustment was made to some of the contents of these domains. For instance, the irritability and anger facets of neuroticism in the big five neuroticism have been included in the agreeableness domain of the HEXACO.

In contrast, the sentimentality facet of the big five agreeableness has been included in the emotionality domain of the HEXACO (Pletzer et al., 2019). Lastly, honesty-humility includes being fair and genuine in relating with others. This trait has been significantly linked with antisocial behavior, such as workplace deviance, because individuals

who are low in this trait engage in acts that could harm others and their society (Ashton & Lee, 2007, 2008; Pletzer et al., 2019).

Studies have continued to affirm that the HEXACO and the big five differ significantly (Miller et al., 2011; Hilbig et al., 2016). Specifically, Ashton and Lee (2019) note that "a large amount of non-big five HEXACO variance can be understood partly by considering that HEXACO agreeableness correlates only modestly with honesty-humility. The modest size of these correlations contrasts with what would be expected based on the suggestion that HEXACO agreeableness and honesty-humility are merely two markers of big five agreeableness" (p. 571). It has been affirmed that HEXACO is a better predictor of workplace deviance than its big five counterparts because of its honesty-humility scale (Lee et al., 2005; Pletzer et al., 2019). Cohen (2018) also affirm that the honesty-humility trait of the HEXACO is important in predicting workplace deviance while comparing the two models of personality traits as measures of moral character and their impact on predicting workplace deviance.

Studying the influence of personality traits among 290 employees of different organizations in Pakistan, Khan et al. (2019) reveal that agreeableness is negatively associated with workplace deviance. Abdullah and Marican (2016) examined the effect of the big five personality traits on workplace deviance among public sector employees in Malaysia by focusing on the big five personality traits. The findings revealed that surgency or extraversion and conscientiousness are positively and negatively associated with both interpersonal and organizational deviance, respectively. At the same time, openness to experience was negatively associated with organizational deviance only. Other personality traits (agreeableness and adjustment (emotional stability)) were found to be insignificant in predicting workplace deviance.

Lee et al. (2005) assert that the HEXACO model significantly outperformed its big five counterparts in predicting workplace deviance, following comparative analyses of the two domains in a 3-country sample, namely, Netherlands, Australia, and Canada. Ashton and Lee (2019) further assert that using the big five as an alternative to the

HEXACO scales will essentially result in a loss of information and can be equated to the same amount lost if one of the big five scales is discarded. Pletzer et al. (2019) affirmed these assertions in a comparative meta-analysis of the big five and the HEXACO personality in predicting workplace deviance. It was found that the variance of the HEXACO domain in workplace deviance is more than its counterpart in workplace deviance, with HEXACO having 31.97% relative to the big five (19.05%). The honesty-humility scale was a major predictor of deviance as much as all the other five combined.

Burtăverde et al. (2017) explored the link between personality and risky driving behavior and the comparison between the big five and the HEXACO personality traits using samples of 227 undergraduate students and 244 community respondents. The study concluded that the HEXACO model was a better predictor of aggressive driving and revealed that the honesty-humility traits of the HEXACO personality domain explained the risky driving behavior of the respondents, which is the tendency to express verbal aggression. Furthermore, Pletzer et al. (2019), in a meta-analysis of 749 articles, compared the validities of the big five and the HEXACO personality domains and revealed that both domains conceptually differ and that the latter better predicted workplace deviance. Specifically, honesty-humility had the strongest correlation with workplace deviance, followed by the conscientiousness domain of the big five and the HEXACO in predicting workplace deviance.

The neuroticism in the big five is characterized as emotionality with some slight differences, excluding the quick temper in the HEXACO domain. These duo domains, neuroticism (positive) and emotionality (negative), also strongly correlated with workplace deviance, though not as the honesty-humility domain. However, the openness to experience and extraversion domain of the HEXACO and the big five did not significantly contribute to predicting workplace deviance. Although 749 articles were used for the meta-analysis, at least one of the domains must have been included in the study, which means studies that considered the relationship between agreeableness and workplace deviance were included. Only a few studies used for the meta-analysis examined all the six-facet of the HEXACO domain.

Based on the literature review, the major differences between the HEXACO and the big five lie in the three traits, namely honesty-humility, agreeableness, and emotionality (H-HAE). As noted by Pletzer et al. (2019), the other three personality traits in the HEXACO are similar to the big five; therefore, they are expected to share similar relations in predicting workplace deviance. In the same vein, Hastings and O'Neil (2009) note that it is expedient that the items used in measuring personality are minimized to accomplish a comparable prediction, hence the need to focus on H-HAE. The few studies on the HEXACO domain and workplace deviance have consistently reported that these three traits (H-HAE) are significant in predicting workplace deviance (Pletzer et al., 2019; Lee et al., 2005). Due to scant research examining the HEXACO and workplace deviance, this study examines the effects of these three distinguishing HEXACO traits in this assumed relationship, considering the need for comparable prediction with extant literature in Nigeria. It is essential to understand these three HEXACO traits and how they relate to workplace deviance.

Individuals high in honesty-humility trait are not inclined to exploit other individuals even though there are no risks of negative consequences for such exploitation (Ashton & Lee, 2007). Sincerity, loyalty, generosity, altruism, honesty, faithfulness, helpfulness, and non-deceptiveness are characteristics of high honesty-humility individuals. In addition, those who score high on this trait tend to be fair, sincere, and modest, while those who score low tend to be pretentious and deceitful (Ashton & Lee, 2007, 2012).

As previously explained, the big five agreeableness differs significantly from the HEXACO. Studies have suggested that agreeableness and workplace deviance are negatively related (Costa & McCrae, 1992; Pletzer et al., 2019). This could be attributed to the characteristics of an agreeable person. For example, agreeable employees show more concern for the welfare of other employees, help others in completing their tasks, and are highly beneficial to the organization. These individuals have good interpersonal relationships with other employees (Witt et al., 2002). The implication is that employees who are disagreeable or low in agreeableness are more likely to engage in counterproductive work behavior, unlike those who are high (Barrick & Mount, 1991).

In organizations, agreeable individuals or employees display a forward-looking level of interpersonal ability and aptitude (Witt et al., 2002). As previously mentioned, this trait in the HEXACO differs significantly from that of the big five. Individuals who are high in this trait are anxious, fearful, and depend on others for emotional support. They have empathy for others and are sentimentally attached to others. Individuals who are low in this trait are not afraid of physical harm, worry less even in a stressful situation, and may have little need for emotional support from others (Ashton & Lee, 2007). There is an association between high levels of HEXACO emotionality, higher levels of big five neuroticism, and somewhat higher levels of big five agreeableness. This trait captures the sentimentality trait of the big five. This difference may influence its prediction of workplace deviance (Pletzer et al., 2019).

The literature review reveals that the HEXACO personality domain tends to offer a definitive explanation for workplace deviance; however, their relation needs to be examined, especially in Nigeria. For example, Ruwan et al. (2016) and Amin et al. (2018) examined the links between the big five personality traits and workplace deviance, focusing on a secondary school in the Northern region and universities in the North-West region of Nigeria, respectively. The continuous incidences of workplace deviance in the public university presents an opportunity to evaluate the effect of the HEXACO personality domain on workplace deviance in Nigerian public universities.

The study aims to examine the effect of personality traits on workplace deviance by testing the following hypotheses:

H1a: *Honesty-humility trait is negatively related to organizational deviance.*

H1b: *Honesty-humility trait is negatively related to interpersonal deviance.*

H2a: *Agreeableness trait is negatively related to organizational deviance.*

H2b: *Agreeableness trait is negatively related to interpersonal deviance.*

H3a: Emotionality trait is negatively related to organizational deviance.

H3b: Emotionality trait is negatively related to interpersonal deviance.

2. METHODS

This study employed a quantitative approach to achieve its objectives. Respondents were selected based on simple random sampling, giving an equal chance for all respondents to be selected. Employees (academic and non-academic staff) of three universities, namely Ekiti State University (EKSU), University of Lagos (UNILAG), and the Federal University of Akure (FUTA), were selected from the Southwestern region of Nigeria. These universities were purposively selected on the criteria that each of these universities must have been established for ten years or more. In addition, each of these universities must have had at least an incidence of workplace deviance reported among its employees on social media or in newspapers. The academic and non-academic staff were selected because they are the employees whose personality traits and involvement in workplace deviance are being examined. Table 1 shows the population characteristics.

Table 1. Population distribution

S/N	Universities	Non-academic	Academic	Total
1.	Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti	1500	555	2055
2.	University of Lagos, Akoka	2550	813	3363
3.	Federal University of Technology, Akure	1413	587	2000
	Total	5463	1955	**7,418**

To derive the sample size for the population, Taro model (Yamane, 1967) was employed:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N \cdot (e)^2}, \qquad (1)$$

where n – the sample size, N – total population for the study, e – the acceptable sampling error at (0.05).

The ratio scale analysis was used to delineate the sample, which yielded a sample size of 704 respondents comprising academic and non-academic staff. This sample size guarantees the required precision and confidence and represents the population.

Table 2. Distribution of sample size among the universities

S/N	Universities	Non-academic	Academic	Total
1.	Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti	144	53	197
2.	University of Lagos, Akoka	240	77	317
3.	Federal University of Technology, Akure	134	56	190
	Total	518	186	**704**

A structured close-ended questionnaire was used to collect quantitative data and was distributed to 704 employees of the selected universities, comprising both academic and the non-academic staff. Of the 704 respondents, only 572 (81%) provided usable data. Due to the COVID-19 travel restriction, three research assistants were employed for the questionnaire distribution; these research assistants were informed of the purpose of the data and well-oriented on the processes of collecting data. Data collection was done within six months.

The study adopted measures from the extant literature to collect information on the variables. Specifically, to measure workplace deviance, Bennett and Robinson's (2000) measures were used. The scale consists of two forms of deviance: organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance. These consist of twelve and seven items, respectively, with statements such as "discussed confidential company information with an unauthorized person" and "acted rudely toward someone at work." 4-point-Likert typing scale ranging from 4 (never) to 1 (every time) was used to ask how frequently respondents involve in these acts at work. Hartley (2014) argued that this scale aids interpretation. Also, it helps to avoid respondents sitting on the fence as questions relate to their daily work experience and behavior. The measures reported reliability scores of .81 and .78, respectively.

Ashton and Lee's (2009) HEXACO personality scale was used to measure personality traits, including honesty-humility, emotionality, and agreeableness. These three traits consist of ten

items each, with items like "I would not use flattery to get a raise or promotion at work, even if I thought it would succeed." "When it comes to physical danger, I am very fearful." "My attitude toward people who have mistreated me is to forgive and forget." The participants responded on their level of agreement with these statements on a 4point-Likert typing scale ranging from 4 (strongly disagree) to 1 (strongly agree). The scales have internal reliability ranging from .70 to .80.

In ensuring compliance with the ethical standard for carrying out research, a consent form was given to the participant to sign, indicating their consent to voluntarily participate in the survey. Furthermore, anonymity and confidentiality were guaranteed, and the purpose of collecting the data was clearly stated.

3. RESULTS

3.1. Descriptive statistics

Age group analysis shows that out of the 572 recovered questionnaires, 33, 62, 92, 134, and 251 individuals fall within the 21-25, 26-30, 31-35, 36-40, and 40-above age ranges, respectively. These figures suggest that studied university staff are most likely matured adults as 67.4% of the total respondents are above 35 years. The educational qualification distribution of the respondents revealed that 35, 74, 238,159, and 66 respondents hold school certificates, national diplomas, HND/B.Sc., master and Ph.D. qualifications, respectively. The majority of the non-teaching staff normally hold a first degree and below, while the teaching staff strives to attain the highest academic qualification; this suggests that non-teaching and academic staff are duly represented. In addition, 98, 138, 175, 74, and 87 worked for 5 years and below, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20,

and 20 years and above work experience, respectively. The descriptive analysis revealed that most respondents have 11 years and more experience in their workplace. Lastly, the frequency distribution revealed that male and female counterparts are almost equally represented, constituting 50.5 and 49.5, respectively.

3.2. Correlation analysis

Table 3 shows that the correlation between each of the three dimensions of personality traits, namely honesty-humility (–.234**), emotionality (–.114**), agreeableness (–.194**) viz-a-viz organizational deviance is negative and significant at 1% or 5% level of significance. Similarly, honesty-humility (–.213**), emotionality (–0.044), and agreeableness (–.241**) each demonstrate a negative correlation with interpersonal deviance, albeit with statistical insignificance of emotionality. The correlation results show that H-HAE personality traits negatively affect workplace deviance.

3.3. Regression results

The results of multiple linear regression are presented in Table 4. ANOVA index is used to predict the total fitness of the models. The index is associated with p-values that are less than 5%, suggesting the regression models are of good fit. In Table 4, the adjusted R^2 of 0.086 implies that the H-HAE personality traits explain an 8.6% variance in organizational workplace deviance. The standardized Beta value for each of the independent variables indicated: honesty-humility (β = –0.206, $p < 0.05$); emotionality (β = –0.138, $p < 0.05$); agreeableness (β = –0.131, $p < 0.05$). The results revealed that the H-HAE personality traits are negatively related to organizational deviance. Hence, H-HAE personality traits reduce organizational deviance.

Table 3. Pearson correlation: Personality traits and workplace deviance

	OD	ID	H_H	E	A
OD	1	.690**	–.234**	–.114**	–.194**
ID	.690**	1	–.213**	–0.044	–.241**
H_H	–.234**	–.213**	1	–0.056	.219**
E	–.114**	–0.044	–0.056	1	.115**
A	–.194**	–.241**	.219**	.115**	1

Note: OD – organizational deviance, ID – interpersonal deviance, H-H – honesty-humility, E – emotionality, A – agreeableness. ** – 5% level of significance.

Table 4. Regression model: Summary of effects of personality traits on workplace deviance

Variables	Coefficients	T–Statistics	P–value	R²	AdjR²	F	P–value
Dependent Variable: Organizational deviance							
Constant	34.376	12.901	<.0005				
Honesty-Humility	−.298	−4.735	<.05	0.091	0.086	17.080	<.0005
Emotionality	−.214	−3.224	<.05				
Agreeableness	−.169	−2.994	<.05				
Dependent Variable: Interpersonal deviance							
Constant	20.163	11.322	<.0005				
Honesty-Humility	−.161	−3.842	<.05	0.086	0.080	16.084	<.0005
Emotionality	−.058	−1.307	>.05				
Agreeableness	−.170	−4.488	<.05				

Furthermore, H-HAE explains an 8.0% variance in interpersonal workplace deviance. The standardized Beta value for each of the independent variables indicated: honest-humility ($\beta = −.167$, $p < 0.05$); emotionality ($\beta = −.056$, $p > 0.05$); agreeableness ($\beta = −.196$, $p < 0.05$). Similarly, the H-HAE personality traits are negatively related to interpersonal deviance, although the negative effect of emotionality is not statistically significant. Overall, the results of the regression analyses suggest that H-HAE personality traits individually have reducing effects on the organizational and interpersonal forms of deviance. The negative effect of each personality trait on organizational and interpersonal workplace deviance, as found in the regression results, corresponds to the negative Pearson correlation results.

Based on the regression results, the null hypotheses are rejected in favor of the alternative hypotheses. Hence the study concludes that the Honesty-humility trait, Agreeableness trait and Emotionality traits are negatively related to organizational and interpersonal deviance.

4. DISCUSSION

This study examines the effects of H-HAE dimensions of the HEXACO personality domain on workplace deviance by examining the individual effect of each dimension on each of the two main dimensions of workplace deviance. The null hypothesis that states that each dimension of H-HAE personality traits is positively related to each organizational and interpersonal workplace deviance is rejected. Hence, H-HAE personality traits individually reduce organizational and interpersonal workplace deviance. Ripley (2019)

finds that honesty-humility does not determine police officers' workplace deviance in Canada. However, the finding of this study lends support to Anglim et al. (2018) and Bourdage et al. (2018), affirming the predictive ability of honesty-humility to reduce workplace deviance. This is because the honesty-humility trait includes the tendency to be fair and genuine in relating with others, and individuals who are high in this trait have a tendency not to engage in acts that could be harmful to others and to their society (Ashton & Lee, 2007, 2008; Pletzer et al., 2019). The study findings revealed that a higher level of honesty-humility traits tends to significantly alleviate the worrisome state of anti-productive behavior experienced at public universities.

This study establishes the negative effect of agreeableness on the organizational and interpersonal classifications of workplace deviance. This finding agrees with Khan et al. (2019), who associated employees with a high level of agreeableness trait with a low level of destructive behavior in Pakistan, and Anglim et al. (2018), who affirmed its predictive ability on counterproductive attitudes among job applicants and non-applicant. Bourdage et al. (2018) and Ripley (2019) have alluded to the potency of agreeableness in instilling desirable workplace behavior. The finding is in line with Kwentoh et al. (2020) and Amin et al. (2018), who showed that agreeableness of the big five has predictive relevance for curing workplace deviance in Nigerian beverage firms and Northwestern universities, respectively, but not congruent with Mase (2016) and Lima et al. (2016), who showed that agreeableness of big five has no impact in Benue state's Nigeria civil service and Malaysian voluntary service sector, respectively. Also, the finding does not align with

Van der Westhuizen (2019), who concluded that agreeableness has an insignificant negative impact on workplace deviance.

This study differs from the identifiable literature in Nigeria regarding region by focusing on the HEXACO agreeableness construct. HEXACO agreeableness is a rotated variant of big five agreeableness, which includes the irritability and anger facets of the big five neuroticism (Pletzer et al., 2019), making it a stronger version. This finding could be attributed to the characteristics of an agreeable person. For example, agreeable employees show more concern for the welfare of other employees, help others in completing their tasks, and are highly beneficial to the organization. These individuals have good interpersonal relationships with other employees (Witt et al., 2002). Furthermore, agreeable employees are forgiving; hence, they would not consider harming the organization. This finding reveals that increases in the number of agreeable employees who would not revenge or retaliate even when they are unfairly treated would ameliorate the menace of workplace deviance currently plaguing the university system.

Further, this study finds a significant inverse effect of emotionality on organizational and interpersonal workplace deviance. This finding agrees with Rahman et al. (2012) and Robinson et al. (2019), who link low levels of organizational and interpersonal deviance to high emotional intelligence among Bangladeshi private university students. However, it contradicts Van der Westhuizen (2019) and Ripley (2019), who conclude that emotionality has an insignificant negative impact on employees' and police officers' chances of being deviant. The support for the findings of this study could be due to the characteristics of individuals who are high in emotionality. Specifically, they depend on others for emotional support; they are fearful and anxious; they have empathy for others and are sentimentally attached to others. Thus, these characteristics would prevent employees high in emotionality from involving in acts that could harm co-workers or the organization.

This study focuses on the HEXACO model, which has been thinly investigated as the big five domains received extensive research attention. Considering its predictive capacity, it would be beneficial to study the relevance of the HEXACO domain in dealing with workplace deviance in other sectors other than education. As a result, evaluating the HEXACO domain in other sectors of the Nigerian economy is recommended.

CONCLUSION

The study examined the effect of the HEXACO honesty-humility, emotionality, and agreeableness (H-HEA) personality traits on both forms of workplace deviance in public universities. The findings revealed that all dimensions of H-HEA personality traits have a desirable reducing effect on both individual and organizational workplace deviance. This study concludes that the H-HEA trait is potent in dealing with organizational and interpersonal deviance in the Nigerian public university. It can be concluded that employee personality traits are negatively related to workplace deviance. Consequently, the HR departments of these institutions can confidently curb workplace deviance by considering staff with honesty-humility traits in their recruitment processes. In addition, an increasing number of agreeable employees would ameliorate the menace of workplace deviance currently plaguing the university system. Moreover, employing individuals with high scores in emotionality will play a key role in curtailing the vices of organizational workplace deviance in Southwestern Nigeria public universities.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Investigation: Grace Obalade, Adefemi Obalade.
Methodology: Grace Obalade, Adefemi Obalade.
Project administration: Grace Obalade, Adefemi Obalade, Vuyokazi Mtembu.
Resources: Grace Obalade, Adefemi Obalade, Vuyokazi Mtembu.
Software: Grace Obalade, Adefemi Obalade.
Supervision: Vuyokazi Mtembu.
Validation: Grace Obalade, Adefemi Obalade, Vuyokazi Mtembu.
Visualization: Grace Obalade, Adefemi Obalade, Vuyokazi Mtembu.
Writing – original draft: Grace Obalade, Adefemi Obalade.
Writing – review & editing: Grace Obalade, Adefemi Obalade, Vuyokazi Mtembu.

REFERENCES

1. Abdullah, A., & Marican, S. (2016). The effects of big five personality traits on deviant behavior. *Procedia – Social and Behavioural Sciences, 219,* 19-25. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.04.027

2. Ahmad, A., Omar, Z., Radzali, F. M., & Saidu, M. B. (2017). Can emotional stability buffer the effect of job stress on deviant behavior? *American Journal of Applied Sciences, 14*(7), 670-677. http://dx.doi.org/10.3844/ajassp.2017.670.677

3. Amin, S. I., Shamsudin, A. S., Razimi, M. S. A., Suleiman, Y., & Tunbosun, L. A. (2018). Relationship between personality factors, group norm and counterproductive work behaviour in Nigerian universities: The mediating role of ethical leadership. *Amity Journal of Management Research, 3*(2), 16-38. Retrieved from https://amity.edu/UserFiles/admaa/1d28ePaper%202.pdf

4. Anglim, J., & O'Connor, P. (2019). Measurement and research using the big five, HEXACO, and narrow traits: A primer for researchers and practitioners. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 71*(1), 16-25. http://doi.org/10.1111/ajpy.12202

5. Anglim, J., Lievens, F., Everton, L., Grant, S. L., & Marty, A. (2018). HEXACO personality predicts counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior in lowstakes and job applicant contexts. *Journal of Research in Personality, 77*(1), 11-20. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2018.09.003

6. Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2007). Empirical, theoretical, and practical advantages of the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 11*(2), 150-166. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868306294907

7. Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2008). The prediction of honesty-humility-related criteria by the HEXACO and five-factor models of personality. *Journal of Research in Personality, 42*(5), 1216-1228. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2008.03.006

8. Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2009). The HEXACO-60: A short measure of the major dimensions of personality. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 91*(4), 340-345. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00223890902935878

9. Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2012). Oddity, schizotypy dissociation, and personality. *Journal of Personality, 80*(1), 113-134. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2011.00735.x

10. Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2018). How well do big five measures capture HEXACO scale variance? *Journal of Personality Assessment, 101*(6), 567-573. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2018.1448986

11. Ashton, M. C., Lee, K., & de Vries, R. E. (2014). The HEXACO honesty-humility, agreeableness, and emotionality factors: A review of research and theory. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 18*(2), 139-152. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868314523838

12. Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 44*(1), 1-26. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1991.tb00688.x

13. Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(3), 349-360. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.3.349

14. Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2003). The past, present, and future of workplace deviance research. In J. Greenberg (Ed.), *Organizational behavior: The state of the science* (pp. 247-281). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

15. Berry, C. M., Ones, D. S., & Sackett, P. R. (2007). Interpersonal deviance, organizational deviance, and their common correlates: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(2), 410-424. http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.2.410

16. Bourdage, J. S., Goupal, A., Neilson, T., Lukacik, E. R., & Lee, N. (2018). Personality, equity sensitivity, and discretionary workplace behavior. *Personality and Individual Differences, 120,* 144-150. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.08.018

17. Burtăverde, V., Chraif, M., Aniței, M., & Dumitru, D. (2017). The HEXACO model of personality and risky driving behavior. *Psychological Reports, 120*(2), 255-270. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033294116688890

18. Cattell, R. B. (1943). The description of personality: Basic traits resolved into clusters. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 38*(4), 476-506. http://doi.org/10.1037/h0054116

19. Chernyak-Hai, L., Kim, S.-K., & Tziner, A. (2018). Gender profiles of workplace individual and organizational deviance. *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones, 34*(1), 46-55. https://doi.org/10.5093/jwop2018a6

20. Cohen, A. (2018). *Counterproductive work behaviors: Understanding the dark side of personalities in organizational life.* Routledge.

21. Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). The five-factor model of personality and its relevance to personality disorders. *Journal of Personality Disorders, 6*(4), 343-359. https://doi.org/10.1521/pedi.1992.6.4.343

22. Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1995). Primary traits of Eysenck's P-E-N system: Three- and five-factor solutions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*(2), 308-317. https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.69.2.308

23. 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. http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1241

24. De Raad, B. (2000). *The big five personality factors: The psycholexical approach to personality.* Ashland, OH: Hogrefe and Huber Publishers.

25. Dike, G. (2017, September 12). *DELSU sacks 14 lecturers, 17 non-academic staffers.* The Sun Newspaper. http://sunnewsonline.com/delsu-sacks-14-lecturers-17-non-academic-staffers/

26. Douglas, S. C., & Martinko, M. J. (2001). Exploring the role of individual differences in the prediction of workplace aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(4), 547-559.

https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.4.547

27. Greenberg, J. (1993). The social side of fairness: Interpersonal and informational classes of organizational justice. In R. Cropanzano (Ed.), *Justice in the workplace: Approaching fairness in human resource management* (pp. 79-103). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

28. Hartley, J. (2014). Some thoughts on Likert-type scales. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology, 14*(1), 83-86. http://doi.org/10.1016/S1697-2600(14)70040-7

29. Hastings, S. E., & O'Neil, T. A. (2009). Predicting workplace deviance using broad versus narrow personality variables. *Personality and Individual Differences, 47*(4), 289-293. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2009.03.015

30. Hilbig, B. E., Moshagen, M., & Zettler, I. (2016). Prediction consistency: A test of the equivalence assumption across different indicators of the same construct. *European Journal of Personality, 30*(6), 637-647. http://doi.org/10.1002/per.2085

31. John, O. P., Naumann, L. P., & Soto, C. J. (2008). Paradigm shift to the integrative big five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and conceptual issues. In O. P. John, R. W. Robins, & L. A. Pervin (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 114-158). The Guilford Press. Retrieved from https://gmdconsulting.eu/nykerk/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/MBTI-and-Big-5.pdf

32. Kalemci, R. A., Kalemci-Tuzun, I., & Ozkan-Canbolat, E. (2019). Employee deviant behavior: Role of culture and organizational relevant support. *European Journal of Management and Business Economics, 28*(2), 126-141. http://doi.org/10.1108/EJMBE-11-2018-0125

33. Khan, A. I., Khan, S., & Zia, M. H. (2019). Impact of personality traits on workplace deviance – A Pakistani perspective. *Global Regional Review, Humanity only, 4*(2), 85-92. Retrieved from

https://grrjournal.com/jadmin/Auther/31rvIolA2LALJouq9hkR/ylJw261ILH.pdf

34. Kwentoh, W. N., Joe-Akunne, C. O., & Anazor, C. S. (2020). Job burnout and personality as predictors of workplace deviance. *International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development, 4*(3), 454-458. Retrieved from https://www.ijtsrd.com/papers/ijtsrd30491.pdf

35. Larsen, R. J., & Buss, D. M. (2005). *Personality psychology: Domains of knowledge about human nature* (2nd ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

36. Lee, J. J. (2012). Correlation and causation in the study of personality. *European Journal of Personality, 26*(4), 372-390. http://doi.org/10.1002/per.1863

37. Lee, K., Ashton, M. C., & De Vries, R. E. (2005). Predicting workplace delinquency and integrity with the HEXACO and five-factor models of personality structure. *Human Performance, 18*(2), 179-197. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1802_4

38. Lima, L. C., Teha, C. J., & Chan-Yin-Fah, B. (2016). A preliminary study of the effects of personality traits on workplace deviance in the voluntary sector international. *Review of Management and Marketing, 6*(7S), 6-10. Retrieved from https://econjournals.com/index.php/irmm/article/view/3159

39. Martinko, M. J., Gundlach, M. J., & Douglas, S. C. (2002). Toward an integrative theory of counterproductive workplace behavior: A causal reasoning perspective. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 10*(1-2), 36-50. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00192

40. Mase, J. A. (2016). Personality factors as predictors of counterproductive work behaviour among Benue State Civil Servants. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Advanced Studies, 3*(12), 139-150. Retrieved from http://www.ijiras.com/2016/Vol_3-Issue_12/paper_30.pdf

41. McCrae, R. R. (2000). Emotional intelligence from the perspective

of the five-factor model of personality. In R. Bar-On & J. D. Parker (Eds.), *The handbook of emotional intelligence: Theory, development, assessment, and application at home, school, and in the workplace* (pp. 263-276). San Francisco, CA, US: Jossey-Bass.

42. Miller, J. D., Gaughan, E. T., Maples, J., & Price, J. (2011). A comparison of agreeableness scores from the big five inventory and the NEO PI-R: Consequences for the study of narcissism and psychopathy. *Assessment, 18*(3), 335-339. https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191111411671

43. Obalade, G. O., & Mtembu, V. (2023). Effect of organisational justice on workplace deviance in Nigerian public universities. *Acta Commercii, 23*(1), a1091. http://doi.org/10.4102/ac.v23i1.1091

44. Pletzer, J. L., Bentvelzen, M., Oostrom, J. K., & de Vries, R. E. (2019). A meta-analysis of the relations between personality and workplace deviance: Big five versus HEXACO. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 112,* 369-383. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2019.04.004

45. Rahman, M. S., Ferdausy, S., & Karan, R. (2012). Relationships among emotional intelligence, deviant workplace behavior, and job performance: An empirical study. *Portuguese Journal of Management Studies, 17*(1), 39-62. Retrieved from https://ideas.repec.org/a/pjm/journl/vxvi-iy2012i1p39-62.html

46. Ripley, A. M. (2019). *Examining the utility of the HEXACO-PI-R for predicting positive and negative indicators of police officer performance.* Walden University. Retrieved from https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations/6858/

47. Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2007). *Organizational behavior* (12th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

48. Robinson, M. D., Persich, M. R., Stawicki, C., & Krishnakumar, S. (2019). Deviant workplace behavior as emotional action: Discriminant and interactive roles for work-related emotional intelligence. *Human Performance, 32*(5), 201-219. https://doi.org/10.1080/08959285.2019.1664548

49. Rogojan, P. T. (2009). *Deviant workplace behavior in organizations: Antecedents, influences, and remedies.* Universitat Wien. https://doi.org/10.25365/thesis.6623

50. Ruwan, I. I. F., Ajodo, F. M., & Kwasau, A. A. (2016). Personality as a factor in deviant behaviour among secondary school students in Kaduna state Nigerian. *Journal of Psychological Research, 12,* 31-34. Retrieved from https://njpsyresearch.com/ojs3/index.php/njopr/article/view/46

51. Sahara Reporter. (2011, March 2). *Ambrose Alli University sex-for-grades: Dr. Obutu fired; Judith Okosun suspended for six semesters.* Retrieved from http://saharareporters.com/2011/03/02/ambrose-alli-university-sex-grades-update-dr-otubu-fired-judith-okosun-suspended-six

52. Sahara Reporter. (2019, June 15). *Sex for marks: Another Nigerian lecturer caught pants down.* Retrieved from http://sahara-reporters.com/2019/06/15/sex-marks-another-nigerian-lecturer-caught-pants-down

53. Salgado, J. F. (2002). The big five personality dimensions and counterproductive behaviors. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 10*(1-2), 117-125. http://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00198

54. Saucier, G. (1994). Mini-markers: A brief version of Goldberg's unipolar big-five markers. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 63*(3), 506-516. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa6303_8

55. Saucier, G. (2009). Recurrent personality dimensions in inclusive lexical studies: Indications for a big six structure. *Journal of Personality, 77,* 1577-1614. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2009.00593.x

56. Schmitt, D. P., Allik, J., Miccrae, R. R., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2007). The geographic distribution of big five personality traits: Patterns and profile of human self-description across 56 nations. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 38*(2), 172-212. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022022106297299

57. Soutter, A. R. B., Bates, T. C., & Mõttus, R. (2020). Big five and HEXACO personality traits, proenvironmental attitudes, and behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 15*(4), 913-941. http://doi.org/10.1177/1745691620903019

58. Van der Westhuizen, J. (2019). *The influence of HEXACO personality factors and job demands on counterproductive work behaviour.* Stellenbosch University. Retrieved from https://scholar.sun.ac.za/server/api/core/bitstreams/57b9b45c-dd43-474b-b42a-e2530fadf4a6/content

59. Witt, L. A., Burke, L. A., Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (2002). The interactive effects of conscientiousness and agreeableness on job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(1), 164-169. http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.164

60. Yamane, T. (1967). *Statistics: An introductory analysis* (2nd ed.). New York: Harper and Row.