

# Demographic Factors Role in Forming Counter-productive Work Behavior of Education Personnel (Study at Private Universities in Padang City)

Ice Kamela, Zeshasina Rosha  
Economics Faculty, Bung Hatta University

## Abstract

This study aims to analyze demographic factors role (gender, age, education and work experience) in forming the counterproductive behavior of education personnel in Private Universities in Padang City, namely Bung Hatta University, Baiturrahmah University and Muhammadiyah University. The sample in this study is the Education Personnel in 3 Private Higher Education institutions totaling 100 participant. Collecting data using a questionnaire, the method used to analyze the data is descriptive statistical analysis: Independent Sample T test and Anova test. The results showed: (1) counterproductive behavior of female education personnel tends to be higher than that of men, (2) the age range of 21-25 years is higher in counterproductive behavior than other age ranges, (3) the work period is 1-3 years higher behavior counterproductive from other work periods, (4) Diploma level education is higher in counterproductive behavior than other levels of education. In addition, it was also found that there were no counterproductive behavioral differences from gender, age, tenure and level of education. Higher Education Managers are advised to: provide opportunities and scholarships to continue their education, implement reward and punishment systems, provide training especially for young people and their work experience is still low, improve supervision and enforce discipline for all education personnel.

**Keywords:** gender, age, years of service, education, counterproductive behavior

## 1. Introduction

To improve the nation's competitiveness in the face of globalization in all fields, Higher Education is needed that is able to develop science and technology and produce intellectuals, scientists, and / or professionals who are cultured and creative, tolerant, democratic, strong character, and dare to defend the truth for the sake of nation. Universities to be able to develop and compete in the free market era, the management needs to provide quality human resources who have professional, technical, managerial and sensitive abilities with various changes. This will be realized if two important elements play a role in improving the quality of graduates, namely lecturers and education personnel working together.

Law No. 12 of 2012 concerning Higher Education states that lecturers and education personnel have an important role in the National Education system. However, education personnel have the same important roles and positions in the context of the implementation of education and are supported by adequate facilities and infrastructure to achieve the objectives in accordance with the vision and mission of the College. thus education personnel are required to not behave in counterproductive when working.

Approaches in organizational behavior explain the high and low performance of employees influenced by factors that come from within and from outside the individual. Internal pressure, employee behavior at work in the form of deviant behavior or also known as counterproductive behavior. Penney and Spector (2002) state that counterproductive behavior is an act of intentional or unintentional work done by individuals that can hinder or interfere with organizational performance. Such behavior is like not following the rules set by the organization, doing work improperly and stalling for time in completing work.

The phenomenon that develops in the world of work, including Private Higher Education is still found education personnel behave counterproductively in work such as coming and going home not on time, chatting things that are not related to work, using office facilities to play games and using longer breaks. This culture is considered reasonable, but has been categorized as counterproductive.

Based on the above phenomenon, this study aims to analyze the role of demographic factors (gender, age, education and work experience) in shaping the contradictory behavior of education personnel in Private Universities in Padang City. This research can contribute to universities in order to improve the quality of education services to students.

## 2. Literature Review

### Education Personnel (Staff)

Education personnel are members of the community who are devoted and appointed to support the implementation of education. Education personnel are people who participate in the implementation of education in education units, although indirectly involved in the education process, (Law 12 of 2012).

### **Counterproductive behavior**

Counterproductive behavior is intentional or unintentional behavior in the work done by individuals that can hamper or interfere with organizational performance. Such behavior is like not following the rules set by the organization, doing work improperly and stalling time in completing work (Penney and Spector, 2006).

Counterproductive behavior is a negative reaction made by employees related to the perception of injustice or irregularity carried out by the company in relation to certain policies, in this case a payroll policy or anything related to compensation. The concept of counterproductive behavior is closely related to the value of job dissatisfaction (Robbins, 2013).

The emergence of counterproductive behavior is caused by various factors, namely demographic factors consisting of gender, age, work experience, education, personality factors, job characteristics factors, work group characteristic factors and organizational culture factors (Anderson et al, 2005).

Gender describes the different characteristics of individuals, where gender is grouped into two, namely men and women. Each gender has different behaviors and characteristics. Robbins (2007) argues that men are gender who prioritize thinking logic but tend to be careless in taking action. In addition, men have less stable emotions and are clearly seen from their behavior or from facial expressions. Female gender has a quieter attitude. However, they tend to emphasize logic and are very thorough in work but have an unstable emotional level. Gender differences can be used as a trigger factor for conflict that encourages counter-productive behavior.

Age is a cycle that an individual undergoes, related to the extent to which a person / individual has done a job from time to time. Age also becomes a reference for the establishment of individuals in work, besides that, the age of guarding shows the development of mindset and emotional intelligence that someone has at work. Therefore, age is also a factor that can trigger conflicts such as conflicts between senior employees and junior employees.

Chang et al (2010) found that behavior deviations by employees cause organizational losses for companies between \$ 6 and \$ 200 billion per year. Other findings 33% to 75% of the total employees involved behave counterproductively namely theft, fraud, embezzlement of office facilities, destruction, sabotage, and absenteeism (Bashir et al, 2012). Some research findings related to counterproductive behavior state that gender, age, education level have a significant impact on counterproductive behavior (Socket and Paul 2002). Furthermore Ratundo et al (2002), found that counterproductive behavior is mostly done by men than women. While Furnham and Thomas (2008) found a significant difference between counterproductive behavior of men and women. Other findings indicate that employees of old age, higher levels of education, and experienced experience tend to be more counterproductive.

Results The study conducted by Bashir et al (2012) in the Public Sector Organization in Pakistan found that most of the employees deviated from violations of production, sabotage, theft and withdrawal. Berkowitz (2003), Laurenz and Spector, 2013 also found that stress, unpleasant situations related to irregularities or related violations in the world of work would increase counterproductive work behavior.

Rusdi (2015), the results of his research found counterproductive work behavior has a greater tendency to occur in government agencies compared to private institutions and counter-productive work behavior is an integral part of PNS routines in Bandar Lampung.

### **3. Research Methods**

The sample in this study were education personnel (staff) at 3 Private Universities in Padang City, namely Bung Hatta University, Baiturrahmah University and Muhammadiyah University. Data collection by distributing questionnaires to 100 education personnel (staff) at three private universities. This study uses descriptive analysis with Independent Sample T Test and Annova.

### **4. Research Results and Discussion**

#### **Respondents Characteristics**

The results of filling out the questionnaire that has been collected are known to the characteristics of the respondents. 100 participating education personnel (staff) at three Private Universities in Padang City with characteristics including gender, age, work period and education level can be classified into the characteristics of respondents as shown in Table 1 below:

**Table 1**  
**Respondents Characteristics**

Information	Total (person)	Percentage (%)
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	50	50
Female	50	50
<b>Total</b>	100	100
<b>Age</b>		
21 – 25 year	9	9
26 – 30 year	19	19
31 – 35 year	17	17
36 – 40 year	16	16
>40	30	30
<b>Total</b>	100	100
<b>Work Period</b>		
<1 year	2	2
1 - 3 year	17	17
4 - 6 year	24	24
>6 year	57	57
<b>Total</b>	100	100
<b>Educaion</b>		
Senior Hight School	40	40
Diploma	20	20
S1 (graduate)	31	31
S2 (postgraduate)	9	9
<b>Total</b>	100	100

**Source: appendix**

Based on Table 1, some conclusions are obtained, among others. the number of male respondents was the same as women with a proportion of 50%, the majority of respondents were aged over 40 years with a proportion of 39%. Based on the length of work, the majority of respondents were those who had a service period of over 6 years with a proportion of 57% and formal education from senior high school to postgraduate level with the largest proportion at the S1 level of 31%.

### Descriptive Analysis

To analyze the role of demographic factors (gender, age, education and years of service) in forming counterproductive behavior using descriptive analysis with the Independent Sample T test and Anova.

### Counterproductive Behavior Based on Gender

To see the role of gender in shaping counterproductive behavior using the Independent Sample T Test. Descriptive results of gender differences test statistics can be seen in Table 2 below:

**Table 2**  
**Descriptive statistics and test differences**  
**Group Statistics**

Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
AveragePKK Male	50	13.9800	5.66583	.80127
Female	50	15.7800	4.54137	.64225

From table 2, it can be seen that the average value of counterproductive behavior in male education personnel (staff) is 13.98 and female is 15.78, this value shows that the tendency of counterproductive behavior of female education personnel is greater than that of men.

To see differences in counterproductive behavior, male and female education personnel (staff) can be seen in Table 3:

**Table 3**  
**Calculation Results Difference Test**  
**Independent Samples Test**

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
AveragePKK Equal variances assumed	13.642	.000	1.753	98	.083	-1.80000	1.02690	-3.83784	.23784
Equal variances not assumed			-.753	93.566	.083	-1.80000	1.02690	-3.83905	.23905

In table 3 shows the results of the two average difference test data obtained t value of -1.753, and a significance level of 0.083. The results showed 0.083 large from 0.05, meaning that there were no differences in counterproductive behavior of male and female education personnel. In other words, counterproductive behavior is the same.

The results of the tendency of counterproductive behavior of female education personnel is higher than that of men. This is because women have a dual role, namely on the one hand as housewives who have family responsibilities to take care of their families and the other side as a secondary breadwinner to help the family (Robbins, 2007). Another finding is that there are no counterproductive behavioral differences between men and women. These results show that although each gender has different characteristics where men prioritize logic in thinking and women have an unstable emotional level, they will behave counterproductively. This counterproductive behavior will emerge if they feel the required skills, the burden of work given and the way they work is beyond their ability.

The results of this study do not support the research of Ratundo et al (2002) who found that counterproductive behavior is more commonly done by men than women and there are significant differences between counterproductive behavior of men and women. The difference in the results of this study is due to differences in culture of a country.

#### Counterproductive behavior based on age

To see the role of age in shaping counterproductive behavior using ANOVA. Descriptive results of demographic factors based on age and difference test can be seen in Table 4 below

**Table 4**  
**Descriptive Age Statistics**  
**Descriptive Statistics**

Dependent Variable:RataPKK

Age	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
21 year - 25 year	17.1111	3.10018	9
26 year - 30 year	13.7368	5.54619	19
31 year - 35 year	14.2353	5.55123	17
36 year - 40 year	13.5625	5.63286	16
> 40 year	15.7436	4.95091	39
Total	14.8800	5.18794	100

From the results of descriptive statistics shows that age divided into 5 categories has an average value of counterproductive behavior of education personnel with an age range of 21-25 years of 17.1111 higher than other age ranges.

To see counterproductive behavioral differences based on age range can be seen in Table 5

**Tabel 5**  
**Calculation Results Difference Test**  
**Tests of Between-Subjects Effects**

Dependent Variable: RataPKK

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	133.555 <sup>a</sup>	4	33.389	1.253	.294
Intercept	17810.249	1	17810.249	668.499	.000
Age	133.555	4	33.389	1.253	.294
Error	2531.005	95	26.642		
Total	24806.000	100			
Corrected Total	2664.560	99			

a. R Squared = .050 (Adjusted R Squared = .010)

Pada table 5 diketahui bahwa nilai signifikansi 0.294. Hasil ini menunjukkan tidak terdapat perbedaan perilaku kontraproduktif tenaga kependidikan berdasarkan usia, karena nilai signifikansinya 0.294 besar dari 0.05. Selain itu untuk melihat adanya perbedaan antar rentang usia dapat dilihat dari tabel 6.berikut ini

**Table 6**  
**Multiple Comparisons**

Dependent Variable: AveragePKK

	(I) Age	(J) Age	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Bonferroni	21 year - 26 year	25 year - 30 year	3.3743	2.08865	1.000	-2.6287	9.3772
		31 year - 35 year	2.8758	2.12777	1.000	-3.2396	8.9912
		36 year - 40 year	3.5486	2.15067	1.000	-2.6326	9.7298
		> 40 year	1.3675	1.90876	1.000	-4.1184	6.8534
	26 year - 30 year	21 year - 25 year	-3.3743	2.08865	1.000	-9.3772	2.6287
		31 year - 35 year	-.4985	1.72320	1.000	-5.4510	4.4541
		36 year - 40 year	.1743	1.75139	1.000	-4.8593	5.2080
		> 40 year	-2.0067	1.44407	1.000	-6.1571	2.1436
	31 year - 35 year	21 year - 25 year	-2.8758	2.12777	1.000	-8.9912	3.2396
		26 year - 30 year	.4985	1.72320	1.000	-4.4541	5.4510
		36 year - 40 year	.6728	1.79787	1.000	-4.4944	5.8400
		> 40 year	-1.5083	1.50011	1.000	-5.8197	2.8031
	36 year - 40 year	21 year - 25 year	-3.5486	2.15067	1.000	-9.7298	2.6326
		26 year - 30 year	-.1743	1.75139	1.000	-5.2080	4.8593
		31 year - 35 year	-.6728	1.79787	1.000	-5.8400	4.4944
		> 40 year	-2.1811	1.53241	1.000	-6.5853	2.2232
> 40 year	21 year - 25 year	-1.3675	1.90876	1.000	-6.8534	4.1184	
	26 year - 30 year	2.0067	1.44407	1.000	-2.1436	6.1571	
	31 year - 35 year	1.5083	1.50011	1.000	-2.8031	5.8197	
	36 year - 40 year	2.1811	1.53241	1.000	-2.2232	6.5853	

Based on observed means.

The error term is Mean Square(Error) = 26.642.

To see differences in counterproductive behavior between age ranges, it can be seen from the mean difference value and significance value. If the significance value is greater than 0.05, there is no difference. From the processed data, it shows that the significance value of all age ranges is 1.00. This value is greater than 0.05. These results indicate that there are no differences in counterproductive behavior of education personnel between the ages of 21-25 years, 26-30 years, 31-35 years, 36-40 years and large than 40 years.

The results of this study can be concluded that counterproductive behavior of education personnel with an age range of 21-25 years is higher than other age ranges this is because in that age range the level of maturity of thinking, acting and emotional intelligence is still low. In addition, the age range of 21-25 years entered the

workforce and the first period of recognition with the world of work. Young employees tend to behave counterproductively.

The findings of this study are not in line with Socket's research, 2002 which found that senior employees tend to be more counterproductive. There is no difference in counterproductive behavior of education personnel based on age range, one of which is due to the characteristics of the work environment and organizational climate. Employees will follow the behavior or habits that apply in the work group. If there is no response from the organization, they tend to repeat the behavior.

### Counterproductive Behavior Based on Work Period

To see the role of the work period in forming counterproductive behavior can be seen from table 7 below:

**Table 7**

#### Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable:RataPKK

Work period	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
< 1 year	13.5000	6.36396	2
1 - 3 year	16.9412	3.49053	17
4 - 6 year	12.3333	5.78353	24
> 6 year	15.3860	5.02406	57
Total	14.8800	5.18794	100

In table 7 of the 4 working periods, it can be seen that the highest mean value of counterproductive behavior is 16.9412, this means that education personnel with a work period of 1 - 3 years are more counterproductive than other work periods.

The results of this study found that higher counterproductive behavior was carried out by education personnel with a working period of 1 - 3 years and there was no difference in counterproductive behavior of education personnel based on their working period. The results of this study do not support previous research which found that employees with long / senior work period were more counterproductive.

The difference in counterproductive behavior of education personnel based on years of service can be seen in Table 8 below:

**Table 8**

#### Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable:RataPKK

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	246.277 <sup>a</sup>	3	82.092	3.259	.025
Intercept	5473.227	1	5473.227	217.274	.000
Work periods	246.277	3	82.092	3.259	.025
Error	2418.283	96	25.190		
Total	24806.000	100			
Corrected Total	2664.560	99			

a. R Squared = .092 (Adjusted R Squared = .064)

In table 8 it is obtained a significance value of 0.025 greater than 0.05. So it can be concluded that there are no differences in counterproductive behavior of education personnel based on their working period

To determine the difference between long working periods can be seen from the Tukey Post Hoc table. in the following table. 9:

**Table .9**  
**Work Periods**  
**Multiple Comparisons**

Dependent Variable:RataPKK

	(I) work periods	(J) work periods	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Bonferroni	< 1 year	1 - 3 year	-3.4412	3.75194	1.000	-13.5490	6.6666
		4 - 6 year	1.1667	3.69389	1.000	-8.7848	11.1181
		> 6 year	-1.8860	3.61070	1.000	-11.6133	7.8414
	1 - 3 year	< 1 year	3.4412	3.75194	1.000	-6.6666	13.5490
		4 - 6 year	4.6078*	1.59104	.028	.3215	8.8941
		> 6 year	1.5552	1.38699	1.000	-2.1814	5.2918
	4 - 6 year	< 1 year	-1.1667	3.69389	1.000	-11.1181	8.7848
		1 - 3 year	-4.6078*	1.59104	.028	-8.8941	-.3215
		> 6 year	-3.0526	1.22129	.085	-6.3428	.2375
> 6 year	< 1 year	1.8860	3.61070	1.000	-7.8414	11.6133	
	1 - 3 year	-1.5552	1.38699	1.000	-5.2918	2.1814	
	4 - 6 year	3.0526	1.22129	.085	-.2375	6.3428	

Based on observed means.

The error term is Mean Square(Error) = 25.190.

\*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

From the Tukey Post Hoc table, it can be seen that the significance value is 0.028 small from 0.05. This shows that there are differences in counterproductive behavior of education personnel between the work period of 1 - 3 years with a work period of 4-6 years.

#### Counterproductive Behavior Based on Education

To see the role of education level in shaping counterproductive behavior can be seen from the following table 10:

**Table 10**

#### Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable:RataPKK

Pendidikan	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
SHS (SMA)	14.5000	5.41603	40
Diploma	17.5500	2.60516	20
S1 (Graduate)	14.1935	5.43703	31
S2 (Postgraduate)	13.0000	6.22495	9
Total	14.8800	5.18794	100

From the results of descriptive statistics shows that the highest average counterproductive behavior is at the level of diploma education with an average value of 17.55 greater than other levels of education. The difference in counterproductive behavior of education personnel based on education level can be seen in table 11 below:

**Table .11**  
**Tests of Between-Subjects Effects**

Dependent Variable:RataPKK

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	194.771 <sup>a</sup>	3	64.924	2.524	.062
Intercept	16072.772	1	16072.772	624.744	.000
Education	194.771	3	64.924	2.524	.062
Error	2469.789	96	25.727		
Total	24806.000	100			
Corrected Total	2664.560	99			

a. R Squared = .073 (Adjusted R Squared = .044)

in table 11, the results showed that the significance value of 0.062 was greater than 0.05. This shows that there is no difference in counterproductive behavior of education personnel based on education level.

To determine the differences between levels of education can be seen from the Tukey Post Hoc table. in table 12 below:

**Table 12**  
**Education**  
**Multiple Comparisons**

Dependent Variable:RataPKK

	(I) education	(J)education	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Bonferroni	SHS	Diploma	-3.0500	1.38907	.183	-6.7922	.6922
		Graduate	.3065	1.21370	1.000	-2.9633	3.5762
		Postgraduate	1.5000	1.87129	1.000	-3.5413	6.5413
	Diploma	SHS	3.0500	1.38907	.183	-.6922	6.7922
		Graduate	3.3565	1.45473	.139	-.5626	7.2755
		Postgraduate	4.5500	2.03590	.166	-.9348	10.0348
	Graduate	SHS	-.3065	1.21370	1.000	-3.5762	2.9633
		Diploma	-3.3565	1.45473	.139	-7.2755	.5626
		Postgraduate	1.1935	1.92053	1.000	-3.9804	6.3675
Postgraduate	SMU	-1.5000	1.87129	1.000	-6.5413	3.5413	
	Diploma	-4.5500	2.03590	.166	-10.0348	.9348	
	Graduate	-1.1935	1.92053	1.000	-6.3675	3.9804	

Based on observed means.

The error term is Mean Square(Error) = 25.727.

From the results of the processed data, it can be seen that all levels of education have a significance value greater than 0.05. This shows that there is no difference in counterproductive behavior of education personnel based on high school, Diploma, graduate and postgraduate education levels. In other words the behavior is the same.

## CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Counterproductive behavior of female education personnel tends to be higher than that of men and there is no counterproductive behavior difference between male and female education personnel. The counterproductive behavior of education personnel with a age range of 21-25 years is higher than other age ranges. And there are no counterproductive behavioral differences between other age ranges. It is suggested to the universities to: apply the reward and punishment system to education staff to change their behavior in work. Providing training, especially for young education staff and their work experience is still low. Increasing supervision, so that no more employees behave counterproductively. Enforcing discipline for all education personnel



## Bibliography

- Anderson, N., Deniz S.O., Handan K. S. and Viswesvaran C. (2005). *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology*. vol 1. London.
- Bashir, Sajid, Misbah Nasir, Saira Qayyum, and Ambreen . 2012. Dimensionality Of Counterproductive Work Behaviours In Public Sector Organizations Of Pakistan. *Public Organiz Rev*, 12:357-366.
- Furnham, A. and Chamorro, T. (2008). Personality, Intelligence and Approaches to Learning as Predictors of Academic Performance. *Journal of Personality and Individual Differences*. 44. 1596-1603
- Penney, L. M. and Paul E. S. (2002). Narcissism and counterproductive work behavior: Do bigger egos mean bigger problems?. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10(1/2): 126-134.
- Robbins, S. (2007). *Perilaku Organisasi*. Jilid 1. Jakarta: Indeks Kelompok Gramedia.
- Rotundo, M. and Paul R. S. (2002). The Relative Importance of Task, Citizenship, and Counterproductive Performance to Global Ratings of Job Performance: A Policy-Capturing Approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.vol 87 (1): 66-80
- Rusdi, Zainur M. 2015. Comparative Analysis of Productive Counter Working Behaviors in Government Agencies and Private Institutions in Bandar Lampung. *Journal of Science Management*. Vol 1 (01).
- Sacket, Paul R. (2002). The structure of Counterproductive Work Behaviors: Dimensionality and Relationships with Facets of Job Performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10(1/2): 5-11.
- Spector, P. E, Suzy F., Lisa M. P., Kari B., Angelina G., and Stacey K. (2006). The Dimensionality of Counterproductivity: Are All Counterproductive Behaviors Created Equal?. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68: 446-460.
- Spector, Paul E and Fox, S. (2005). *The Stressor-Emotion Model of Counterproductive Work Behavior*. Whashington DC: American Psychological Association..
- Republic of Indonesia Law Number 12 of 2012 concerning Higher Education.
- Republic of Indonesia Law Number 20 of 2003 concerning the National Education System