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Abstract

This study’s primary purpose is to explore the psychological capital roles and personality traits of Big-Five in predicting OCB (organizational citizenship behavior) and performance of task in Indonesia’s electricity sector. The data were gathered from the employees of four major cities in Indonesia, in Southeast Sulawesi, comprising 246 employees. The data were analyzed utilizing a PLS (partial least squares) based SEM (structural equation modeling) technique. The findings indicate that the psychological capital and personality traits of Big-Five relate significantly to OCB and the performance of task. Nevertheless, against our expectations, OCB does not significantly relate to the performance of task. This study also discusses the findings’ further implications. In terms of practical implications, the findings of this research stipulate that psychological capital and Big-Five personality traits aimed to improve employee performance and can be most effective if specifically targeted at OCB. Given that both variables play an important role to promote OCB, caring training initiatives that focus on mutual help can be very valuable for organizational improvement. In a managerial perspective, organizations can increase OCB by conducting open communication strategies between managers and employees to further stimulate and strengthen the ability of employees to display extra-role behaviors.
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1. Introduction

Immense technological and economic changes, development in culture, and globalization have impacted the organizational competition’s structure and intensity. They have also influenced other sectors in Indonesia and particularly the electricity sector. In the developing economy, the organization should be skilled to retain and encourage greatly talented employees to keep a competitive edge.

Employees are an organization’s crucial element since those who start their formation have a vital part in decision-making and decide the organization’s survival (Buchko, Buscher, & Buchko, 2017). Employees are the power and energy source in the frictions, activities creation, and actions inside the organization. With no participation of the employees, the organization will not be able to increase the effectiveness, productivity, and efficiency in chasing the general goals (Buchko et al., 2017; Kang & Sung, 2017; Poulse & Ipsen, 2017). The employee-level participation inside the organization is highly controlled by the employee’s individual characteristics. The diverse employee characteristics would impact her/his behavior in completing the tasks. One characteristic that affected the behavior of each employee is the psychological capital, which could assist the employees to increase performance in the working environment (Karatepe & Talebzadeh, 2016; Kim et al., 2017; Tüzün, Çetin, & Basim, 2018).

Psychological capital investment is meant to improve his/her adequate competence to overcome the globalization challenges and develop citizenship of organization that, in turn, is directed to the effectiveness of the organization (Pradhan, Jena, & Bhattacharya, 2016). Employees who are more positive psychologically would...
perform higher OCB (organizational citizenship behavior) than the employees who are negative. The employees would utilize their minds and actions considerably by choosing time advantage. They would show their ability to perform proactive behaviors, for example by offering suggestions or exchanging creative ideas for increasing employees’ work efficiency (Kim et al., 2017; Tüzün et al., 2018).

There are various factors that decide organizational optimal performance, such as personality (Ward, Meade, Allred, Pappalardo, & Stoughton, 2017). Personality takes a crucial role in deciding each employee’s behaviors and habits. Personality differentiations influence how the employee responds to the conditions in their working environment (Harris & Fleming, 2017; Ward et al., 2017). Employees that have emotionally stable characteristics would be inclined to offer help to another employees in completing their work (Ashkanasy, Troth, Lawrence, & Jordan, 2017). Moreover, the employees who benefit from their works would complete the tasks better (Harris & Fleming, 2017). Therefore, by investigating psychological capital of the roles and personality traits of Big-Five in predicting OCB and performance of task, this study not only extends psychological studies, but also extends the organizational effectiveness particularly in the electricity sector of Indonesia.

2. Literature Review

2.1. OCB (Organizational Citizenship Behavior)

OCB is performed without restraint by a person. It does not explicitly or directly relate to the organization’s incentive structure, but it could improve the effectiveness of the organization (Desivilya, Sabag, & Ashton, 2006; Rashi & Konark, 2002; Robbins & Judge, 2011). OCB is concerned with the action of the employee, which exceeds the roles required by the organization, where that action improves the co-workers’ wellbeing, the organization, or the working teams (Organ, 1988; Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006).

OCB involves the persistence of the employee in offering to do the task that is not officially given, integrating extra enthusiasm and tasks completion effort, protecting, supporting as well as sustaining goals of the organization, following practices and rules of the organization, and working and assisting each other (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). Organ (1988) notes that there are five dimensions in OCB: (1) sportsmanship, concerning the disturbances tolerance attitude in the working environment; (2) courtesy, concerning teaching others action before they make decisions or take steps associated to their work; (3) civic virtue, concerning the action taken to involved in and support the administrative functions in the organization; (4) conscientiousness, concerning the action taken to show a given task that exceeds what is expected by the organization; and (5) altruism, concerning the employee assisting other employees to finish the tasks in particular conditions.

Chien (2003) states that the OCB application in the working environment could develop the performance of the individual employee, performance of the unit, and performance of the organization. OCB influences employee performance because it includes a strong conviction that OCB is essential to organizational success (Basu, Pradhan, and Tewari 2017; Hermawati and Mas 2017), (Dong & Phuong, 2018). Empirical results indicate that OCB implants a public service ethic (Rayner, Lawton, & Williams, 2012), diminishes clashes between the employees (Beheshtifar & Hesani, 2012), and develops performance of the employee (Asiedu, Sarfo, & Adjei, 2014; Darsana, 2013; Harwiku, 2013; Maharani, Troena, & Noermijati, 2013; Putri, Udin, & Djastuti, 2019; Shahab, Sobari, & Udin, 2018; Suwanti & Udin, 2020).

\[ H1: \text{OCB relates positively to the performance of task.} \]

2.2. Psychological Capital

Hmieleski and Carr (2008) refer to the psychological capital as a groundwork comprising of the hope (Snyder, Sympson, & Ybasco, 1996), self-efficacy elements (Bandura, 1997), optimism (Carver & Scheier, 2003), and resilience (Masten, 2001). Luthans, Avolio, Avey, and Norman (2007) define ‘psychological capital’ as a psychological state of mind distinguished by a motivation or positive state to reach success (hope), a positive psychology that could urge a person to go up from breakdown or complete extra tasks (resilience), high self-confidence in countering the challenges (self-efficacy), and high optimism or a positive attribution concerning to present and upcoming success (optimism). Yardley (2012) further explains that psychological capital refers to the positive power that arises from the internal person and increases success in the workplace.

The self-efficacy refers to a person’s belief about the individual ability to utilize programs for necessary action, motivation, and cognitive resources to achieve success in accomplishing particular tasks in a specific circumstances (Herbert, 2011). An employee with high self-efficacy is inclined to believe in the current abilities they have to succeed in the given tasks performance (Rego, Marques, Leal, Sousa, & Cunha, 2010). Herbert (2011) further stated that persons who have high self-efficacy would select and enjoy tasks that are considered challenging, which could show their ability to overcome any difficulties or obstructions to those tasks performance.

Hope refers to a thought or cognitive process in which persons can build reality with challenging or intriguing
goals and eventually achieve the goals through the determination of self-directed, internal control perception, and energy (Youssef & Luthans, 2010). Employees with high hope would be encouraged to reach their goals and own determination and energy to accomplish the expectancy (Rego et al., 2010). Further, Youssef and Luthans (2010) add that optimism is a thinking mode whereby persons attribute perpetual positive circumstances to themselves. Meanwhile, Rego et al. (2010) argue that optimism is the persons’ hope that something good would occur to them. Optimists would not surrender easily and generally incline to possess an action plan in any problematic situation. Employees with optimistic characteristics would consider setback as a chance or challenge that could eventually direct to success (Luthans, Avolio, Walumbwa, & Li, 2005). The employees also have a more persistent characteristic in facing obstructions, and show more proficiently in evaluating the external context in a working environment (Youssef & Luthans, 2010).

Resilience is a capacity positive psychology, which could allow the employee to come up from breakdown and undertake extra tasks. The definition of ‘resilience’ is a capacity of positive psychology to evade conflict, failure, and uncertainty and to make positive progress, responsibility and change (Luthans & Jensen, 2002). Employees who have high resilience would possess the ability to face a meaningful life, receive reality and, highly, have the capability to adapt to changes (Coutu, 2002).

To compete effectively in the modern working environment, the organization does not only hire talented employees, but also ought to be able to encourage and support them to utilize every part of the skills they have to the work (Bakker, Albrecht, & Leiter, 2011). Nelson and Cooper (2007) state that the behavior of positive organization research has reported that employees who have psychological capital could demonstrate the jobs they have successfully.

The investment in the employee’s psychological capital is aimed to increase adequate competence for the employee to counter the globalization challenges and develop citizenship of an organization that, in turn, is directed to the effectiveness of the organization (Murthy, 2014). Employees who are more positive psychologically would show better OCB than the employees who are psychologically negative. They would utilize their minds and actions significantly by choosing time advantage. They would show their ability to perform proactive behaviors, for example, by creating suggestions or exchanging creative ideas for increasing employees’ work efficiency (Avey, Luthans, & Youssef, 2008).

Furthermore, employees with positive psychological capital would perform work simultaneously to establish a positive, unique life side in the working environment. They also would endeavor to be successful by finishing tasks well (Norman, Avey, Nimnicht, & Pigeon, 2010). Empirical results reveal that psychological capital decreases stress of employee (Luthans, Avey, & Jensen, 2009), develops OCB (Avey et al., 2008; Beal, Stavros, & Cole, 2013; Murthy, 2014), and increases performance of employee (Hodges, 2010; Karatepe & Talebzadeh, 2016; Kim et al., 2017; Liu, Hu, Wang, Sui, & Ma, 2013; F. Luthans, Avey, Avolio, & Peterson, 2010; Nguyen & Ngo, 2020; Norman et al., 2010; Peterson, Luthans, Avolio, Walumbwa, & Zhang, 2011; Venkatesh & Blaskovich, 2012).

H2: Psychological capital positively relates to OCB.
H3: Psychological capital positively relates to the performance of task.

2.3. Personality Traits of Big-Five

According to Darsana (2013), personality is frequently inferred to an individual’s character or attitude viewed in some circumstances. Moreover, Robbins and Judge (2011) claim that personality is the totality of the ways where persons interact with and respond to another. Personality is traits of complex behavior comprising of temperament (emotional response in react to sates or stimuli of the spontaneous environment) and the individual unique emotions, which differentiate a person from another (Han, 2020; Jalal, Zeb, & Fayyaz, 2019).

Cervone and Pervin (2013) mention that, in particular, two factors are responsible to affect personality: environmental and genetic factors. Environmental factors comprise family, social class, culture, situations, and peers, while genetic factors are concerned with the individual unique aspects.

Najari, Ahmadi, and Habibitabar (2011) declare that, in the model of Big-Five, personality is assessed by several dimensions that differentiate individuals from each other, consisting of conscientiousness, openness to experience, neuroticism, extroversion, and agreeableness. Conscientiousness concerns the goals that interests a person’s attention. People with a high scoring is inclined to listen to pursue consciously several goals purposefully. He/she is, hence, highly dependent, achievement-oriented and defensive. Openness to experience happens when an individual is attracted by innovation and novelty and is inclined to be intellectual, imaginative, and sensitive. He/she appears to be more conventional with his/her openness and reveals enjoyment in familiarity (Robbins & Judge, 2011).

Neuroticism concerns the individual’s ability to tolerate the stress and perform stability of positive emotion, which is indicated by calm, security, and passion (Robbins & Judge, 2011). Extroversion concerns pleasure at the individual level in communicating with another. High extroversion people are inclined to be recognized as open and friendly. Meanwhile, introverts are not fully open, and feel happier if they find themselves in solitude. Agreeableness concerns the
individual’s inclination to view submission to the other as the right behavior. People with high agreeableness believe in other people, are cooperative, and easy to please.

Personality traits of Big-Five act as a great role in deciding individuals’ behaviors and the habits that are free from external pressure. The personality traits of Big-Five tend to shape the feeling, behaving, and thinking in particular circumstances, and OCB is likewise conducted without any restriction. Hence, the personality traits of Big-Five and OCB are significantly related (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). Potentially, the personality traits of Big-Five could bring OCB in the working environment together by means of some processes of interconnected. Personality differences would influence how the employee is personally motivated, and also would influence how employee comprehends interpersonal circumstances. An employee who is emotionally stable would be inclined to offer help to another employee in their work completion (Najari et al., 2011).

Several researchers’ findings (Ahmadi, 2010; Kumar, Bakhshi, & Rani, 2009; Leephaijaroen, 2016; Najari et al., 2011; Podsakoff et al., 2000; Singh & Singh, 2009) have recognized that personality traits of Big-Five impact OCB. Mahdiou, Ghahramani, and Sharif (2010) reveal prospective variables of some personality traits of the Big-Five in predicting employees’ organizational citizenship behavior, comprising of conscientiousness, openness to experience, and agreeableness. Moreover, Malik, Ghafoor, and Iqba (2012) and Sjahruddin, Armanu, Sudiro, and Normijati (2013) noted that personality traits of Big-Five influence significantly positive on organizational citizenship behavior. Thus,

**H4**: Personality traits of Big-Five relate positively to OCB.

The personality traits of Big-Five have an essential role in increasing organizational performance effectiveness and efficiency. The effectiveness of the organization would improve strongly when it is reinforced and matched with the employees’ mental and personal characteristics (Askarian & Eslami, 2013). Different personalities form how the employee responds to the occurring circumstance in their working environment (Hooper-Boyd, 2012). An employee who enjoys his/her jobs would show completing assigned tasks better (Chu, Lee, & Chao, 2012).

Some studies also reveal that personality traits of Big-Five have a significant effect on commitment of organization (Abdullah, Omar, & Rashid, 2013), employee well-being (Marzuki, 2013), and employee performance (Askarian & Eslami, 2013; Bhatti, Battour, Ismail, & Sundram, 2014; Chu et al., 2012; Harris & Fleming, 2017; Hooper-Boyd, 2012). Hence,

**H5**: Personality traits of Big-Five relate positively to the performance of task.

### 3. Research Methodology

#### 3.1. Sample and Data Collection

The population surveyed was civilians who work in the electricity sector in South Sulawesi cities of Kolaka, Kendari, Wakatobi, and Bau-Bau. The sampling technique was completed through simple random sampling. There were 350 questionnaires distributed. Incomplete responses were eliminated, which resulted in 246 valid questionnaires (70.2%) for further analysis. From 246 respondents, 45% were female and 55% were male. Also, the age of the majority of respondents is 31-40 years (39.43%) and 41-50 years (33.33%), the work experience exceeded seven years for 47.38% of respondents and above seven years for 52.84%, in the same job. Respondents’ educational level was mostly university graduates (82.52%) and the remaining (17.48%) only attended senior high school (see Table 1).

#### 3.2. Measurement

There are 18 items contained in the questionnaire and those items were tested through a 5-point Likert scale: 1 is ‘strongly disagree’, 5 is ‘strongly agree’. Four dimensions were proposed to measure the psychological capital – hope, self-efficacy, optimism, and resilience (Bandura, 1997). Experience, extraversion, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and agreeableness, as part of Big-Five personality traits, were calculated from scale 1-to-4 as adopted from HPI or Hogan Personality Inventory (Hogan, Hogan, & Murtha, 1992). According to Podsakoff, Ahearne, and Mackenzie (1997), organizational citizenship behavior or OCB was estimated to include civic virtue, conscientiousness, altruism, sportsmanship, and courtesy. Working safely, inspecting, detecting and testing problems using equipment, planning and organizing work, and performing routine maintenance are items used to measure task performance as adapted from Campbell (1987).

#### 3.3. Structural Equation Modeling and Partial Least Squares

As part of multivariate analysis technique, structural equation modeling (SEM) tests theoretical models put forward by the researcher. Kline (1998) states that it employs the fusion of statistical data and qualitative causal assumption. The technique is emphasized more compared to exploration, also it is more appropriate to conduct testing rather than mere development of theory. There are two components as the results of SEM, those are the structural model and the measurement model. The structural model
brings robustness and orientation of latent variables’ relationship. Meanwhile, the measurement model allows association of observed variables and latent variables to deliver reliability and validity. Thus, the combination of structural model and measurement model is important to establish the research’s quality (Trochim & Donnelly, 2008).

There are two approaches in SEM: (1) a variance based approach regarding Partial Least Square (PLS); and (2) a covariance-based approach regarding certain tools such as Analysis of Moment Structures (AMOS) and EQS. PLS approach was chosen in this research to conduct data analysis based on the following reasons: requirements relationships research is quite original, and given this situation, there is no available measurement model to date; PLS can be an alternative technique to encounter new phenomena (Chin, 1998).

### Table 1: Designation of the Respondents

| Items             | Description          | Frequency | Percentage |
|-------------------|----------------------|-----------|------------|
| Gender            | Male                 | 135       | 54.88      |
|                   | Female               | 111       | 45.12      |
| Age               | < 21 years old       | 6         | 2.44       |
|                   | 21–30 years old      | 28        | 11.38      |
|                   | 31–40 years old      | 97        | 39.43      |
|                   | 41–50 years old      | 82        | 33.33      |
|                   | > 51 years old       | 33        | 13.42      |
| Education level   | University graduates | 203       | 82.52      |
|                   | Senior high school   | 43        | 17.48      |
| Work experience   | 1 – 3 years          | 36        | 14.63      |
|                   | 4 – 6 years          | 91        | 36.99      |
|                   | > 7 years            | 119       | 47.38      |
| Years on the same job | 1 – 3 years      | 35        | 14.23      |
|                   | 4 – 6 years          | 81        | 32.93      |
|                   | > 7 years            | 130       | 52.84      |

4. **Results**

In line with Hair, Black, Babin and Anderson’s finding (2010), the results of the measurement model show that overall the factor loadings, which have been standardized in every construct, were relatively high (>0.50) to secure the convergent validity. The combined Cronbach’s Alpha and reliability value for whole constructs (4) is >0.70, which secures internal consistency and this is in accordance with the research by (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010). Next, average variance extracted value or AVE of four constructs surpasses standard by 0.50 and was greater than the squared correlations between all set of constructs in this study (see Table 2). Considering the reliability and validity’s figures and measurements, hence, these circumstances are qualified for further hypotheses testing and structural models.

Table 3 shows the findings of the SmartPLS M3 Version 2.0 software proposed by Ringle, Wende, and Will (2005), also it was administered to examine hypotheses H1 to H5.

The findings reveal: (1) OCB was not notably associated with task performance ($t$-statistic = 0.288, $\beta = 0.008$); (2) psychological capital was remarkably connected to OCB ($t$-statistic = 3.051, $\beta = 0.091$), and task performance ($t$-statistic = 52.328, $\beta = 0.759$); and (3) personality traits were connected to OCB ($t$-statistic = 14.348, $\beta = 0.424$), and task performance ($t$-statistic = 6,249, $\beta = 0.110$). Findings concluded that H2, H3, H4, and H5 were accepted, except hypotheses H1.
Table 2: Results of Measurement Model

| Construct indicators      | Factor loadings | Cronbach α | Composite reliability | AVE   |
|---------------------------|-----------------|------------|-----------------------|-------|
| Task Performance          |                 | 0.787      | 0.853                 | 0.596 |
| 1. TP1                    | 0.856           |            |                       |       |
| 2. TP2                    | 0.687           |            |                       |       |
| 3. TP3                    | 0.664           |            |                       |       |
| 4. TP4                    | 0.858           |            |                       |       |
| OCB                       |                 | 0.953      | 0.966                 | 0.854 |
| 1. OCB1                   | 0.696           |            |                       |       |
| 2. OCB2                   | 0.979           |            |                       |       |
| 3. OCB3                   | 0.982           |            |                       |       |
| 4. OCB4                   | 0.957           |            |                       |       |
| 5. OCB5                   | 0.973           |            |                       |       |
| Personality Traits        |                 | 0.864      | 0.900                 | 0.644 |
| 1. PT1                    | 0.785           |            |                       |       |
| 2. PT2                    | 0.826           |            |                       |       |
| 3. PT3                    | 0.789           |            |                       |       |
| 4. PT4                    | 0.785           |            |                       |       |
| 5. PT5                    | 0.826           |            |                       |       |
| Psychological Capital     |                 | 0.628      | 0.772                 | 0.568 |
| 1. PC1                    | 0.770           |            |                       |       |
| 2. PC2                    | 0.511           |            |                       |       |
| 3. PC3                    | 0.571           |            |                       |       |
| 4. PC4                    | 0.832           |            |                       |       |

Table 3: Summary of Hypotheses Testing Results

| Hypotheses                        | β     | S.E    | T-value | Results         |
|-----------------------------------|-------|--------|---------|-----------------|
| OCB → Task Performance            | 0.008 | 0.028  | 0.288   | Not supported   |
| Psychological Capital → OCB       | 0.091*** | 0.029 | 3.051*** | Supported      |
| Psychological Capital → Task Performance | 0.759*** | 0.015 | 52.328*** | Supported      |
| Personality Traits → OCB          | 0.424*** | 0.029 | 14.348*** | Supported      |
| Personality Traits → Task Performance | 0.110*** | 0.018 | 6.249***  | Supported      |

Note: N = 246, ***Significant level < 0.05
5. Discussion

In an aggressive and uncertain business environment, belongingness between employees should be encouraged and strengthened by managers to be successful. At the moment, employees understand that they have become fixtures of certain corporation, they will perceive that their efforts are more significant, in effect, it will boost their performance. Also, managers got to integrate communication in an efficient and effective manner to foster OCB by, for instance, supporting open policies that emancipate workers to be actively involved in the process of making decision.

Murthy (2014) affirmed that the intention of psychological capital investment of employees is to establish adequate competency for employees to prepare themselves to the globalization challenges and enhance organizational citizenship in order to lead to organizational effectiveness. Workers with a stable and positive psychological state will reveal greater OCB than employees with a negative state. The employees’ actions and minds will be utilized to their potential by managing the available time. Employees will show skills to present proactive behaviors, namely, making suggestions for improvement or sharing creative ideas (Avey et al., 2008). The findings of this research are in line with previous research that shows a significant positive effect of psychological capital on OCB. Employees with positive psychological capital will perform task simultaneously to shape a positive and unique life in the work environment (Norman et al., 2010). Moreover, employees will struggle to accomplish success by carrying out orders in a better manner. Based on the significant positive effect of psychological capital on employee performance, this study supports the results of previous studies.

Personality also has to deal with determining employee behavior, in acting freely based on orders (Najari et al., 2011). The tendency to think, act, and feel are reflected in personality. Personality differences will affect the reaction of employees to particular situations happening in their work environment (Hooper-Boyd, 2012). Workers with stable feelings will allow other employees to receive assistance in carrying out their tasks. The findings of this research fortifies findings that there is a significant positive effect of Big-Five personality traits on OCB. Personality traits of Big-Five bring significant contribution in enhancing the organizational performance’s efficiency and effectiveness (Asiedu, M., Sarfo, J. O., & Adjei, D. (2014). Organisational Commitment and Citizenship Behaviour: Tools to Improve Employee Performance, An Internal Marketing Approach. European Scientific Journal, 10(4), 288-305).

6. Conclusion

The results of this research show that personality traits of Big-Five and psychological empowerment have significant role in supporting employee performance and the behavior of organizational citizenship in the electricity sector in Indonesia, specifically in four major cities (Kendari, Bau-Bau, Kolaka and Wakatobi city). This study adds more empirical evidence concerning the connection between the aforementioned variables.

This research has limitations. Firstly, this research only studies the outcome of personality traits of Big-Five and psychological capital and performance on OCB, thus, further research should integrate other factors contributing to organizational effectiveness. Secondly, further research should enlarge the study’s scope, for instance, (1) documenting the presumed connection in other industries and countries, (2) including other groups that might potentially exhibit OCB, namely, police, soldiers, salespeople, and other staff in the service sector, and (3) recruiting lecturers at public and private universities where the findings might be beneficial to create and develop guidelines for OCB and employee performance improvement in other sectors.

In terms of practical implication, the findings of this research posit that psychological capital and Big-Five personality traits aiming to improve employee performance can be most effective if specifically targeted at OCB. Given that both variables play an important role in promoting OCB, caring training initiatives that focus on mutual help can be very valuable for organizational improvement. In a managerial perspective, organizations can increase OCB by conducting open communication strategies between managers and employees to further stimulate and strengthen the ability of employees to display extra-role behaviors.
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