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Abstract

The study aimed at investigating the relationship between personality, stress and counterproductive workplace behaviours among employees of Ministry of Education and Sports. The study adopted a correlational study design with a population of 60 employees from the human resource department. Simple random sampling technique was used to draw a sample of 52 respondents from the population. Data was collected from respondents using self-administered standard questionnaire and through Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) data was entered and analyzed. Descriptive statistics showed that 51.9% of the respondents were female and 48.1% were male, majority were between 20-30 years (48.1%). Results from Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (r) further indicated that there was a no significant relationship between personality and stress (r=.210, p=.136); no significant relationship between personality and stress (r=-.143, p=.313); and there is a significant positive relationship between stress and counterproductive workplace behaviour (r=.401, p=.003). Thus, the findings of this study provide several recommendations to administrators and managers of the several organizations mostly government agencies in designing policies and procedures that will determine outcomes of their staff such as reduced stress and counterproductive workplace behaviours. Basing on the findings, organisations should therefore not discriminate individuals based on the personality traits they have during recruitment and selection. Major concern should be put on interventions aimed at reducing stress and counterproductive workplace behaviours. This is because there is no significant relationship between personality and stress as well as personality and counterproductive workplace behavior.
Chapter One

Introduction

Background

Employees serve as assets for an organization but when they are stressed then the results are increased absenteeism, low productivity, low motivation and usually legal financial damages which eventually affect the employee work behavior and leads him/her towards the counterproductive work behavior (Aftab & Javeed, 2012). Nonetheless, Counterproductive Work Behaviour may be understood as the behaviour which can harm or intended to harm self, people and organizational resources (Chand & Chand, 2014). The Counterproductive Work Behaviour is an act which may be directed towards both the organization and individuals. Counterproductive Work Behaviour has become a significant concern in organizations (Appelbaum et al., 2005 as cited in Radzali, Ahmad & Omar, 2013) and has received much attention among researchers (Bennett & Robinson, 2000, 2003; Colbert et al., 2004; Dunlop & Lee, 2004; Liao et al., 2004).

Accordingly, Kinicki, (2008) refers to an individual’s personality as a stable set of characteristics responsible for a person’s identity, implying that such characteristics do not change over a long period of time. On the other hand, Asmawati et al., (2013) notes that occupational stress is harmful physical and emotional responses that occur when the requirements of the job do not match the capabilities, resources, or needs of the worker. However, according to one school of thought, differences in individual characteristics such as personality and coping style are most important in predicting whether certain job conditions will result in stress or not. In other words, what is stressful for one person may not be a problem for another. According to Asmawati et al., (2013), results of Pearson Correlation test showed that
there is a meaningful positive correlation between job stress and psychoticism and neuroticism. However the result also showed that extraversion showed negative correlation with occupational stress.

According to a study by Aftab and Javeed (2012), results showed that the overall sample was facing occupational stress mainly due to huge deal of attention demanded by their work beyond normal jobs range, remember many things, excessive workload than normal work, forced to work more by their supervisors and employers, poor communication, no appreciation received from management, unfair performance evaluation system, inappropriate working conditions and inappropriate salaries and rewards. The results of this study also revealed that the job stress among employees lead them somewhat towards counter-productive work behavior and there was a sufficient positive correlation exist between job stress & employee CWB.

Metofe, (2017), identified conscientiousness, a personality trait as a predictor of CWB, and Fallon, Avis, Kudisch, Gornet, and Frost (2000) further asserted that individuals low on conscientiousness are likely to exhibit CWB. According to the Affective events theory model (Weiss & Brief, 2002), job satisfaction mediates the relationship between personality traits and CBWs. This model further posits that employees with job dissatisfaction, assuming low scores on agreeableness and conscientiousness scales of a personality measure are likely to engage in CBWs and those employees with high job satisfaction, assuming high scores on the agreeableness and conscientiousness scales, are less likely to enact CBWs.

Natukunda, (2008) revealed that due to the nurse-patient ratio in most of public hospitals in Uganda being not balanced, this to her was such a clear indicator these nurses experience a great deal of work-related stress. On the other hand, according to the Ministry of Finance Report
(2009), it was noted that there were high levels of employee deviant behavior among the employees due to dissatisfaction.

Thus, organizations need to shift attention to how they carry out recruitment and selection of prospective employees such that probably a person-job fit is achieved if they are to practically manage employee’s stress at work and also if they are to reduce on the probability of such employees engaging in deviant behavior at work. Therefore, this study aimed at investigating the relationship between personality, stress and counterproductive workplace behaviours among employees of Ministry of Education and Sports.

**Statement of the problem**

Most employees in Uganda are facing high levels of work-related stress, which has led them to engage in deviant workplace behaviours such as sabotage, theft, abuse, and withdrawal and production deviance as a means of counter reacting to such stress levels. The latter is presumed to be attributed to the fact that people are different and thus react differently to such encounters like stress at work. Thus, if organizations fail to develop effective strategies aimed at reducing work-related stress, employee’s likelihood to engage in deviant workplace behavior may increase.

**Purpose of the study**

The purpose of the study was to investigate the relationship between personality, stress and counterproductive workplace behaviours among employees of Ministry of Education and Sports.

**Objectives of the study**

The study was guided by the objectives below;
1. To examine the relationship between personality and stress among employees of Ministry of Education and Sports.

2. To establish whether stress and counterproductive workplace behaviours are significantly related among employees of Ministry of Education and Sports.

3. To investigate the relationship between personality and counterproductive workplace behaviours among employees of Ministry of Education and Sports.

Scope of the study

Geographical Scope

The study was conducted at Ministry of Education and Sports. The research was conducted in this place because, the research finds it relevant such a study in such a place and partly because of ease for access to the premises and also because the researcher assumed she would collect first-hand information from the respondents.

Content Scope

The study focused on personality, stress and counterproductive behaviours. Under personality, the researcher considered components of openness to experience, conscientiousness, extroversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism. Thus according to Kinicki, (2008) personality is a stable set of characteristics responsible for a person’s identity.

While occupational stress is defined as the harmful physical and emotional responses that occur when the requirements of the job do not match the resources, capabilities and needs of the worker (Lindholm, 2006; Nakasis & Ouzouni, 2008).

Lastly, Counterproductive Work Behaviour (CWB) is defined as any deliberate or unintentional activity on the part of an individual which can hamper the performance of self, others or organization (Chand & Chand, 2014). Spector, Fox, Penney, Brursema, Goh, and
Kessler (2006) classified CWBs into five main dimensions. Based on their treatment, we use the following classification in this research:

**Abuse** It consists of harmful behaviours directed toward co-workers and others that harm either physically or psychologically through making threats, nasty comments, ignoring the person, or undermining the person’s ability to work effectively.

**Production Deviance** It is the purposeful failure to perform job tasks effectively the way they are supposed to be performed.

**Sabotage** It is defacing or destroying physical property belonging to the employer; intentional wasting of the materials in the organization and Purposely dirtied or littered the place of work.

**Theft**- wrongfully taking the personal goods or property of another.

**Withdrawal** It is consists of behaviours that restrict the amount of time working to less than is required by the organization. It includes absence, arriving late or leaving early, and taking longer breaks than authorized.

**Significance**

This research has important employee behavior implications among employees of Ministry of Education and Sports. in terms of examination of personality, occupational stress and deviant behavior providing significant information to management and policy makers within the ministry to formulate policies that aim at providing good quality services to its clients.

The study will be of help to students who will be seeking research material and knowledge on the relationship among the variables of personality, occupational stress and counterproductive workplace behaviours.
Figure 1: Shows the relationship between variables of personality, occupational stress and Counterproductive workplace behaviour.
Chapter Two
Literature Review

Introduction

This chapter involves literature review of other researchers giving details on the relationship between the variables of the study. This chapter is divided into various subsections which constitute the relationship between personality and stress, personality and counterproductive workplace behaviour and lastly stress and counterproductive workplace behaviour.

Personality and Stress

Personality theorists have proposed five fundamental personality dimensions – Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism and Openness to experience, collectively labelled the Big Five (Goldberg, 1990; McCrae & Costa, 1997). Extraversion refers to a person’s engagement with the external world and social relationships; people who score highly on Extraversion are usually sociable, assertive, cheerful and exuberant. Agreeableness captures an individual’s concern with social harmony, and people who have high levels of Agreeableness are good natured, cooperative, trusting and warm. Conscientiousness reflects a person’s reliability and self-control; a highly conscientious person is hard-working, responsible, self-disciplined and persistent. Neuroticism represents an individual’s emotion regulation and tendency to experience negative feelings; people with low levels of Neuroticism are calm, secure, emotionally stable and self-confident. Openness to experience denotes an individual’s creativity and adventurousness; people who score highly on Openness to experience are generally imaginative, curious, expressive and eager to try new things or challenge convention.
There is strong evidence that the personality traits of the Big Five model are related to job performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991) and positive work attitudes such as job satisfaction (Judge, Heller & Mount, 2002), and commitment (Erdheim, Wang, & Zickar, 2006). It is therefore reasonable to suppose similar associations with stress, and this has prompted a number of empirical studies.

According to a study by Asmawati (2013) Pearson correlation test results showed that there is a meaningful positive correlation between job stress and psychoticism and neuroticism. It was proposed that the neuroticism dimension indicated emotional instability and reactivity, and that individuals who score high on this dimension tend to be anxious, depressive, overly emotional, shy, and have low self-esteem. Individuals with these traits of personality will easily experience job stress. The positive link between job stress and neuroticism is endorsed by several research findings (Srivastava 2001; Kumaresean 2004; Grant & Langan-Fox 2006; Smithikrai 2007) which are contrary to this study’s findings.

Mroczek and Almeida (2004) conducted a study regarding stress levels and the Five-Factor Model of personality. According to these researchers, those higher in neuroticism react to stressful events in a more aversive and negative way. The results showed a significant positive correlation between stress and levels of neuroticism, and that those participants that scored higher on neuroticism reported an over-all higher amount of stress on any given day.

According to a study by Deary, Agius, Sadler, (1996), a randomly selected group of consultant psychiatrists (n = 39) working within the NHS in Scotland was compared with a combined group of physicians and surgeons (n = 149) on several variables related to the stress process, including personality traits, coping strategies, psychological distress, burnout, job stress
and work demands. Psychiatrists reported fewer clinical work demands (p < .001), and their mean personality scores were significantly different from physicians and surgeons by being high in neuroticism (p = .009), openness (p = .003) and agreeableness (p = .002), and low in conscientiousness (p = .04). Psychiatrists reported higher work-related emotional exhaustion (p = .03) and severe depression (p = .02). However, psychiatrists did not report more work-related stress than physicians and surgeons. Many stress-related variables were highly correlated within the group of psychiatrists, suggesting that there is a very general disposition to experience negative emotion (including job-related stress) in some individuals. Organizational and personal contributions to stress in the practice of psychiatry are considered. There are personality characteristics that might dispose some people toward psychiatry as a career and toward stress. However, there is no evidence to suggest that screening for admission to psychiatry in terms of personality or other psychological factors would be useful or advisable.

Bedin et al. (2015) whose study assessed the relationship between the personality traits and stress levels in children. The Scale of Children Personality Traits and the Scale of Infant Stress were administered. The personality trait dimensions referred to were: neuroticism, psychoticism, extroversion and sociability, and the stress dimensions referred to were: levels of stress resistance, alertness, near-exhaustion and exhaustion and the stress reaction types regarding the psychological, psychological with depressing component, psychophysiological and physic types. Fifty children of both genders were assessed; all of them studied in classes from the first to the fourth grades of an elementary public school. The data indicate moderate and positive correlations between the neuroticism and stress levels traits, being mainly evidenced in psychological reactions. On the other hand, the traits psychoticism, extroversion and sociability did not present significant correlations with the sample stress levels.
A number of studies reporting a link between extraversion and stress also report connections between extraversion and coping. It has been reported that extraverts experience more positive stressful life events (Magnus, Diener, Fujita, & Pavot, 1993), selectively attend to positive aspects of stressors (Hemenover & Dienstbier, 1996), and engage in more social support and help seeking when encountering stressors (Amirkhan, Risinger, & Swickert, 1995). Extraversion has been associated predominantly with active, problem-focused coping (Amirkhan, Risinger, & Swickert, 1995; Penley & Tomaka, 2002), and reports of less subjective stress and fear following a stressor (Penley & Tomaka, 2002). In contrast, extraversion has been inversely related to emotion-focused coping and avoidance (Amirkhan, Risinger, & Swickert, 1995). These findings support a retired notion that problem-focused coping is always more adaptive than emotion-focused coping.

**Personality and Counterproductive Workplace Behaviour**

Deviant workplace behavior has become a significant concern in organizations (Appelbaum et al., 2005 as cited in Radzali, Ahmad, & Omar, 2013) and has received much attention among researchers (Bennett & Robinson, 2000, 2003; Colbert et al., 2004; Dunlop & Lee, 2004; Liao et al., 2004).

Several previous studies examining the predictors of counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs) have found positive relationships for neuroticism and negative relationships for conscientiousness and agreeableness. We extend this research by examining whether employee personality traits interact with each other to influence CWBs. Because conscientiousness and agreeableness may suppress one's tendency to engage in CWBs, thus according to Bowling, et al., (2011) found out that that the neuroticism–CWB relationship was weaker among workers
who are high in either conscientiousness or agreeableness than among workers who are low in these traits.

Intan et al., (2013) study aimed at investigating the influence of big five personality traits towards CWB, targeted on CWB-O and CWB-I. The findings showed there was a relationship between CWB-O and big five personality traits, except for extraversion and conscientiousness. Agreeableness was found to have a negative relationship with CWB-O, which indicated employees with high agreeableness were more likely to demonstrate lower CWB-O. The regression model showed that all research questions had been partially supported. Agreeableness, neuroticism, and openness to experience did influenced employees’ CWB while extraversion only influenced CWB-I. Agreeableness had been found to have the strongest influence on employees’ CWB.

According to a survey study by Yuxin, Huawei, Jianwei, & Liangliang, (2011) which explored the effects of big five personality dimensions on CWBs. Using data of 447 participants, hierarchical regression analyses revealed that conscientiousness had significant predictive power on both property CWB and production CWB. Among the five personality factors, conscientiousness and neuroticism had significant predictive power on general CWB. Emotional social support were found to moderate the relationship between conscientiousness and production CWB, and also between neuroticism and general CWB.

**Stress and Counterproductive Workplace Behaviour**

Stress has become a major challenge for the organizations due to its immense occurrence and according to Aftab & Javeed (2012)-he asserts that, the employees work behavior is greatly effected due to stress. Much of the studies on deviant workplace behavior that investigate stress factors contributing to the prevalence of deviant behavior have focused on job-related stress
factors such as workload and job stress (Douglas & Martinko, 2001; Fox et al., 2001; Lee & Allen, 2002; Omar et al., 2011).

A study conducted on 162 employees from a public organization in Malaysia revealed that there was a positive relationship between job stress and deviant workplace behavior (Omar et al., 2011). In this study, employees who experienced negative emotions such as frustration and irritation due to work-related stress were more prone to exhibit deviant behaviors at their workplace. According to Spector and Fox (2005), deviant workplace behavior occurs due to employee’s reaction to job stress and other factors that can induce negative emotions. Other studies have also shown that job stress is a major factor that causes several forms of deviance behavior (Sulksky & Smith, 2005; Spector & Fox, 2005) and among the forms of deviance are absenteeism, alcoholism, substance abuse, low job motivation and low productivity (Safaria et al., 2010).

According to Piar, & Pawan (2014), conducted to understand the cause and effect relationship between Counterproductive Work Behaviour (CWB) and Job stressors among junior managers (scale -1 officer) of Indian public sector banks. A total of 300 junior managers (scale -1 officers) were chosen through purposive sampling technique from various Indian public sector banks. Result of research study reveals sabotage, withdrawal and theft dimensions of counterproductive work behaviour were found positive and significant in correlation with organization constraints, quantitative workload inventory, inter personal conflict at workplace and physical symptoms inventory dimensions of job stressors. Theft dimension of CWB was found positive and significant in correlation with interpersonal conflict at workplace and quantitative workload inventory dimensions of job stressors, among scale-1 officers of Indian Public Sector Banks. No significant correlation was found between theft and physical symptoms
inventory, abuse and organization constraint scale, abuse and interpersonal conflict at workplace. Production deviance another dimension of CWB was also found, insignificant in correlation with organization constraint scale, interpersonal conflict at workplace; physical symptoms inventory dimensions of job stressor among scale-1 officers of Indian Public Sector Banks.

An explanation of relation between job stressor and CWB can also be based on the Hobfoll (1989) conservation of resources (COB) theory. According to the theory, People strive to protect and retain resources under stressful condition. Hence, it is proposed that individual may perform CWB behaviour as a reactive mechanism primarily cued by stressful circumstances that interact with personality and allowing them to protect themselves from future losses (Gallagher et al., 2008).

In fact, Mohammad Esmaeel Ansari et al. (2013) define that high perception of organizational constraints at work places causes the employees hopelessness, indifference, and frustration. In the end, the employees perform special behaviors, such as getting away from their tasks and being late at work, etc. Fox et al. (2001) reported that some organizational constraints (for example, situational constraints resulting from policies and procedures, lack of resources.) are positive correlated with counterproductive behavior, especially with such as revenge. They also showed that for individuals with high scores on trait anxiety, the high levels of constraints were associated with high levels of interpersonal counterproductive behaviors. For those who had high scores for anger, high levels of conflict were associated with high levels of interpersonal behavioral counterproductive. Mehta (2000), also, showed in his research that some organizational constraints are significant predictors of both organizational and interpersonal counterproductive behaviors. A high workload is likely to make feel workers uncertain about whether they can get all of the work done (Beehr & Bhagat, 1985). Indeed, Krischer, Penney, &
Hunter (2010) showed that workload would lead more likely to act CWB toward organization rather than toward organizational members.

**Hypotheses**

The researcher adopted the following hypotheses:

1. There is a significant relationship between personality and stress.
2. There is a significant relationship between personality and counterproductive workplace behaviour.
3. Stress is significantly related to counterproductive workplace behaviour.
Chapter Three

Methodology

Introduction

This chapter entails the methodology that were used in the study to investigate the research objectives. This includes research design, population, sample, instrument, measures, procedure, quality control, data management, data analysis and ethical consideration.

Research Design

This study adopted a correlational research design that is quantitative in nature. This design is chosen because it allows a sizeable amount of information about the characteristics of a particular group to be obtained from the target sample at one point in time and most important because the purpose of the study is to investigate the relationship between the personality, counterproductive workplace behavior and stress.

Population

The population for this study comprised of 60 employees from the human resources department of Ministry of Education and Sports.

Sample Size and Selection Technique

The study sample was 52 respondents both male and female and this was determined using Krejcie and Morgan (1970) table of sampling. A simple random sampling technique was used to select the respondents for participation in the study. A simple random sampling technique was used in order to avoid biasness during selection of respondents.
**Instrument**

A self-administered questionnaire was used in the data collection process. The questionnaire sought responses on bio data, personality, stress and lastly, counterproductive workplace behaviour.

**Measures**

This describes how the variables in the study were measured. The study adopted previously validated and reliable scales from the literature to measure the variables. Scales items were scored using a 5-point Likert scale format.

**Instruments**

Big five inventory (BFI), by John et al., (2008) - summarized version was used to measure five dimensions of personality. It is a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 0-5 (where 1 = strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=agree and 5 =agree strongly). It includes 16 statements that ask the respondents to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with a particular statement. These statements are related to five dimensions of personality.

Stress was measured on a five (5) point scale with 15 items developed by Driscoll and Beehr (1994) on a scale ranging from strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), not sure (3), agree (4) and lastly, strongly agree (5).

Counterproductive Workplace Behaviour was measured using a scale developed by Jamal and Baba (2001). The questionnaire is made up of 14 items. Items are presented in Likert-type format with a scale ranging from 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.

**Procedure**

The researcher obtained an introductory letter from School of Psychology Makerere University. The researcher then sought permission from the human resource manager at the
Ministry of Education and Sports in order to access the targeted respondents. The researcher always explained the purpose of the research to the target respondents before distributing the questionnaire to them. The filled questionnaires were collected immediately from the respondents who have completed them there and then. However, for the respondents were busy, they were given a time frame to complete the questionnaires and the researcher would thereafter collect them, start data entry, analysis and subsequent report writing.

**Quality Control**

This concerns the reliability and validity of the data collection instrument. The researcher ensured validity by adopting instrument that have been used before and validated by other researchers. However, the instrument were also given to the supervisor to ascertain for validity of the items on the instruments and where necessary adjustments were done. Since standard instruments were adopted for this study with already determined reliability coefficients, it was predetermined that the measuring instruments were reliable.

**Data management**

Data collected from the field was edited and coded accordingly to ensure easy analysis. Background data for each respondent was coded for example gender was coded as; Male” coded as 1, and “Female” coded as 2, Age range from ’20-30 years’ coded as 1, “31-40 years” coded as 2; “41 to 50” coded as 3, ’51 year and above’ coded as 4. Education levels, Master’s Degree coded as 1, Bachelor coded as 2, Diploma coded as 3, Certificate coded as 4 and others coded as 5.

**Data analysis**

The collected data was edited for incompleteness and inconsistency to ensure correctness and completeness of the information given. Background information data was coded and
analyzed using descriptive statistics. The descriptive analysis was done using statistics such as frequency, percentages and presented in tabular form. Pearson correlation coefficient was used to test the significance and the direction of the relationship between the study variables. All the above was done using Statistical Package for Social Scientist (SPSS) version 21.

**Ethical Consideration**

At the onset of data collection, the researcher sought permission from the management at the Head office of Ministry of Education and Sports to carry out the study. In addition, the researcher also sought for consent from the target respondents. The respondents were further assured of confidentiality of the information provided and that the study findings were to be used for academic purpose strictly. The respondents were further assured of their personal protection and that they have the authority to refuse or accept to participate in the study.
Chapter Four

Findings

Introduction

This chapter consists of results and interpretation of the findings in line with the objectives of the study and hypothesis generated after review of relevant literature. The data presented includes both descriptive statistics and inferential statistics of Pearson’s correlation for the three hypotheses generated in chapter two.

Descriptive Statistics

Respondents were asked to indicate their age, sex, marital status and level of education. The results were obtained and computed into frequencies and percentages as shown in the tables below;

Age of the Respondents

Table 1: Showing respondent’s distribution by age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of respondents</th>
<th>Frequency(N)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-30 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results in Table 1 above show that the majority of respondents were between 20-30 years (48.1%) followed by the respondents between 31-40 years (40.4%), and the minority being those between 41-50 years (11.5%).
Gender of Respondents

Table 2: Showing respondent’s distribution by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency (N)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results in table 2 further show that majority of the respondents were female (51.9%), followed by male (48.1%) respectively.

Marital status of the respondents

Table 3: Showing respondent’s distribution by marital status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Frequency (N)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results in table 3 also show that majority of the respondents were married (57.7%), followed by those that are single (42.3%).
Level of Education of the respondents

Table 4: showing respondent’s distribution by level of education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of education</th>
<th>Frequency (N)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, results in table 4 also show that the majority of the respondents were Bachelor’s degree holders and master’s degree holders (48.1%), while Certificate holders (3.8%) were the minority.
**Inferential statistics**

The table below presents Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation Coefficient of the relationship between personality and stress.

**Correlation between personality and stress.**

**Table 5 : Showing correlation between personality and stress.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Personality</th>
<th></th>
<th>Stress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

The first hypothesis stated that personality and stress are significantly related. Results in table 5 above shows that P=.136 ≥ 0.01, r=.210. Since the P-value is greater in magnitude than the level of significance, the alternative hypothesis stated before is rejected and it is concluded that personality and stress are not significantly related. This implies that the level of stress experienced by employees at work is not as a direct result of their personality.
Correlation between Personality and Counterproductive Workplace Behaviour.

Table 6: Showing correlation between personality and counterproductive workplace behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Personality</th>
<th>Counterproductive Workplace Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>- .143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countepractive</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>- .143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Behavior</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The second hypothesis stated that personality and counterproductive workplace behavior are significantly related. Results in table 6 above show that P=.313 0.01, r=-.143. Since the P-value is greater in magnitude than the level of significance, the alternative hypothesis above is rejected and it is concluded that personality and counterproductive workplace behavior are not significantly related. This implies that an individual’s personality does not directly influence him/her to engage in any deviant behavior at the workplace.
The third hypothesis stated that stress and counterproductive workplace behaviour are significantly related. Results in table 7 above shows that $P=0.003 \leq 0.01$, $r=.401$. Since the $P$-value is less in magnitude than the level of significance, the alternative hypothesis stated earlier is retained and it is concluded that stress and counterproductive workplace behaviour are significantly positively related. This implies that, when employees stress increases given factors such as work overload and role conflict, such employee’s level at which they engage in deviant behaviors at work also increases. However, when employees stress decreases given factors such as work overload and role conflict have reduced, such employee’s level at which they engage in deviant behaviors at work also reduce.
Chapter Five

Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendations

Introduction

This chapter is composed of the discussion of the results of the study, conclusions drawn from the study and recommendations suggested according to the findings of the study.

Personality and Stress

The first alternative hypothesis stated that there is a significant relationship between personality and stress. Findings of this study reveal that there is no significant relationship between personality and stress. This implies that the different levels of stress experienced by employees at work is not as a direct result of their personality. Additionally, possible explanations could include that different personalities appraise and subsequently respond to stressful situations differently that is, the different stressors at work are experienced different by employees that is what could be a stressing to one may not stressing to another irrespective of their different personalities. Nonetheless, neuroticism was found to be highly responsible for occupational stress among blue collar employees in Indian manufacturing sector (Deary et al., 2014) which is inconsistent with the findings of the this study.

The findings are inconsistent with Bedin et al. (2015) whose study assessed the relationship between the personality traits and stress levels in children. The Scale of Children Personality Traits and the Scale of Infant Stress were administered. The personality trait dimensions referred to were: neuroticism, psychoticism, extroversion and sociability, and the stress dimensions referred to were: levels of stress resistance, alertness, near-exhaustion and exhaustion. The data indicate moderate and positive correlations between the neuroticism and stress levels traits, being mainly evidenced in psychological reactions. On the other hand, the
traits psychoticism, extroversion and sociability did not present significant correlations with the sample stress levels.

The results are in disagreement with Asmawati (2013) whose results of Pearson correlation test showed that there is a meaningful positive correlation between job stress and psychoticism and neuroticism. It was proposed that the neuroticism dimension indicated emotional instability and reactivity, and that individuals who score high on this dimension tend to be anxious, depressive, overly emotional, shy, and have low self-esteem. Individuals with these traits of personality will easily experience job stress. The positive link between job stress and neuroticism is endorsed by several research findings (Srivastava 2001; Kumaresean 2004; Grant & Langan-Fox 2006; Smithikrai 2007) which are contrary to this study’s findings.

The results are in disagreement with earlier study by Mroczek and Almeida (2004) who conducted a study regarding stress levels and the Five-Factor Model of personality. According to these researchers, those higher in neuroticism react to stressful events in a more aversive and negative way. The results showed a significant positive correlation between stress and levels of neuroticism, and that those participants that scored higher on neuroticism reported an over-all higher amount of stress on any given day.

The results are in disagreement with earlier study by Deary, Agius, and Sadler, (1996), who randomly selected group of consultant psychiatrists (n = 39) working within the NHS in Scotland was compared with a combined group of physicians and surgeons (n = 149) on several variables related to the stress process, including personality traits, coping strategies, psychological distress, burnout, job stress and work demands. Psychiatrists reported fewer clinical work demands (p < .001), and their mean personality scores were significantly different from physicians and surgeons by being high in neuroticism (p = .009), openness (p = .003) and
agreeableness (p = .002), and low in conscientiousness (p = .04). Psychiatrists reported higher work-related emotional exhaustion (p = .03) and severe depression (p = .02). However, psychiatrists did not report more work-related stress than physicians and surgeons. Many stress-related variables were highly correlated within the group of psychiatrists, suggesting that there is a very general disposition to experience negative emotion (including job-related stress) in some individuals. Organizational and personal contributions to stress in the practice of psychiatry are considered. There are personality characteristics that might dispose some people toward psychiatry as a career and toward stress. However, there is no evidence to suggest that screening for admission to psychiatry in terms of personality or other psychological factors would be useful or advisable.

**Personality and counterproductive workplace behaviour.**

Findings tested by Pearson correlational coefficient (r) revealed that personality and counterproductive workplace behaviour are not significantly related to each other which is inconsistent with the alternative hypothesis stated in chapter two. This implies that an individual’s personality does not directly influence him/her to engage in any deviant behavior at the workplace. Additionally, the results imply that, employee who engaging in counterproductive workplace behavior at the workplace do not necessarily have to be as a result of having certain dispositional characteristics (for example, being an extrovert or an introvert).

Results are consistent with the study made by Michielsen, (2004); LePine et al., (2004), and Witt et al., (2004), but inconsistent with the results obtained by Deary et al., (2003). Lastly, the differences of findings from previous study were due to the different industry, geographical area and employee’s perception towards the organization.
The findings are in disagreement with those by Yuxin, Huawei, Jianwei, and Liangliang, (2011) which explored the effects of big five personality dimensions on CWBs. Using data of 447 participants, hierarchical regression analyses revealed that conscientiousness had significant predictive power on both property CWB and production CWB. Among the five personality factors, conscientiousness and neuroticism had significant predictive power on general CWB. Emotional social support were found to moderate the relationship between conscientiousness and production CWB, and also between neuroticism and general CWB.

The results of this study are in disagreement with Intan et al., (2013); whose study aimed at investigating the influence of big five personality traits towards CWB, targeted on CWB-O and CWB-I. The findings showed there was a relationship between CWB-O and big five personality traits, except for extraversion and conscientiousness. Agreeableness was found to have a negative relationship with CWB-O, which indicated employees with high agreeableness were more likely to demonstrate lower CWB-O. The regression model showed that all research questions had been partially supported. Agreeableness, neuroticism, and openness to experience did influenced employees’ CWB while extraversion only influenced CWB-I. Agreeableness had been found to have the strongest influence on employees’ CWB.

The result of this study are inconsistent with the previous study made by Bolton, (2010). Big Five personality traits have been found to influence CWB-I (Bolton, 2010). Similarly, the results of this study are inconsistent with the previous study made by O’Neill et al., (2011), which showed that there was a relationship between conscientiousness and CWB-I.
Stress and counterproductive workplace behaviour.

One of the objective of this study was to investigate the relationship between stress and counterproductive workplace behaviours among employees of Ministry of Education and Sports. The results of this study indicated that stress is significantly positively related to counterproductive workplace behaviours. This implies that, when employees stress increases given factors such as work overload and role conflict, such employee’s level at which they engage in deviant behaviors at work also increases. However, when employees stress decreases given factors such as work overload and role conflict have reduced, such employee’s level at which they engage in deviant behaviors at work also reduce. Counterproductive Workplace Behaviour (CWBs) sometimes can be seen as an innocent reaction to unfair treatment by employers and stress. Therefore, workers feel that they have been left petrified and powerless at work; the only weapon they can use to stand up for their rights is engaging in CWBs, especially the passive type. As well as employers, organizational conditions can cause CWBs too.

The findings are in agreement with Omar et al., (2011) who conducted a study on 162 employees from a public organization in Malaysia and results revealed that there was a positive relationship between job stress and deviant workplace behavior (Omar et al., 2011). In this study, employees who experienced negative emotions such as frustration and irritation due to work-related stress were more prone to exhibit deviant behaviors at their workplace. According to Spector and Fox (2005), deviant workplace behavior occurs due to employee’s reaction to job stress and other factors that can induce negative emotions.

Additionally, the results are consistent with other studies such as Sulksky and Smith, (2005); Spector and Fox, (2005) who found out that job stress is a major factor that causes
several forms of deviance behavior; and among the forms of deviance are absenteeism, alcoholism, substance abuse, low job motivation and low productivity (Safaria et. al., 2010).

The findings are in agreement with the earlier results by Piar, and Pawan (2014), conducted to understand the cause and effect relationship between Counterproductive Work Behaviour (CWB) and Job stressors among junior managers (scale -1 officer) of Indian public sector banks. A total of 300 junior managers (scale -1 officers) were chosen through purposive sampling technique from various Indian public sector banks. Result of research study revealed sabotage, withdrawal and theft dimensions of counterproductive work behaviour were found positive and significant in correlation with organization constraints, quantitative workload inventory, inter personal conflict at workplace and physical symptoms inventory dimensions of job stressors. Theft dimension of CWB was found positive and significant in correlation with interpersonal conflict at workplace and quantitative workload inventory dimensions of job stressors, among scale-1 officers of Indian Public Sector Banks. No significant correlation was found between theft and physical symptoms inventory, abuse and organization constraint scale, abuse and interpersonal conflict at workplace. Production deviance another dimension of CWB was also found, insignificant in correlation with organization constraint scale, interpersonal conflict at workplace; physical symptoms inventory dimensions of job stressor among scale-1 officers of Indian Public Sector Banks.

The results are in agreement with Hobfoll’s (1989) explanation of relation between job stressor and CWB can also be based on the conservation of resources (COB) theory. According to the theory, People strive to protect and retain resources under stressful condition. Hence, it is proposed that individual may perform CWB behaviour as a reactive mechanism primarily cued
by stressful circumstances that interact with personality and allowing them to protect themselves from future losses (Gallagher et al., 2008).

The findings are in agreement with Fox et al. (2001) who reported that some organizational constraints (for example, situational constraints resulting from policies and procedures, lack of resources) as an indicator of stress are positive correlated with counterproductive behavior, especially with revenge as an indicator. They also showed that for individuals with high scores on trait anxiety, the high levels of constraints were associated with high levels of interpersonal counterproductive behaviors. For those who had high scores for anger, high levels of conflict were associated with high levels of interpersonal behavioral counterproductive. Mehta (2000), also, showed in his research that some organizational constraints are significant predictors of both organizational and interpersonal counterproductive behaviors.

**Conclusion**

This study aimed at investigating the relationship between personality, stress and counterproductive workplace behaviours among employees of Ministry of Education and Sports. Results after Pearson correlation analysis revealed that personality is not significantly related to stress, personality is not significantly related to counterproductive workplace behaviour but stress is significantly positively related to counterproductive workplace behaviour.

**Recommendations**

The findings of this study provide several insights (such as knowing that individuals appraise different situations at work) to administrators and managers of the several organizations mostly government agencies in designing policies and procedures that will determine outcomes of their staff such as reduced stress and counterproductive workplace behaviours.
Organizations should enhance their stress management strategies as this could lead to decrease relatively the frequency with which employees engage in CWB. Strategies such as reducing on the workload, improving work conditions among others may help improve on the overall employee attitude which serves to increase the organization`s competitive advantage.

Basing on the findings, organisations should therefore not discriminate individuals based on the personality traits they have during recruitment and selection. Major concern should be put on interventions aimed at reducing stress and CWB`s. This is because there is no significant relationship between personality and stress as well as personality and CWB`s.
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Appendices

Appendix I-Questionnaire

Dear respondent, as part of the requirements for the partial fulfilment of the award of a Bachelor in Industrial and Organizational Psychology Degree, I am required to carry out research. My topic of interest is Personality, Stress and Counterproductive Workplace Behaviors among Employees. You have been selected to participate by responding to the following questions, simply tick/circle were appropriate. The questionnaire has four sections, that is Section A, B, C and D.

SE**CTION A: BIO DATA**

1) Sex of respondent:

a) Male □ b) Female □

2) Age group in years:

a) 20-30 years □ b) 31-40 years □ c) 41-50 years □ d) 51 yrs and above □

3) Level of Education:

a) Master’s Degree □ b) Bachelor’s degree □

c) Diploma □ d) Certificate □ e) Other qualifications □

4) Marital status:

a) Married □ b) Single □

**SECTION B; Personality**
Using the scale given below, please circle/tick the number by each statement that best represents the extent to which you agree with the given statements. Before you start, quickly read through the entire list to get a feel for how to rate each statement. Remember there is no right or wrong answer, and your honest opinion is critical to the success of this study. All your responses will be kept confidential.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I see myself as someone who...........</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Is talkative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Tends to find faults with others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Is reserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Does a thorough job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Generates a lot of enthusiasm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Is original, comes up with new ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Is helpful and unselfish with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Starts quarrels with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Has an active imagination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Can be moody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Values artistic, aesthetic experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Make plans and follows through with them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION C; Stress

Please indicate the extent to which you strongly agree or disagree with the following statements about your feelings toward this organization by ticking appropriate scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I do not enjoy my work
2. There is too much pressure on work
3. I have lost motivation for my work
4. My work is unpleasant
5. My boss does not appreciate my work
6. I have trouble organizing my work
7. I do not get enough time to rest
8. I find it difficult to find meaning in my job
9. I feel an interruption in my work
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>How satisfied are you with:</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I feel exhausted at work</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I find myself withdrawn from colleagues</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I am short tempered than I have been</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>My job has a lot of demands</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I find it difficult to work with some colleagues</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I spend a lot of time avoiding work</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section D: Counterproductive workplace behaviors**

Please use the scale to rate yourself using items below by using the most appropriate or./ tick the option that describes your intent for the next 12 items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree no</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responses**

1. My bosses know that they cannot count on me
2. At work I often day dream
3. I spend a lot of time avoiding work
4. It is hard to control your feeling when you are caught up in traffic
5. When someone hearts me, I intend to revenge
6. I have used an illegal drug on the job in the past year.
7. Drinking on a job is a real safety hazard
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>At work I have shown a fellow employee to beat the system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Most people lie a little at work to protect themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I would not use my computer at work to send and receive email if it was against company policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>It is ok for employees at work to use their computers to play computer games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Making sexual remarks is part of human nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I have put my arm around a member of opposite sex at work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I have never acted without thinking first</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thanks for your response
### Appendix II: Table for Determining Sample Size from a given Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$S$</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$S$</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$S$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>30000</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>40000</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>50000</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>75000</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>100000</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** $N$ is population size and $S$ is sample size.