



HEXACO MODEL OF PERSONALITY, COUNTERPRODUCTIVE ACADEMIC BEHAVIOUR AND HEDONISM OF STUDENTS IN PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION

Dr. Katarina Sokić¹, Sarwar Khawaja², Dr. Fayyaz Hussain Qureshi³

¹Research Associate, Oxford Business College (OBC), 65 George Street, Oxford, United Kingdom, orcid.org/0000-0001-7522-1228

²Chairman Business Developmen, 65 George Street, Oxford, United Kingdom

³Head of Research, Oxford Business College (OBC), 65 George Street, Oxford, United Kingdom PGR (Doctoral) Supervisor University of Wales Trinity Saint David (UWTSD) orcid.org/0000-0003-1305-9493

Abstract

The main goal of the present study is to investigate associations between HEXACO personality traits, counterproductive academic behaviour and present hedonism among students in private higher education ($n = 422$, 204 male and 218 female, $M_{age} = 22$, $SD = 5,29$). In addition to examining the association between personality traits, hedonism, and unproductive academic conduct, we also tested how present hedonism influences the relationship between honesty-humility, conscientiousness, and counterproductive academic behaviour. Self-report data were collected by using the 100-item HEXACO-PI-R, modified Workplace Deviance Scale and the Short version of the Zimbardo Time Perspective Inventory – subscale of Present hedonism. As hypothesized, hierarchical regression analyses revealed that honesty-humility, conscientiousness, and agreeableness negatively predicted counterproductive academic behaviour. In line with the prediction, present hedonism moderated the relationship between conscientiousness and counterproductive academic behaviour, such that the present hedonism - counterproductive academic behaviour relationship was stronger for students with high hedonism. These results emphasize the significant role of honesty-humility, conscientiousness, and agreeableness in predicting undesirable academic behaviour. The negative effect of present hedonism on counterproductive academic behaviour is more pronounced when associated with low conscientiousness.

Keywords: personality, counterproductive academic behaviour, hedonism, private higher education

1. Introduction

Counterproductive academic behaviour (CAB) is a complex phenomenon that affects educational institutions around the world, with different cultures and social norms. Over the past decade, research interest in the study of CAB is grown A great deal of research conducted for decades has

³Correspondence email: fayyaz.qureshi@oxfordbusinesscollege.ac.uk

shown that the prevalence of CAB has reached alarming levels. Empirical findings showed that CAB negatively affects students who engage in these activities, their peers, teachers, academic staff, and the entire educational system (Cuadrado et al. 2021; Schwager, 2016). Therefore, it is crucial to address the high occurrence of CAB and take into account its negative effects to create methods that would lower CAB event rates (Salgado et al., 2022). According to Cummings et al. (2017), CAB can be described as student actions that compromise the academic integrity and interests of the university and its participants by flouting the expected standards of behaviour. These are intentional behaviours that conflict with legitimate academic goals. Therefore, CAB is voluntary and intentional, they are not accidental. These behaviours harm educational institutions and/or individuals who are part of that institution. CAB could manifest as disrespectful, disruptive, and contemptuous of established norms, procedures, and rules at the university. The list of unproductive academic behaviours is extensive and includes plagiarism, cheating, absenteeism, and academic procrastination. CAB hurts students' academic success in terms of grades and detracts from the effectiveness of other group members (Schwager et al., 2016). Additionally, misbehaving students could harm the universities reputation, which emphasises the need to find ways to curtail CAB. The high prevalence of CAB results in serious problems that go beyond the field of education and require the engagement of experts from different fields including psychologists and social pedagogies.

The role of personality factors in predicting academic behaviour has constantly received attention. The majority of this topic's study has centred on determining how the Big Five (Costa & McCrae, 1992; Goldberg, 1992) and academic behaviour relate to one another. Meta-analyses showed that conscientiousness has the strongest negative association with CAB (e.g. Mammadov, 2022, Richardson et al., 2012). The HEXACO model of personality (Lee & Ashton, 2004, 2005) is a relatively new model that originated in the normal psychology tradition and is increasingly adopted in personality research. The HEXACO model consists of six dimensions found in lexical studies of personality in various languages (Ashton, Lee, & De Vries, 2014), i.e. honesty-humility, emotionality, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience. Compared to the Big Five model, HEXACO encompasses a larger personality sphere and has better cross-cultural validity (Ashton & Lee, 2007; Lee & Ashton, 2008). This model of personality is largely similar to the well-known Five-Factor (Big Five) model of personality (Lee & Ashton, 2008) but the main distinction with the addition of a sixth broad dimension, honesty-humility. Honesty-Humility captures sincerity, fairness, greed avoidance, and modesty. High levels of honesty-humility indicate a tendency to cooperate with others and an inclination to behave benevolently and reciprocally. Low levels of honesty-humility are associated with a tendency to manipulate others, cheat and exploit others to achieve a goal (Ashton et al., 2014). The HEXACO model of personality and honesty-humility in particular has been found to outperform the five-factor model in relation to variables which are conceptually relevant to the honesty-humility dimension (accountable for a morally relevant, pro-social behaviour, such as the variables concerning unethical and antisocial behaviour (Ashton et al., 2014). In work-related criteria, such

as antisocial behaviours directed at organisations, workplace delinquency, unethical business decisions and egoism it was discovered that honesty-humility offered significant incremental validity above and beyond the five-factor model (e.g., de Vries et al., 2009; Lee et al., 2005; Ashton & Lee, 2008). Conscientiousness includes organization, diligence, perfectionism, and prudence and is important for the responsible and disciplined behaviour of an individual in both work and academic contexts. Low scores on conscientiousness are frequently associated with low self-discipline, low work ethics, and the tolerance of errors in their work and behaving carelessly and randomly, while high scorers consider maintaining order and favour an organised approach to activities (Lee & Ashton, 2004). The domain of agreeableness includes forgiveness, gentleness, flexibility and patience. High levels of this personality domain reflect a willingness to compromise and cooperate with others and a tendency to remain calm in challenging and tense situations. On the contrary, a low level of agreeableness reflects intolerance in interpersonal relations and poor control of emotions, especially anger (Ashton et al., 2014).

In the era of modern society characterized by globalization and digitalization, there is a noticeable increase in hedonism, especially among the younger population (Ertina & Setiawan, 2018; Putra et al., 2022). Schwartz's model of values (1992) identifies hedonism as one of ten universal social values. Hedonism includes enjoyment of life, a good salary and high standard of living, life stability and comfort, satisfaction and sensory satisfaction for oneself, social position, prestige and control or dominance over people. Hedonism was associated with lower academic achievement and low affective well-being (Chen & Zeng, 2022).

To the best knowledge of the authors, the relationship between CAB, the HEXACO model of personality and hedonism is not explored. In particular, the role of hedonism in the relationship between personality and CAB has not been examined. Therefore, the aim of this study was to examine these relationships.

2. Literature review

2.1. Personality and counterproductive academic behaviour

Personality is often the focus of research into various forms of academic behaviour and academic performance. Recently, more emphasis has been placed on the role of personality in the CAB. A recent meta-analysis (Cuadrado et al., 2020) estimated the correlation of the overall CAB with the Big Five and whether the validity coefficients of the Big Five personality traits vary across the different dimensions of counterproductive academic behaviours (cheating, absenteeism, deception, breach of rules, low effort and misuse of resources). It has been shown that conscientiousness is the best predictor of overall CAB. Also, conscientiousness uniquely negatively predicted absenteeism, cheating, misuse of resources, low effort and breach of rules. Another significant predictor of CAB was Big Five agreeableness, especially when it comes to resource abuse, rule-breaking, and deception.

In the last few years, the HEXACO model has been increasingly used to examine the role of personality in behaviour due to its dimension of honesty-humility. Studies have shown that the

relationship between the HEXACO model and CAB is not clear. Some findings confirmed that honesty-humility and conscientiousness are the best predictors of counterproductive academic behaviour (de Vries et al., 2011; Marcus et al., 2007). However, a study conducted by Schwager et al. (2016) has shown that in addition to honesty-humility and conscientiousness, emotionality also negatively predicted CAB. In this study relationship between agreeableness and CAB was significant on a bivariate level. In a recent study, Wang & Zhang (2022) investigated the effects of HEXACO personality traits and attitudes towards the rule on academic dishonesty on academic dishonesty among university students in China. In this study, academic dishonesty was measured by the Academic Integrity Survey which encompasses different forms of CAB like cheating, research misconduct, and plagiarism in misconduct. In summary, with the exception of the emotionality component, four out of the six dimensions in the HEXACO model significantly predicted academic dishonesty. According to the findings of the structural equation modelling, people with high scores on the personality traits honesty-humility, agreeableness, conscientiousness, openness to experience, and extraversion were less likely to commit academic misconduct. On a bivariate level, all six HEXACO personality traits negatively correlated with academic dishonesty. The strongest connections were between academic dishonesty and honesty-humility, emotional stability and agreeableness. Taking into account the mixed findings of the above-mentioned studies, it is necessary to carry out further investigations of the relationship between the HEXACO model and CAB.

2.2. The link between personality, hedonism and counterproductive academic behaviour

The relationship between personality and hedonism has been well explored. A meta-analysis (Parks-Leduc et al., 2015) showed relationships between the Big Five and Schwartz's personal values in about fifty studies. The results indicated the absence of a connection between the Big Five factors and hedonism. Studies that used the HEXACO model have shown a negative relationship between hedonism and honesty-humility, emotionality, and openness (Pozzebon, 2006), as well as negative correlations between conscientiousness and hedonism (Anglim et al., 2017). Pozzebon & Ashton (2009) find a negative relationship between hedonism and honesty-humility, agreeableness, conscientiousness and openness to openness to experience.

The relationship between CAB and hedonism has not been sufficiently examined. Hedonism consistently shows a negative association with grades (Hofer et al., 2011; Liem et al., 2012; Vecchione & Schwartz, 2022) and predicted low aspirations for education (Knafo & Schwartz, 2004). Studies have shown that hedonism is associated with low motivation to learn (de Bilde et al., 2011) and lower academic success (Barber et al., 2009). Chen & Zeng (2022) investigated relationships between hedonic orientations and academic achievement. The findings of this study indicated a negative relationship between students' hedonic orientation and academic achievement. Besides, hedonic orientation was associated with high procrastination and low positive affect. A negative relationship between present hedonism and greater grade point average was found in the study conducted by Rudzinska-Wojciechowska et al. (2021). According to the above findings, hedonism is a negative predictor of academic success and is associated with different forms of

CAB. However, further research is needed to examine the nature of these interactions and to determine which forms of CAB are most strongly associated with hedonism.

2.3. Present study: Aim and hypotheses

The current study's main goal was to investigate relationships between HEXACO personality traits, present hedonism, and counterproductive academic behaviour among students in private higher education. This study also aims to investigate the impact of present hedonism on the relationship between conscientiousness, honesty-humility, and counterproductive academic behaviour.

Based on the theoretical description of the HEXACO model of personality (Lee & Ashton, 2004, 2005; Ashton, Lee, & De Vries, 2014) and previous findings relating the HEXACO dimensions of honesty-humility, conscientiousness and agreeableness to counterproductive academic behaviour (e.g. de Vries et al., 2011; Marcus et al., 2007; Wang & Zhang, 2022), we expect that honesty-humility, conscientiousness and agreeableness would be related negatively to counterproductive academic behaviour (**Hypothesis 1, 2, 3**).

Consistent with the notion that hedonism includes enjoyment of life, a good salary and high standard of living, life stability and comfort, satisfaction and sensory satisfaction for oneself, social position, prestige and control or dominance over people (Schwartz, 1992) and based on prior empirical findings (Chen & Zeng, 2022; de Bilde et al., 2011; Hofer et al., 2011; Knafo & Schwartz, 2004; Vecchione & Schwartz, 2022), we hypothesized that hedonism would be related positively to counterproductive academic behaviour (**Hypothesis 4**).

The moderation analysis between honesty-humility, conscientiousness and conscientiousness in predicting CAB is exploratory because there is no clear theoretical basis or empirical basis for establishing an a priori hypothesis. However, in general, hedonism can be expected to moderate the negative association of honesty and conscientiousness with respect to CAB in a way that reduces the negative effect of honesty, and conscientiousness on CAB. Therefore, we hypothesize the following:

Present hedonism moderates the relationship between honesty–humility and CAB, such that the negative relationship is stronger when present hedonism is high (**Hypothesis H5b**).

Present hedonism moderates the relationship between conscientiousness and CAB, such that the negative relationship is stronger when present hedonism is high (**Hypothesis H5b**).

3. Method

3.1. Participants and procedure

The overall sample consisted of 281 422 students in private higher education institutions in Croatia ($n = 422$, 204 male and 218 female, $M_{age} = 22$, $SD = 5,29$, range = 19 - 25). Students attended various faculties and colleges located in Zagreb. Participants were asked to complete a battery of self-report measures anonymously. The participants received no course credit for their

participation. Students participated on a voluntary basis during regularly-scheduled classes and completed a battery of self-report measures anonymously. The participants were chosen using convenience sampling and were provided with information about the purpose and procedure of the current study.

3.2. Measures

3.2.1. Personality

Personality traits were assessed with the 100-item HEXACO-PI-R (Ashton & Lee, 2007; Babarović & Šverko, 2013). It assesses Honesty-Humility (H), Emotionality (E), Extraversion (X), Agreeableness (A), Conscientiousness (C), and Openness to Experience (O). The total HEXACO scores are calculated as sums of ratings on associated items divided by the number of items per scale. Each personality dimension had sixteen items, each of which was assessed on a 5-point Likert scale (1 being strongly disagreed with and 5 being strongly agreed with). Internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) varied from .76 for conscientiousness to .85 for openness to experience.

3.2.2. Counterproductive academic behaviour

Counterproductive academic behaviour was investigated with twelve items, extracted from the Workplace Deviance Scale (Bennett & Robinson, 2000). The items were modified for the academic setting ("I spent too much time fantasizing or daydreaming instead of studying"; "I fabricated a medical certificate to excuse my absence from classes"; "I am often late or do not show up for lectures without a valid reason."; "I neglected to follow the professor's instructions"; „I was rude to someone in college“). A seven-point rating scale (1 = never to 7 = very often) was used to rate the responses. To test the goodness of fit of the counterproductive academic behaviour scale, we conducted a confirmatory factor analysis. According to previous studies (Marcus et al., 2016; Schwager et al., 2016) we calculated an overall score from all the items. Fit statistics showed that model fit was good to excellent across all indicators: $\chi^2(21) = 51.435$; TLI = 1.00; RMSEA = .073, CFI = .96, SRMR = .067. The fit indices were selected based on Brown's (2006) suggestions. Cronbach's alpha across the twelve items was .83.

3.2.3. Present hedonism

Present hedonism was measured by the Short version of the Zimbardo Time Perspective Inventory – subscale of Present hedonism (SZTPI; Zhang et al., 2013) which consists of 3 items („I make decisions on the spur of the moment“, „Taking risks keeps my life from becoming boring“, „It is important to put excitement in my life“) and ratings on a 5-point Likert scale (1- very untrue to 5- very true). Internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) was 0.72.

3.3. Statistical Analyses

To determine the relationship between HEXACO personality traits, hedonism and CAB, zero-order correlations were calculated. In order to assess for unique (incremental) variance in CAB explained by the personality traits and hedonism a further set of hierarchical regression analyses was performed. In regression analyses gender, age, honesty-humility, emotionality, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, openness to experience and present hedonism were entered as predictors in Step 1, and standardized interaction between present hedonism and honesty-humility and standardized interaction between present hedonism and conscientiousness were entered in Step 2 of the analysis.

4. Results

4.1. Descriptive statistics and correlations analyses

Descriptive statistics, observed correlations and internal consistency for the study variables are reported in Table 1. Cronbach alphas for all used scales were higher than .70, thus indicating adequate internal consistency. Skewness and kurtosis for all scales were in the acceptable range of tolerance for normal distribution (between -2 to +2) (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2014). Bivariate correlations showed that Honesty-Humility ($r = -.40, p < .01$) and Conscientiousness ($r = -.41, p < .01$), showed moderate negative correlations with counterproductive academic behaviour, thus supporting Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2. Agreeableness ($r = -.42, p < .01$), showed moderate negative correlations with counterproductive academic behaviour, providing support for Hypothesis 3. As expected (Hypothesis 4), present hedonism ($r = .25, p < .01$) was positively related to counterproductive academic behaviour. On a bivariate level, emotionality, extraversion and openness to experience were not significantly correlated to counterproductive academic behaviour.

Table 1 Descriptive statistics, intercorrelations and internal consistency values among HEXACO personality traits, Counterproductive academic behaviour and Present Hedonism for the overall sample ($n = 422$).

| Correlations | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|----|------|------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|
| | 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | 5. | 6. | 7. | 8. |
| 1. Honesty-Humility | - | .11* | -.01 | .35** | .25** | .16** | -.56** | -.40** |
| 2. Emotionality | | - | -.08 | -.08 | .02 | .02 | -.07 | .06 |
| 3. Extraversion | | | - | .05 | .21** | .14** | .16** | -.08 |
| 4. Agreeableness | | | | - | .06 | .15** | -.33** | -.42** |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|
| 5. Conscientiousness | | | | | - | .16** | -.07 | -.41** |
| 6. Openness to experience | | | | | | - | -.14** | -.07 |
| 7. Present hedonism | | | | | | | - | .25** |
| 8. Counterproductive academic behaviour | | | | | | | | - |
| <i>M</i> | 53.19 | 51.65 | 55.24 | 45.80 | 56.63 | 51.71 | 25.08 | 22.58 |
| <i>SD</i> | 10.59 | 9.46 | 7.61 | 8.37 | 7.89 | 9.07 | 4.30 | 3.82 |
| Skewness | -.39 | .01 | -.33 | -.03 | -.32 | -.01 | .12 | .54 |
| Kurtosis | .40 | -.30 | .45 | -.19 | .38 | -.11 | -.23 | .19 |
| α | .81 | .79 | .82 | .80 | .76 | .85 | .72 | .83 |
| <i>Note.</i> * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$ | | | | | | | | |

4.2. Regression analysis

Results of regression analysis (Table 2) concerning Hypothesis 1, Hypothesis 2 and Hypothesis 3 revealed that honesty–humility ($\beta = -.20$, $p < .01$), conscientiousness ($\beta = -.33$, $p < .01$), and agreeableness ($\beta = -.35$, $p < .01$) shared a significant amount of variance with counterproductive academic behaviour, while emotionality, extraversion, openness to experience and present hedonism were not showed to be significant predictors of counterproductive academic behaviour. In order to test Hypothesis 5a and Hypothesis 5b, interactions between honesty–humility and present hedonism and conscientiousness and present hedonism were calculated. We standardised the predictor variables before calculating the interaction terms to lessen the issue of multicollinearity (Marquardt, 1980). To evaluate the distinctive contributions of the personality traits and present hedonism and interactions between honesty–humility, conscientiousness and present hedonism to counterproductive academic behaviour we performed regression analyses for each six personality traits and present hedonism, included together as predictors in Step 1, and the interactions between personality traits (honesty–humility and conscientiousness) and present hedonism entered in Step 2. The criterion variable was counterproductive academic behaviour. Gender and age were included as the control variables in Step 1 all regression analyses. The results are presented in Table 2.

As predicted (H5b) present hedonism moderates the relationship between conscientiousness and counterproductive academic behaviour. The results showed that there was a significant increase in R^2 on the second step of analysis ($\Delta R^2 = 0.01$, $\Delta F = 4.46$, $p = .03$), with significant interaction between present hedonism and conscientiousness ($\beta = -.68$, $p < .05$). At a high level of present hedonism, conscientiousness shows a weaker negative effect on CAB, while the opposite trend can be seen at a low level of present hedonism where there is a high negative association between conscientiousness and CAB. Contrary to our prediction (H5a) interaction between present hedonism and honesty-humility was not significant on the secont step of regression analysis ($\beta =$

-.21, $p > .05$). Overall, the regression analysis showed that the HEXACO personality traits and present hedonism together explained 38% of variance in counterproductive academic behavior.

Table 2 Moderated Regression Analysis Predicting Counterproductive Academic Behavior from HEXACO personality traits and Present Hedonism ($n = 422$)

| | Model 1 | | Model 2 | | Model 3 | |
|---|--------------|---------|--------------|---------|--------------|---------|
| | ΔR^2 | β | ΔR^2 | β | ΔR^2 | β |
| Predictor | .38** | | .38** | | .38** | |
| <i>Step 1</i> | | | | | | |
| Honesty-Humility | | -.20** | | .03 | | -.20** |
| Emotionality | | .08 | | .06 | | .07 |
| Extraversion | | -.03 | | -.03 | | -.03 |
| Agreeableness | | -.35** | | -.34** | | -.35** |
| Conscientiousness | | -.33** | | -.33** | | -.33** |
| Openness to experience | | .00 | | .00 | | .00 |
| Present hedonism | | -.02 | | .17 | | -.02 |
| <i>Step 2</i> | | | .00 | | .01* | |
| Present hedonism x Honesty-Humility | | | | -.20 | | |
| Present hedonism x Conscientiousness | | | | | | -.68* |
| Total R^2 | .38** | | .38** | | .39** | |
| <i>Note.</i> * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$ | | | | | | |

5. Discussion

The main goal of this study was to investigate relationships between HEXACO personality traits, present hedonism, and counterproductive academic behaviour among students in private higher education. This study also aims to investigate the impact of present hedonism on the relationship between conscientiousness, honesty-humility, and counterproductive academic behaviour. In general, the results of the study confirmed the personality-CAB relationships and suggested that HEXACO personality traits are important predictors of CAB. Overall, HEXACO personality traits predicted 38% of the variance in CAB. Results indicate that HEXACO's honesty-humility, agreeableness and conscientiousness were associated with less counterproductive academic behaviour.

As predicted, honesty-humility was independently and negatively associated with CAB. Our results are similar to the previous studies which shown that honesty-humility was associated with CAB (de Vries et al., 2011; Marcus et al., 2007; Schwager et al., 2016) and academic dishonesty Wang & Zhang (2022). Also, our results are in line with assumptions of the HEXACO model that honesty-humility entails sincerity, fairness, greed avoidance and modesty (Ashton et al., 2014).

In particular, the fairness reflects the propensity to resist fraud and corruption, traits that directly conflict with CAB. The modesty explains the propensity to regard oneself as an ordinary person without demanding special treatment and to be unassuming. These instincts go against entitlement in every way. According to Campbell et al. (2004), those who believe they deserve more than others have an unwarranted expectation of success and reward, regardless of their actual work.

In accordance with the hypotheses, conscientiousness negatively predicted CAB which is line to previous studies (Cuadrado et al., 2020; de Vries et al., 2011; Marcus et al., 2007; Wang & Zhang (2022)). These findings add to the body of evidence supporting the usefulness of personality in predicting unproductive behaviour among university students. The findings also offer more proof that conscientiousness, one of the Big Five personality traits that have garnered the most attention, is a valid predictor of CAB. The fact that HEXACO conscientiousness encompasses such content as organization, hard work, carefulness, and thoroughness and consists of facets named organization, diligence, perfectionism, and prudence explains the negative association between this personality dimension and CAB. Conscientiousness is typically regarded as desirable and negatively predicted counterproductive academic behaviours such as cheating, absenteeism, deception, breach of rules, low effort, misuse of resources and absenteeism (Cuadrado et al., 2020). As expected, our results showing bivariate and unique relationships of agreeableness with CAB are in line with the previous finding (Schwager et al., 2016; Wang & Zhang, 2022), thus suggesting that this HEXACO dimension is conceptually relevant to CAB. However, more research is needed to examine which facets of conscientiousness are particularly predictive of low levels of CAB. Based on the theoretical assumptions of the HEXACO model (Ashton & Lee, 2007; Lee & Ashton, 2004) we can expect that it is a facet of flexibility which assesses the individual's willingness to cooperate with others and comply with the given rules.

As predicted, hedonism was positively correlated with CAB at the bivariate level. These results are consistent with the theoretical assumptions that hedonism includes enjoyment of life, good salary and high standard of living, life stability and comfort, satisfaction and sensory satisfaction with oneself, social position, prestige and control or dominance over people (Schwartz, 1992). and with previous findings showing that hedonism is associated with poorer academic performance (Chen & Zeng, 2022) and high levels of different types of CAB (de Bilde et al., 2011; Hofer et al., 2011; Knafo & Schwartz , 2004; Vecchione and Schwartz, 2022). Our results are based on the observed increase in hedonism, especially among the younger generation, in the era of modern society characterized by globalization, digitalization and the search for sources of pleasure, which is in contrast to patience and diligence (Ertina & Setiawan, 2018; Putra et al., 2022).

As hypothesized, conscientiousness moderated the relationship between hedonism and CAB such that the hedonism-CAB relationship was stronger for students low on conscientiousness. Contrary to expectations, the results showed that there is no moderating effect of honesty on the relationship between hedonism and CAB. These results confirm earlier findings that high conscientiousness is the strongest predictor of low CAB (Cuadrado et al., 2020; Marcus et al., 2007; Schwager et al., 2016).

Regarding the relationship between personality and hedonism, the results showed a positive relationship between extraversion and hedonism, and negative relations between honesty-humility, agreeableness, conscientiousness and hedonism while emotionality and openness to experience were not significantly correlated to hedonism. These results are in line with settings of the HEXACO model of personality which proposes that honesty-humility captures a tendency to avoid fraud and corruption (Ashton & Lee, 2007; Ashton et al., 2014). It is also in line with the studies showing that hedonistic value orientation was associated with honesty-humility (Anglim et al., 2017). The finding of the positive relationship of extraversion with hedonistic values is in line with previous studies showing that extraversion positively correlated with hedonistic values (Kajonius et al., 2015; Abraham & Rahjardo, 2015), and with the theoretical description that extraversion is marked by social boldness and tendency to enjoy social interaction and a tendency towards thrill-seeking and a dramatic lifestyle (Lee & Ashton, 2004). Our findings that agreeableness and conscientiousness negatively correlated with hedonism are consistent with the notion that agreeableness entails compromise and cooperation, and that conscientiousness entails a tendency to work hard (Lee & Ashton, 2004), and with prior research empirical findings (Anglim et al., 2017; Pozzebon & Ashton, 2009).

Overall, our results showed the significant role of HEXACO personality and hedonism in CAB. The role of conscientiousness and honesty-humility is particularly important in the explanation of CAB. The results also showed that conscientiousness has moderating role in the hedonism and CAB relationship.

Study limitations and future directions

There are several limitations of this study that must be acknowledged. First, the participants consisted of a homogeneous sample of students from private higher education institutions and not students from public higher education institutions. For these reasons, further research is needed to evaluate the possibility of generalizing the findings to the student population as a whole. Additionally, further research may use other measures of the CAB as well as other measures of hedonism to confirm the findings. To gain a deeper understanding of how each HEXACO trait relates to CAB and hedonism, in future research, it would be useful to examine the relationships between HEXACO personality traits, hedonism and CAB at a narrow facet level in addition to relationships at a broad trait level. A further limitation of this study concerns the use of self-report measures particularly when dealing with CAB. Future studies should use peer assessment measures as well as data on CAB behavioral indicators such as absenteeism, grades and academic performance.

Funding Statement

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors declare no potential conflicts of interest concerning this article's research, authorship, and/or publication.

About the Authors

Dr Katarina Sokić, Research Associate at Oxford Business College, PhD (Psychology), MSc in Civil Law.

6. References

Anglim, J., Knowles, E. R. V., Dunlop, P. D., & Marty, A. (2017). HEXACO Personality and Schwartz's Personal Values: A Facet-Level Analysis. *Journal of Research in Personality, 68*, 23-31. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2017.04.002>

Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2007). Empirical, theoretical, and practical advantages of the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 11*, 150–166. <http://dx.doi:10.1177/1088868306294907>

Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2008). The prediction of Honesty-Humility-related criteria by the HEXACO and Five-Factor Models of personality. *Journal of Research in Personality, 42*(5), 1216–1228. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2008.03.006>

Ashton, M. C., Lee, K., & De Vries, R. E. (2014). The HEXACO Honesty-Humility, Agreeableness, and Emotionality factors: A review of research and theory. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 18*, 139-152. <http://dx.doi:0.1177/1088868314523838>

Babarović, T., & Šverko, I. (2013). The HEXACO personality domains in the Croatian sample. *Društvena istraživanja, 3*, 397-411. <http://dx.doi:10.5559/di.22.3.01>

Barber, L. K., Munz, D. C., Bagsby, P. G., & Grawitch, M. J. (2009). When does time perspective matter? Self-control as a moderator between time perspective and academic achievement. *Personality and Individual Differences, 46*(2), 250–253. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2008.10.007>

Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 349–360. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.3>

Campbell, W. K., Bonacci, A. M., Shelton, J., Exline, J. J., & Bushman, B. J. (2004). Psychological entitlement: Interpersonal consequences and validation of a self-report measure. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 83*(1), 29-45. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa8301_04

Chen, H., & Zeng, Z. (2022). Associations of hedonic and eudaimonic orientations with subjective experience and objective functioning in academic settings: The mediating roles of

academic behavioral engagement and procrastination. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13:948768. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.948768>

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Neo personality inventory-revised (NEO-PI-R) and neo five-factor inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Cuadrado, D., Salgado, J. F., & Moscoso, S. (2020). Personality, intelligence, and counterproductive academic behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 120(2), 504–537. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000285>

Cummings, D. J., Poropat, A. E., Loxton, N. J., & Sheeran, N. (2017). Development and initial validation of a multidimensional student performance scale. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 59, 22-33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2017.08.008>

de Bilde, J., Vansteenkiste, M., & Lens, W. (2011). Understanding the association between future time perspective and self-regulated learning through the lens of self-determination theory. *Learning and Instruction*, 21(3), 332–34. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2010.03.002>

de Vries, A., de Vries, R. E., & Born, M. P. (2011). Broad versus narrow traits: Conscientiousness and honesty–humility as predictors of academic criteria. *European Journal of Personality*, 25, 336–348. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/per.795>

de Vries, R. E., de Vries, A., de Hoogh, A., & Feij, J. (2009). More than the Big Five: Egoism and the HEXACO model of personality. *European Journal of Personality*, 23(8), 635–654. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.733>

Ertina, S., & Setiawan, I. A. (2018). The Students' Hedonism Lifestyle. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research (ASSEHR) Vol.CCCIV*

Goldberg, L. R. (1992). The development of markers of the Big Five factor structure. *Psychological Assessment*, 4, 26–42. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.4.1.26>

Gravetter, F.; & Wallnau, L. (2014) *Essentials of Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences*. 8th Edition, Wadsworth, Belmont, CA.

Hofer, M., Kuhnle, C., Kilian, B., Marta, E., & Fries, S. (2011). Motivational interference in school-leisure conflict and learning outcomes: The differential effects of two value conceptions. *Learning and Instruction*, 21(3), 301-316. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2010.02.009>

- Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2004). Psychometric properties of the HEXACO Personality Inventory. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *39*, 329–358.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr3902_8
- Lee, K., & Ashton, M.C. (2005). Psychopathy, Machiavellianism, and narcissism in the five factor model and the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *38*, 1571–1582. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2004.09.016>
- Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2008). The HEXACO personality factors in the indigenous personality lexicons of English and 11 other languages. *Journal of Personality*, *76*, 1001-1053.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2008.00512.x>
- Lee, K., Ashton, M. C., & De Vries, R. E. (2005). Predicting workplace delinquency and integrity with the HEXACO and five-factor models of personality structure. *Human Performance*, *18*, 179– 197. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1802_4
- Liem, A. D., Martin, A. J., Porter, A. L., & Colmar, S. (2012). Sociocultural antecedents of academic motivation and achievement: Role of values and achievement motives in achievement goals and academic performance. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, *15*(1), 1-13.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-839X.2011.01351.x>
- Knafo, A., & Schwartz, S.H. (2004). *Value transmission in the family: Effects of family background and implications for educational achievement*. Jerusalem: NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education (Hebrew).
- Mammadov, S. (2022). Big Five personality traits and academic performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality*, *90*(2), 222-255. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12663>
- Marcus, B., Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2007). Personality dimensions explaining relationships between integrity tests and counterproductive behavior: Big five, or one in addition? *Personnel Psychology*, *60*(1), 1–34. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00063.x>
- Marcus, B., Taylor, O. A., Hastings, S. E., Sturm, A., & Weigelt, O. (2016). The structure of counterproductive work behavior: A review, a structural meta-analysis, and a primary study. *Journal of Management*, *42*(1), 203–233. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206313503019>
- Parks-Leduc, L., Feldman, G., & Bardi, A. (2015). Personality Traits and Personal Values A Meta-Analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *19*, 3-29.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868314538548>

Pozzebon, J. A. (2006). *Personality traits and personal values: an investigation into the importance of each in the prediction of behaviour*. (Masters of Arts), Brock University. Retrieved July 16, 2023, from <https://dr.library.brocku.ca/handle/10464/1411>

Pozzebon, J. A., & Ashton, M.C. (2009). Personality and Values as Predictors of Self- and Peer-Reported Behavior. *Journal of Individual Differences*, 30(3), 122–129. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1614-0001.30.3.122>

Putra, N. A. et al. (2022). Hedonism in the Student Environment in the Era of Globalization. *International Journal of Religion Education and Law*, 1(2), 93-97. <https://doi.org/10.57235/ijrael.v1i2.110>

Richardson, M., Abraham, C., & Bond, R. (2012). Psychological correlates of university students' academic performance: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 138(2), 353-387. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026838>

Rudzinska-Wojciechowska, J, Wojciechowski, J., & Stolarski, M. (2021). Do time perspectives predict school performance beyond intelligence and personality?. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 172, 110594. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.110594>

Salgado, J. F., Cuadrado, D., & Moscoso. S. (2022). Counterproductive Academic Behaviors and Academic Performance: A Meta-Analysis and a Path Analysis Model. *Front Psychol.* 2 (13). 893775. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.893775. PMID: 35719594; PMCID: PMC9200985

Schwartz, S. H. (1992). *Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries*. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 25, pp. 1–65). New York: Academic Press

Schwager, I. T. L., Hülshager, U. R., & Lang, J. W.B. (2016). Be aware to be on the square: Mindfulness and counterproductive academic behavior. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 74-79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.08.043>

Vecchione, M., & Schwartz, S. S. H. (2022) Personal values and academic achievement. *British Journal of Psychology*, 113(3), 630-652. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjop.12555>

Zhang, J. W., Howell, R. T., & Bowerman, T. (2013). Validating a brief measure of the Zimbardo Time Perspective Inventory. *Time & Society*, 22(3), 391–409. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0961463X12441174>

Wang, H. & Zhang, Y. (2022). The effects of personality traits and attitudes towards the rule on academic dishonesty among university students. *Scientific Reports*, *12*, 14181, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-18394-3>