

The Influence Of Proactive Personality On Career Success Through Political Influence Behavior Of Employees Pt. Bank Sulselbar

A. Aiyul Ikhram, Andi Ratna Sari Dewi

Abstract: The element of trust is the key to win the competition in the field of banking. This research aimed to investigate and analyze the influence of proactive personality on the career success through the political influence behavior. The research approach used was the quantitative approach. The research population was the generalization areas which consisted of a group of objects or subjects made as the sources of the research data. The types of the data comprised the qualitative data and the quantitative data. The data used in the research included the primary and secondary data. The data collection was done through questionnaires, observation, interviews, and documentation. The calculation in the descriptive statistical analysis was performed using the computer program of SPSS package, AMOS version and 19.0 20.0. The research results indicated that a proactive personality had a significant effect on the career success through the Political Influence Behavior. Consequently, at the moment when the proactive personality of the employees of Bank Sulselbar was able to affect the environment, it would raise political influence behavior which would increase the career of the employees.

Index Terms: Proactive personality, career success, career enhancement

1 INTRODUCTION

The indicators of political influence behavior used in Wayne et al (1999) and Nilawati (2004) research are job focused tactics and supervisor-focused tactics. Respondents Nilawati (2004), are middle managers of manufacturing and service companies in Central Java and Yogyakarta. The indicators of political influence in the present study are self promotion and ingratiation with the respondents of local government officials in Sleman, Yogyakarta. The study of Wayne et al (1999), examines the factors that predict career success. Personality through the process of personal control can ultimately affect the outcomes determined by the strength of the environment. The underlying assumption of the researcher when using ingratiation and self promotion in this research is that the political behavior affecting career success depends on the type of influence tactics employee uses, ie whether the employee uses ingratiation or self promotion (especially on government agency employees). While in private employees tend to use supervisor-focused tactics or job focused tactics. When looking at career successes from job enhancement that employees gain through promotion or face-to-face with leaders, some researchers then suggest that political promotion is a key mechanism for individuals who want to achieve career success. because career success is the accumulation of results, the product of behavior accumulated in a relatively long period of time, so that individuals who have proactive personality will try to achieve its goal in organizing, namely career success. Buss & Craik in Nilawati (2004), argues, that personality is more associated with factors that determine the number or cumulative results, such as career success of any single action or measure of behavior. The results of Seibert et al (1999) showed that there is a positive relationship between individuals who have proactive personality with two indicators of career success, self-reported subjective (salary and promotion) and subjective (career satisfaction), after controlling some variables such as used in the study of Wayne et al (1999), namely demographics, human capital, motivation, organizational and industrial. Consistent with previous research, the variables in the Seibert et al (1999)

study, such as demographics and motivation, provide a significant improvement in the explanation of salary variance (variance). Variance in promotion is explained by demographics and human capital. The variance of career satisfaction is explained by objective career outcomes, demographics, motivation, personality, while human capital and organizational can not explain variance. Individuals who are good at playing politics, are likely to get rewards related to their work or career (Wayne et al., 1999). Wayne et al (1999) defines political influence behavior as a process of social influence, in which behavior is strategically designed to maximize self-interest both in the short and long term, and one of them is consistent with the sacrifice of other interests. In order to understand how influence behavior affects career success, it first needs to consider the social psychological process that motivates the behavior. Some researchers propose a tactical taxonomy that affects which taxonomy is based on assumptions: (1) differences in motivation underlying specific tactics, and (2) not all effective tactics to achieve the expected results. This is because the motivation of the influence behavior is classified as ingratiation and self-promotion, so it is important to distinguish between them. There are three types of ingratiation tactics, the other enhancement, selfpresentation and opinion conformity. Self promotion leads to one's special accomplishments. According to Ferris & Kacmar (1991), there are two forms of self-promotion, namely materialistic and improvement. Research on career success conducted by Wayne et al (1999), examines the role of human capital, motivational, and supervisor support in predicting career success. Prior empirical research has identified several variables related to career success, namely demographic, human capital, motivational, influence and access to mentor. Career success is defined as a positive psychological feeling or work-related outcome or an accumulation of one's achievement as a result of work experience. Career success is determined in objective and subjective dimensions (Judge et al., 2004). The objective career success indicators used in Wayne et al (1999), is salary progression whereas indicator of subjective career success is career satisfaction ($a = 0,81$) and promotability ($a = 1,87$). One of the most developed institutions today is

the Bank. The existence of banks today has become a necessity in the wider community. With various products offered such as savings, demand deposits, deposits, multifarious financing and other financial services, it is realized that banks support various activities or transactions that take place in the community. Therefore the presence of banks has become the solution to various financial problems. In the course of the bank must maintain and make changes to a better direction in the management of the bank, and try to better by finding something new in the banking business competition. The element of trust is the key to winning the competition in banking. To obtain a good financial performance, by improving the information system and improve the quality and quantity of reliable human resources who have the ability and expertise in accordance with the needs of banks. The purpose of this research is to know and analyze the effect of proactive personality toward career success through political influence behavior.

2 METHODS

Research design The approach of this research is quantitative approach. Quantitative research approach is a method to test certain theories by examining the relationship between variables. These variables are measured normally with research instruments, so the data consisting of figures can be analyzed based on statistical procedures (Creswell, 2010). **Population and Sample** Subject of research to be made the population is all permanent employees at the Head Office of PT. Bank Sulsebar Makassar numbered 175 employees. To obtain a sample that can represent the population, then in determining the sample of this study used Slovin formula as follows:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N e^2}$$

Where :

n = sample size N = population size

e = percent laxity inaccuracy due to intolerable sampling errors.

Of the total population with the level of inaccuracy lag is set at 5%, then by using the formula above obtained a sample of

$$n = \frac{175}{1 + 175 (0.05)^2}$$

$$n = \frac{175}{1,4375}$$

n = 121,739, The number of respondents obtained is 121,739 rounded to 125.

Types and Data Sources

Types and sources of data used in this study are qualitative data and quantitative data. Qualitative data, ie data in the form of words, sentences, schemes, and images, such as literature and theories related to the author's research. Quantitative data, is data expressed in the form of

numerical scales or numbers, such as: qualitative data that is scored from the results of the questionnaire. While the data source used in this research is primary data source and secondary data. According to Indriantoro & Supomo (2009), primary data are research data obtained directly from specially collected data sources and directly related to the problem under study. Primary data can be individual or group of subject (subject) opinions, observations of an object (physical), event or activity, and test results. Primary data is obtained through the dissemination of questionnaires to respondents who in this case are the employees at the Head Office PT. Bank Sulsebar Makassar. According to Indriantoro & Supomo (2009), secondary data is data obtained by researchers indirectly through intermediaries (obtained and recorded by other parties). Secondary data are generally in the form of evidence, records or historical reports that have been compiled in published and unpublished documentary (documentary) files. In this study secondary data obtained from institutions / organizations or parties related to this research, namely data from the Head Office PT. Bank Sulsebar Makassar in the form of data about the influence of proactive personality towards career success through political influence behavior. **Data collection technique** Data collection used in this research is questionnaire, observation, interview, and documentation. Questionnaires are arranged in the form of questions of written questions given to respondents. According Sugiyono (2005), the questionnaire is an efficient data collection techniques when researchers know with certain variables to be measured and know what can be expected from respondents. Data were collected by using a questionnaire (questionnaire) closed, the questionnaire used to obtain data about the influence of proactive personality towards career success through political influence behavior. Observation is done by doing direct observation to the research location by looking at various activities undertaken by the respondent. With regard to observation, the accuracy or accuracy of procedures, as well as the reliability of the instrument (means) of observation must be absolutely convincing. Interviews used are indepth interviews or unstructured interviews. According Sugiyono (2005), in-depth interviews are conducted freely where researchers do not use interview guidelines arranged systematically for data collection. The required documentation is written or unwritten documents that show or describe important data and information related to the research.

Data analysis technique

Data analysis techniques used in this study is descriptive statistical analysis is used to analyze data by describing or describing the data collected as it is without intending to make conclusions that apply to the public (Sugiyono, 2009). Descriptive statistical analysis is used to explain the characteristics of respondents including sex, last education, age, and years of service. In addition, descriptive statistical analysis is also used to explain the responses of respondents to research variables. Calculations in descriptive statistical analysis were performed with the help of a computer using AMOS program pack 19.0 and SPSS version 20.0.

3 RESULT

In the first indicator (Y1.1) that is self promotion, manifested by 0 of respondents or 0% who stated very unsuitable, 2 respondents or 1.6% stated unsuitable, 37 respondents or 29.6% stated neutral, 84 respondents or 67.2% stated accordingly and 2 respondents or 1.6% stated very appropriate. The average respondent's answer on the first indicator (Y1.1) that is equal to 3.69 that entered in the category of high / good (between 3.34 - 5.00). In the second indicator (Y1.2) the ingratiation, manifested by 0 respondents or 0% that states very unsuitable, 2 respondents or 1.6% which states are not appropriate, 45 respondents or 36.0% who declared neutral, 77 respondents or 61.6% accordingly and 1 respondent or 0.8% who stated very appropriate. The average respondent answers on the second indicator (Y1.2) that is equal to 3.62 which entered in the category of high / good (between 3.34 - 5.00). The third indicator (Y1.3) is supervisor focused tactics, manifested by 0 respondents or 0% which states highly inappropriate, 7 respondents or 5.6% stated unsuitable, 71 respondents or 56.8% stated neutral, 43 respondents or 34.4% the corresponding states and 4 respondents or 3.2% who stated very appropriate. The average respondent answers on the third indicator (Y1.3) that is equal to 3.35 which entered in the category of high / good (between 3.34 - 5.00). In the fourth indicator (Y1.4) that is job focused tactics, manifested by 7 respondents or 5.6% which stated very unsuitable, 21 respondents or 16.8% stated unsuitable, 46 respondents or 36.8% stated neutral, 34 respondents or 27.2% the corresponding states and 17 respondents or 13.6% who stated very appropriate. The average respondent's answer on the fourth indicator (Y1.4) that is equal to 3.26 that entered in the category of being (between 1.67 - 3.33). In the first indicator (Y1.1) that is self promotion, manifested by 0 respondents or 0% which states very unsuitable, 2 respondents or 1.6% which states not appropriate, 37 respondents or 29.6% who stated neutral, 84 respondents or 67.2% stated appropriate and 2 respondents or 1.6% who stated very appropriate. The average respondent's answer on the first indicator (Y1.1) that is equal to 3.69 that entered in the category of high / good (between 3.34 - 5.00). In the second indicator (Y1.2) the ingratiation, manifested by 0 respondents or 0% that states very unsuitable, 2 respondents or 1.6% which states are not appropriate, 45 respondents or 36.0% who declared neutral, 77 respondents or 61.6% accordingly and 1 respondent or 0.8% who stated very appropriate. The average respondent answers on the second indicator (Y1.2) that is equal to 3.62 which entered in the category of high / good (between 3.34 - 5.00). The third indicator (Y1.3) is supervisor focused tactics, manifested by 0 respondents or 0% which states highly inappropriate, 7 respondents or 5.6% stated unsuitable, 71 respondents or 56.8% stated neutral, 43 respondents or 34.4% the corresponding states and 4 respondents or 3.2% who stated very appropriate. The average respondent answers on the third indicator (Y1.3) that is equal to 3.35 which entered in the category of high / good (between 3.34 - 5.00). In the fourth indicator (Y1.4) that is job focused tactics, manifested by 7 respondents or 5.6% which stated very unsuitable, 21 respondents or 16.8% stated unsuitable, 46 respondents or 36.8% stated neutral, 34 respondents or 27.2% the corresponding states and 17 respondents or 13.6% who

stated very appropriate. The average respondent's answer on the fourth indicator (Y1.4) that is equal to 3.26 that entered in the category of being (between 1.67 - 3.33). In the first indicator (Y2.1) is the work itself, manifested with 15 respondents or 12.0% who stated very unsuitable, 26 respondents or 20.8% stated inappropriate, 47 respondents or 37.6% stated neutral, 26 respondents or 20.8% stated accordingly and 11 respondents or 8.8% stated very appropriate. The average respondent's answer on the first indicator (Y2.1) of 2.94, which entered in the category of being (between 1.67 - 3.33). In the second indicator (Y2.2) that is salary, is manifested by 10 respondents or 8.0% which states very unsuitable, 28 respondents or 22.8% which states unsuitable, 49 respondents or 39.2% stated neutral, 32 respondents or 25.6% accordingly and 6 respondents or 4.8% stated very appropriate. The average respondent's answer on the second indicator (Y2.2) of 2.97, which entered in the category of being (between 1.67 - 3.33). On the third indicator (Y2.3) is promotion, it is manifested by 12 respondents or 9.6% which states highly inappropriate, 31 respondents or 24.8% stated unsuitable, 40 respondents or 32.0% stated neutral, 35 respondents or 28.0% corresponding and 7 respondents or 5.6% who stated very appropriate. The average respondent answers on the third indicator (Y2.3) that is equal to 2.95, which entered in the category of being (between 1.67 - 3.33). In the fourth indicator (Y2.4), the supervisor, manifested by 14 respondents or 11.2% who stated very unsuitable, 41 respondents or 32.8% stated unsuitable, 52 respondents or 41.6% stated neutral, 13 respondents or 10.4% stated accordingly and 5 respondents or 4.0% stated very appropriate. The average respondent's answer on the fourth indicator (Y2.4) that is equal to 2.63, which entered in the category of being (between 1.67 - 3.33). In the fifth indicator (Y2.5) that is work group, manifested by 8 respondents or 6.4% which stated very unsuitable, 26 respondents or 20.8% stated unsuitable, 25 respondents or 20.0% stated neutral, 53 respondents or 42.4% stated appropriate and 13 respondents or 10.4% stated very appropriate. The average respondent answers on the fifth indicator (Y2.5) which is 3.30, which entered in the category of being (between 1.67 - 3.33).

5. CONCLUSION

Based on the results and discussion it can be concluded that the proactive personality has a significant effect on career success through the variable Political Influence Behavior. Sehingga when the proactive personality of employees of Bank Sulselbar able to influence the environment it will cause political influence behavior that will improve employee career. In order to gain continuous career enhancement for Bank Sulselbar employees, it is possible to improve the personality proactively by always initiating new ideas and creativity to change the status quo rather than acting passively in the face of current conditions. As proactive personality increases, it will be followed by an increase in Political Influence Behavior and an impact on career success.

REFERENCES

- [1] Creswell J.W. (2010). Research design approaches are qualitative, quantitative and mixed, Yogyakarta: Student libraries

- [2] Ferris G.R. & Kacmar K.M. (1991). Perceptions of organizational politics. *Journal of Management*, 18 (1): 93 -116.
- [3] Indriantoro N. & Supomo B. (2009). *Business Research Methods For Accounting and Management*. BPFE. Yogyakarta
- [4] Judge T., Mueller J.K., & Bretz R.D. (2004). A longitudinal of sponsorship and career success. *Business Administration*. Vol.57: 271- 303.
- [5] Nilawati L. (2004). Influence Effects on the Political Influence Behavior on the Relationship between Proactive Personality and Career Success. Thesis UGM, Not published.
- [6] Seibert S.E., Kraimer M.L., & Crant J.M. (1999). Proactive personality and career success. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Vol. 84, Issue: 3: 416-427
- [7] Siswanti Y. (2011). The Influence Of Proactive Personality To Career Success With Poly Influence Behavior As A Mediating Variable. International Seminar And Call For Papers "Towards Excellent Small Business" Yogyakarta, April 27, 2011
- [8] Sugiyono. (2005). *Statistics For Research*, Bandung: Alfabeta
- [9] Sugiyono. (2009). *Quantitative Research Methods, Qualitative and R & D*. Bandung Alfabeta
- [10] Wayne S.J., Liden R.C., Kraimer M.L .., & Graft I.K. (1999). The role of human capital, motivation, and supervisor sponsorship in predicting career success. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol.20, Issue: 5: 577-595.