CONSCIENTIOUSNESS AND PARANOID IDEATION AS PREDICTORS OF WORKPLACE HOSTILITY AMONG UNIVERSITY NON-ACADEMIC STAFF

¹T.M. Oguegbe; ²M.I. Okeke
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka

&

³G. C. Dibia
Delta State Polytechnic Ogwashi Uku.

Abstract:

Industrialization in Africa is believed to be marred by certain workplace behaviours that are anti productive with a tendency of jeopardizing the economy of a nation and its sustenance, especially in Nigeria. This study examines conscientiousness and paranoid ideation as predictors of workplace hostility among university non-academic staff. 210 non-academic staff, comprising 98 (47%) males and 112 (53%) females who were randomly selected through the simple random sampling technique from Nnamdi Azikiwe University Awka, Anambra State, were used as participants for the study. The ages of the participants ranged between 25 and 61, with the mean age of 35 and standard deviation of 9.56. The Symptom Distress Checklist (SCL-90) by L.R. Derogatis, R.S Lipman & L. Covi (1977) and Big Five Inventory (BFI) by O.P. John, & R.L. Kentle (1991) were used for data collection. A correlational design was adopted and multiple regression analysis was employed to analyze the data collected. Two hypotheses were tested in the study. The first hypothesis, which stated that conscientiousness will significantly predict workplace hostility among university non-academic staff, was not significant at $p > .05$ and so, was not accepted. The second hypothesis which stated that paranoid ideation will significantly predict workplace hostility among university non-academic staff was significant at $p < .05$ and so, confirmed. Based on the findings, it is recommended that workplace interventions, in the form of ombudsmen or industrial psychologists, be engaged in organizations to mediate workplace behaviours that are inimical to organizational well-being, productivity and effectiveness for better industrialization in Africa.

Introduction:

Background to the study:

The most important element in industrial organisation is people, which comprises individuals with different backgrounds. The workplace is not immune to aggression since it assembles different shades of personalities. Consequently, some bitterness, exchange of words, verbal abuse, physical assaults and other forms of human excesses are not strange in such a setting (Ayinde, 2012). There is mounting evidence of workplace hostility/aggression in workplaces and that the phenomenon rears its ugly head, factually on daily basis, among workers in Nigeria, but in reality, only a few cases have been reported or investigated (Ayinde, 2012). The present study was motivated by the persistent incidents of work-place aggression as is widely reported in many workplaces. This lends credence to the fact that much still needs to be done in terms of unearthing the root cause/s of, and what sustains the practice. Thus, it becomes pertinent to look at the psycho-social underpinnings of workplace hostility/aggression, particularly in Nigeria.

Hostility is a negative behaviour that is characterized by the desire to harm or hurt others. In many institutions of learning, hostile tendencies among non-academic staff have caused a lot of damage which includes unfriendliness to others, use of abusive words, and unhealthy

relationship between non-academic staff and students. To support this, Etim and Okey (2013) stated that Nigerian Universities have, for decades, been faced with so many crises which include conflict between lecturers and students, conflict among students, and so on. They added that such conflicts give rise to hostility. Hostility is a form of emotionally charged aggressive behaviour and one of the most pervasive and troubling behaviours in human society. It may also be considered as a negative attitude that combines anger and disgust which is often accompanied by feelings of indignation, contempt and resentment towards others; on some occasions, it can even degenerate to bitterness and violence.

The terms 'hostility' and 'aggression' are used and studied in the psychological (Ermakov, Skirtach & Kovsh, 2015; Ermakov & Fedotova, 2015), political (Fedotova, 2013), sociological (Abakumova, Ermakov & Kolesina, 2016), ideological (Fedotova & Chigisheva, 2015), cultural (Abakumova, Boguslavskaya & Grishina, 2016), psychogenetic (Ermakov & Abakumova, 2016; Kovsh, Skirtach & Bunyaeva, 2015), and pedagogical contexts now. Hostility is an irregular, emotionally charged shape of behaviour (Bunyaeva, 2015). In the world of scientific literature, the term hostility has not received a generally accepted definition. So far, it has been treated by various authors differently. In most works the term 'hostility' is used, as a rule, along with other words closely related in meaning such as dislike, aggression and anger.

The standard definition of hostility is often credited to Buss (1961) who regarded the construct as an attitude that involves the dislike and negative evaluation of others. "Hostility is a negative evaluation of persons and things (Buss, 1961), often accompanied by a clear desire to do harm" (Kaufmann, 1970).

Plutchik (1980) considered it as a negative attitude that combines anger with disgust, and it is accompanied by feelings of indignation, , contempt and resentment towards others; on some occasions, it can even become bitterness leading to violence. This cluster of negative feelings towards others known as 'hostile attribution' is its subjective component (Barefoot, 1992) being reflected in a disfavoured judgement on them, perceived as antagonistic and threatening (Berkowitz, 1994). Hostility is expressed when we say we don't like somebody, especially if we wish him ill. A hostile person is somebody that usually does negative evaluations of and towards others, showing an overall dislike and contempt for others. This attitude of resentment and suspicion can be reflected in verbal and motor responses, such as the aggressive ones (Bushman & Anderson, 2001). Others have used the term 'hostility' to describe the broad construct involving affect, cognition and behaviour, but this term has a more specific meaning involving cognitive factors (Miller, Smith, Turner, Guijarro, & Hallet, 1996).

Social psychologists define hostility as behaviour that is intended to harm another individual who does not wish to be harmed (Baron & Richardson, 1994). Baron & Richardson (1994) stated that, because it involves the perception of intent, what looks like aggression from one point of view may not look so from another, and the same harmful behaviour may or may not be aggressive depending on its intent.

Workplace hostility is a pattern of persistent, malicious, insulting, or exclusionary, intentional or non-intentional behaviours that a target perceives as intentional efforts to harm or control a co-worker or drive him from the workplace (Lutgen-Sandvik, 2005). Workplace hostility is a purposeful and persistent set of non-physical behaviours undertaken by an individual or group

of individuals with an individual in the same organization perceiving these behaviours as intending to harm the individual (Meridith, 2002).

Workplace aggression or hostility (both used interchangeably) includes a variety of behaviours ranging from psychological acts (eg. shouting) to physical assault (Dupre & Barling, 2003). Baron, Neuman & Geddes (1999) proposed that aggressive workplace behaviours can be grouped into three different categories: expression of hostility (i.e hostile verbal or symbolic behaviours such as “the silent treatment”), observation (i.e behaviours that are designed to hamper the target’s performance such as refusing to provide needed resources), and overt aggression (eg. assaults and destruction of property).

Workplace hostility is another dimension to violence in organisations and is assuming an alarming rate which portends danger for the generality of people in Nigeria (Ayinde 2012). There are few key characteristics of workplace hostility that differentiate it from other behaviours measured in the harmful workplace behaviours field and they are as follows: Intentionality, persistence, non-physical nature, organizational affiliation, violation of organizational and/or social norms, and perception of the target (Namie & Namie, 2003).

Hostility in the workplace is becoming a prevalent problem in organisations. It is estimated that between 33 and 75 percent of all employees have engaged in some form of hostile behaviour in the workplace such as antisocial behaviour, deviance, aggression, and violence (Harper, 1990). Less prevalent, yet still harmful, are aggressive behaviours such as lying (DePaulo & DePaulo, 1989), spreading rumours (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997; Fox & Spector, 1999), withholding effort (Kidwell & Bennett, 1993), and absenteeism (Johns, 1997). These attitudes violate workplace norms and, therefore, are considered to be an antisocial type of behaviour (Robinson & Bennett, 1995).

Cognitive Neoassociation Theory:

A lot of theories have been used to study hostility but the present study was supported by the Cognitive Neoassociation Theory by Berkowitz (1990). Berkowitz (1989, 1990, & 1993) proposed that aversive events such as frustrations, provocations, loud noises, uncomfortable temperatures, and unpleasant odours produce negative affect. Negative affect produced by unpleasant experiences automatically stimulates various thoughts, memories, expressive motor reactions, and physiological responses associated with both fight and flight tendencies. The fight associations give rise to rudimentary feelings of anger, whereas the flight associations give rise to rudimentary feelings of fear. Furthermore, cognitive neoassociation theory assumes that cues present during an aversive event become associated with the event and with the cognitive and emotional responses triggered off by the event. In cognitive neoassociation theory, aggressive thoughts, emotions, and behavioural tendencies are all linked in the memory (Collins & Loftus 1975).

The Cognitive neoassociation theory also includes higher-order cognitive processes, such as appraisals and attributions. If people are motivated to do so, they might think about how they feel, make causal attributions for what led them to feel this way, and consider the consequences of acting on their feelings. Such deliberate thought produces more clearly differentiated feelings of anger, fear, or both. It can also suppress or enhance the action tendencies associated with these feelings. Cognitive neoassociation theory not only subsumes the earlier frustration aggression hypothesis (Dollard et al. 1939), but it also provides a causal mechanism for explaining why aversive events increase aggressive inclinations, i.e., through negative affect

(Berkowitz 1989). This model is particularly suited to explaining hostile aggression, but the same priming and spreading activation processes are also relevant to other types of aggression.

It is therefore not surprising that organizational scholars have focused, with vigour, on various forms of negative behaviour in the workplace in recent times (Fox & Spector, 1999; Fisher, 2003; Griffin & Lopez, 2005). Employee deviance, aggression, antisocial behaviour, violence, as well as playing mean pranks, acting rudely, and arguing have been suspected to be the fastest growing hostile workplace behaviours among Nigerian work groups in recent times.

Because of the harmful effects of hostility in organisations, a lot of studies have attempted to determine its likely predictors. This attempt has met a paucity of research to determine the psychological predictors of workplace hostility within the Nigerian context, as much of the studies centered on environmental and situational factors which were mostly conducted outside Nigeria. Hence, the present study attempts to examine conscientiousness and paranoid ideation as likely psychological predictors of workplace hostility.

Conscientiousness is defined as individual differences in the propensity to follow socially prescribed norms for impulse control, to be goal-directed, planful, able to delay gratification, and to follow norms and rules (Roberts, Jackson, Fayard, Edmonds, & Meints, 2009). It is the personality trait that has been defined as being thorough, careful, or vigilant; it implies a desire to do tasks well.

Conscientiousness is a broad domain of traits that subsume multiple lower-order facets. Presently, at least five facets can be thought of as components of conscientiousness: industriousness, orderliness, impulse control; reliability, and conventionality (Jackson, Bogg, Walter, Wood, Harms, et al., 2009; Roberts, Chernyshenko, Stark, & Goldberg, 2005; Roberts, 2004). Additional facets may also be part of conscientiousness such as virtue and decisiveness (Hough & Ones, 2001; Roberts et al., 2005) but have yet to be confirmed in subsequent research.

It is one of the most reliable predictors of work outcomes, including job performance (Dudley, Orvis, Lebiecki, & Cortina, 2006), leadership (Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002), income (Moffitt, Arseneault, Belsky et al., 2011), and occupational attainment (Roberts et al., 2007). Conscientious people tend to be very careful about their future planning (Burch & Anderson 2008), they are cautious about their surroundings, compact and fully scheduled (Cattell & Mead 2008). Conscientiousness is most often thought of as a personality trait, which reflects the relatively enduring, automatic patterns of thought, feeling, and behaviour that differentiate people from one another and that are elicited in trait-evoking situations (Roberts, 2009; Roberts & Jackson, 2008). Conscientious people are efficient and organized as opposed to easy-going and disorderly people. They exhibit a tendency to show self-discipline to be generally organized, dependable, and goal oriented; to act dutifully and aim for achievement. It is manifested in characteristic behaviours such as being neat and systematic; also including such elements as carefulness, thoroughness and deliberation (the tendency to think carefully before acting). Conscientious individuals are generally hard-working and reliable. When taken to an extreme they may become workaholics, perfectionists and compulsive in their behaviour. People who score low on conscientiousness tend to be more laid back, less goal oriented and less driven by success; they are more likely to engage in antisocial and criminal behaviours like workplace hostility (Ozer & Benet-Martinez, 2006) whereas people who score high on the

trait of conscientiousness tend to be more organized and less clustered in their homes and offices unlike those who score low in this trait (Gosling, 2008).

Finally, conscientiousness is an independent predictor of major depression above and beyond other personality traits, such as neuroticism (Kendler & Myers, 2010). Most researchers are familiar with the term conscientiousness because of its inclusion in the Big Five taxonomy of personality traits: Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability, and Openness/Intellect (Goldberg, 1993). Conscientiousness has been shown to be the most consistent, significant predictor of workplace performance. (Barrick, & Mount, 1991; Behling, 1998; Dudley, Orvis, Lebiecki, & Cortina, 2006; Hogan, Holland, 2003; Hurtz, & Donovan, 2000). For example, meta-analyses on the prediction of job performance from personality dimensions have demonstrated that broad measures of Conscientiousness predict overall job performance, (Barrick, Mount, & Judge, (2001); Hurtz, & Donovan, (2000) even controlling for cognitive ability (Hough, & Oswald, (2008). Schmidt, & Hunter, (1998) in addition to overall job performance, broad measures of Conscientiousness have been shown to predict a number of other valued workplace behaviour, such as organizational citizenship (Borman, Penner, & Motowidlo (2001); Sackett, Berry, Wiemann, & Laczko, (2006) and leadership (Judge, Heller, & Mount, 2002) as well as undesirable behaviors such as procrastination, (Judge, & Ilies, 2002) .

H₁. Conscientiousness will significantly predict hostility among university non-academic staff.

Paranoid ideation is another likely predictor of workplace hostility as captured in the present study. Derogatis, Lima & Covi (1977) saw paranoid ideation as the act of suspiciousness, distrustfulness and blaming others. Paranoid ideation, according to DSM-5, is characterized by a pervasive distrust and suspiciousness of others such that their motives are interpreted as malevolent, beginning in early adulthood and present in a variety of contexts as indicated by these behavioural symptoms: suspects, without sufficient basis, that others are exploiting, harming, or deceiving him; is preoccupied with unjustified doubts about the loyalty or trustworthiness of friends or associates; is reluctant to confide in others because of unwarranted fear that the information will be used maliciously against him; persistently bears grudges, (i.e. is unforgiving of insults, injuries, or slights), perceives attacks on his character or reputation that are not apparent to others and is quick to react angrily or to counter-attack.

It is not surprising that the term ‘paranoia’ has migrated from the clinical literature into the popular lexicon (Freeman & Freeman, 2008). Although paranoia originally signified psychopathology or madness (Lewis, 1970), the word, now more broadly, denotes “a tendency on the part of an individual or group for excessive or irrational suspiciousness and distrustfulness of others” (Merriam-Webster, 2012). For many individuals, beliefs that appear paranoid stem from real life experiences and may constitute rational responses to threatening environments. Discrimination and micro-aggression (Rippy & Newman, 2006; Sue, Capodilupo, & Holder, 2008), economic inequity, peer rejection and bullying (Campbell & Morrison, 2007; Schreier et al., 2009), and childhood abuse and neglect (De Loore et al., 2007; Lataster, Van, Drukker, Henquet, et al., 2006; Natsuaki, Cicchetti, & Rogosch, 2009; Price & Glad, 2003) all predict biases in or proclivities for anticipating physical or psychological aggression from others. As each of the studies cited above also illustrated, however, the correspondence between negative life experiences and paranoid thinking is far from perfect. Many individuals who experience mistreatment never develop paranoid ideas or conceptualize

ostensibly benign others as sources of danger; conversely, not all individuals who hold such beliefs show clear histories of having been aggression targets.

H₂: Paranoid Ideation will significantly predict hostility among university non-academic staff.

Methodology:

Population and sample size:

Data was obtained from Two hundred and ten (210) non-academic staff of a University. These participants were randomly selected from the different structures of the non-academic staff arm in the administrative section of the university. Systematic sampling was used in selecting the participants for the study. The total sample consisted of 98 (47%) males and 112 (53%) females. The ages of the participants ranged between 25 and 61, with a mean age of 35 years and standard deviation of 9.56.

Instrumentation:

Two instruments were used for data collection namely; The Symptom Distress Checklist (SCL-90) and The Big Five Inventory. The sub scales of hostility, paranoid ideation and conscientiousness were adopted for the study.

Hostility scale:

This is a subscale of symptom distress checklist (SCL-90) developed by L.R. Derogatis, R.S. Lipman & L. Covi (1977). It is a 90-item inventory designed to assess 10 primary categories of symptoms associated with distress among psychiatric outpatients and with the experience of anguish arising from the problems of living among people in the general population. It is a short 6 (six) item questionnaire with responses to each item on a five-point likert scale numbered 0, 1, 2, 3, & 4. It measured hostility and consisted of questions about how much a person is bothered or distressed in the recent past and present. The scoring was done on a 5-point likert format thus: 0- Not at all, 1- A little bit, 2- Moderately, 3- Quite a bit, 4- Extremely.

Derogatis et. al. (1977) reports an alpha coefficient which ranged from .77 for psychoticism to .90 for depression. The one-week interval test retest reliability coefficients ranged from .80 for hostility to .90 for phobic anxiety. However, through pilot study a Cronbach's alpha of .91 was obtained.

Paranoid ideation scale:

This is a subscale of symptom distress checklist (SCL-90) developed by L.R. Derogatis, R.S. Lipman & L. Covi (1977). It is a 90-item inventory designed to assess 10 primary categories of symptoms associated with distress among psychiatric outpatients and with the experience of anguish arising from the problems of living among people in the general population. It is a short 6 (six) item questionnaire with responses to each item on a five-point likert scale numbered 0, 1, 2, 3, and 4. It measures paranoid ideation and consisted of questions about how much a person is bothered or distressed in the recent past and present. The scoring was done on a 5-point likert format thus: 0- Not at all, 1- A little bit, 2- Moderately, 3- Quite a bit, 4- Extremely.

Derogatis et. al. (1977) reports an alpha coefficient which ranged from .77 for psychoticism to .90 for depression. The one-week interval test retest reliability coefficients ranged from .80 for

hostility to .90 for phobic anxiety. However, through pilot study a Cronbach's alpha of .88 was obtained.

Conscientiousness scale:

This is a subscale of the Big Five Inventory (BFI) developed by O.P. John, E.M. Donahue & R.L. Kentle (1991). This is a 44-item inventory designed to measure personality. The inventory was on conscientiousness and the scales were presented from positive to negative for the items. It is a 9-point inventory designed to measure an individual's conscientiousness that is based on personality traits. It is a direct scoring item. The scoring was done on a 5-point likert format as follows: 1-Disagree strongly, 2- Disagree a little, 3-Neither agree nor disagree, 4-Agree a little, 5- Agree strongly. John et al (1991) reported a Cronbach's alpha score of .80 and 3 months test-retest of .85, validity coefficients of .75 and .85. However, through pilot study a Cronbach's alpha of .90 was obtained.

Procedure:

The researchers, with the help of two research assistants administered the copies of the questionnaires to the staff that were randomly selected through the use of systematic sampling. The units of non-academic staff domiciled in the administrative block were listed and selected using an Nth case of 1. Thereafter the members of the selected units were conveniently used as participants of the study.

Out of 250 copies of the questionnaire administered, 210 were completely filled and returned hence, used for data analysis.

Design and Statistics:

The design used for this study is correlational design which was used because it is a predictive study. The statistical tool for this study is multiple regression.

The Results:

Table 1:
Descriptive statistics

VARIABLES	CONSCIENTIOUSNESS	PARANOID IDEATION	HOSTILITY
GENDER			
MALE Mean	3.9773	1.8946	1.3061
N	98	98	98
Std. Deviation	.72483	.91331	.86404
FEMALE Mean	4.1548	1.8140	.9946
N	112	112	112
Std. Deviation	.63774	.70878	.85127
MARITAL STATUS			
SINGLE Mean	3.9928	1.9543	1.1677
N	124	124	124
Std. Deviation	.66452	.79216	.80985
MARRIED Mean	4.1860	1.7035	1.1000
N	86	86	86
Std. Deviation	.69909	.81626	.95190
TOTAL Mean	4.0720	1.8516	1.1400
N	210	210	210
Std. Deviation	.68390	.80967	.86926

Table 1: indicates that females have higher mean (4.1548) than males (3.9773) on conscientiousness, but males (1.8946) scored higher than females (1.8140) on paranoid ideation; also, males (1.3061) scored higher than females (.9946) on hostility.

Males have higher standard deviation (.72483) than females (.63774) on conscientiousness; males (.91331) scored higher than females (.70878) on paranoid ideation; and also males (.86404) scored higher than females (.85127) on hostility. The females (112) are higher in number than the males (98) are in number.

The table also indicates that married participants (4.1860) have higher mean than single participants (3.9928) on conscientiousness, but singles (1.9543) have higher standard deviation than married (1.7035) whereas singles (124) are higher in number than married ones (86).

Table 2: A table showing result of the hypothesis tested on the predictability of conscientiousness and paranoid ideation on hostility.

Model	Coefficients ^a						
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for β	
	β	Std. Error	Beta (β)			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
(Constant)	1.740	.380		4.582	.000	.991	2.488
CONSCIENTIOUSNESS	-.286	.082	-.225	-3.470	.431	-.448	-.123
PARANOID IDEATION	.304	.070	.283	4.375	.001	.167	.441

a. Dependent Variable: HOSTILITY

Table 2 indicates that the first hypothesis which stated that conscientiousness will significantly predict hostility was rejected at β (-.225) = -3.470, $P > .05$ level of significance. Therefore, conscientiousness will not predict hostility.

The second hypothesis which stated that paranoid ideation will significantly predict hostility was confirmed at β (.283) = 4.375, $p < 0.05$ level of significance. Therefore, paranoid ideation will predict hostility.

Discussion:

The study aims at investigating conscientiousness and paranoid ideation as predictors of workplace hostility among university non-academic staff. Two hypotheses were tested; age, gender and marital status were used in the study as control variables.

The result of the study shows that conscientiousness is not a significant predictor of workplace hostility among university non-academic staff. It indicates that conscientiousness does not contribute to workplace hostility among university non-academic staff. Thus, hypothesis 1, which states that conscientiousness will significantly predict workplace hostility among university non-academic staff, was rejected. This is in line with the findings of Agoha, Benedict C. E. & Igbokwe, David O. (2014) who investigated the big-five as predictors of maladjustment among University Undergraduate students. Participants were 164 students from a private University. The big five personality inventory developed by John & Srivastva, and the University Maladjustment Scale (UMS) were used for the study. It was hypothesised that the

Big Five measures of personality would predict maladjustment among University undergraduates. The findings of the study indicated that conscientiousness, and openness cannot predict academic maladjustment.

Secondly, hypothesis II, which stated that paranoid ideation will significantly predict hostility among non-academic staff was accepted. This is in line with the findings of Anwar, Sarwar, Awan and Aif (2013) who investigated gender differences in workplace hostile behaviour among fifty lecturers of post-graduate level. They were selected randomly as the sample. Of these respondents 26 were males and 24 were females. The results of the study revealed that the ratio of organizational hostility in the university's workplace is more dominant in male teaching staff than in female teaching staff. It agrees with the findings of Combs et al (2009) who examined the perception of hostility by persons with and without persecutory delusions. The sample comprised 32 persons with PD, 28 persons without PD (psychotic controls) and 50 healthy participants (non psychotic controls). Participants completed the Ambiguous Intentions Hostility Questionnaire along with measures of paranoia, attribution style, depression, anxiety, self-esteem and public self-consciousness. Results showed that the group with PD showed greater perception of hostility, blame and aggression scores for most ambiguous situations on the AIHQ. Also, the AIHQ hostility bias score was predictive of paranoid ideation. In conclusion persons with PD showed a social-cognitive bias for perceiving hostility in ambiguous situations. Moreso, the findings of Browning (2009) who conducted an exploratory study on hostile behaviour among service encounter front-line employees indicated that the customer's attitude and behaviour are key factors that influence front-line employees to engage in acts of hostility.

Suggestions for Further Studies:

Researchers in their subsequent studies should endeavour to use larger sample size in order to improve generalization and applicability of the findings. Meanwhile more studies should be conducted using sample from different institutions as it will help to provide clear insight and understanding of workplace hostility and better psychological interventions that may be appropriate in handling workplace hostility. On the other hand, researchers in future should also try to include other variables like, socio economic status, locality, and level in their study to ascertain their influence in manifestation of workplace hostility.

Recommendations:

Psychologists should help provide better psychological interventions that will be appropriate in handling workplace hostility.

On the other hand, more studies should be focused on other variables like; socio economic status, locality, family relationship, level of employment etc which may as well be predictive factors of workplace hostility.

Finally, future studies should try to replicate this study with other tertiary institution's non-academic staff. This would increase the generalization of the result.

Conclusion:

Workplace hostility is common in most institutions today, especially with the presence of a diverse workforce. In developing countries like Nigeria, it is common for non-academic staff to experience and exhibit hostile behaviour at work on a daily basis. Irrespective of the form or dimension, aggressive behaviour affects staff well-being and performance at work and must be discouraged in order to achieve organizational effectiveness. Organizations in Nigeria

must, therefore, develop policies that depict zero tolerance for hostility or aggressive behaviour in the workplace. This may likely reduce the negative consequences of workplace hostility for organizational/ institutional effectiveness and harmony.

References

- Abakumova, I. V., Ermakov, P. N. & Kolesina, K. Y. (2016). On analyzing the results of empirical research into the life-purpose orientations of adults of various ethnic identities and religious affiliation. *Psychology in Russia: State of the Art*, 9(1), 155-163.
- Adolphs, R., Tranel, D., & Damasio, A. R., (1998): The human amygdala in social judgement. *Nature*; 393: 470–474.
- Agoha, B. C. E. Igbokwe, David o. (2014). Stressful life events and somatic complaints in a Nigerian adult sample. *Nigerian Journal of Psychological Research*, 6, 10-17.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179-211.
- Akinbode, G. A. (2009). Effects of gender and organisational factors on workplace deviant and fraudulent behaviours. *Journal of Management and Entrepreneur*, 2(1), 53-79.
- Andreasen, N. C. (1997). Linking mind and brain in the study of mental illnesses: a project for a scientific psychopathology. *Science*; 275: 1586–1593.
- Anwar, M. N., Sarwar, M., Awan, R.N., & Arif, M.I. (2013). Gender differences in workplace deviant behavior of university teachers and modification techniques. *International Education Studies*, 4(1). Published by Canadian Center for Science Education.
- Appelbaum, P. S., Robbins, P., & Monahan, J. (2000). Violence and delusions: Data from the MacArthur Violence Risk Assessment Study. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 157, 566–572.
- Aquino, K., Lewis, M.U., & Bradfield, M. (1999). Justice constructs, negative affectivity, and employee deviance: A proposed model and empirical. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 20(7), 1073-1091. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1379\(199912\)20:7<1073::AID-JOB943>3.0.CO;2-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199912)20:7<1073::AID-JOB943>3.0.CO;2-7)
- Ayinde, A. T. (2012). ‘Psychological Impacts of Aggression in Health Care Institutions: Theoretical perspectives’ In I. Needham, K. McKenna, M. Kingmo, & N. Oud (Eds) Conference Proceeding on Violence in the Health Sector: Linking Local Initiatives with Global Learning.
- Bailey, C. A., & Ostrov, J. M. (2008). Differentiating forms and functions of aggression in emerging adults: Associations with hostile attribution biases and normative beliefs. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 37, 713–722.
- Bandura, A. (1973). *Aggression: A Social Learning Analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Barefoot, J. C. (1992). Developments in the measurement of hostility. In H. S. Friedman (Ed.), *Hostility, coping, and health* (pp. 13–31). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Barling, J. (1996). The prediction, psychological experience, and consequences of workplace violence. In G. VandenBos and E. Q. Bulatao (Eds), *Violence on the job: Identifying risks and developing solutions* (pp. 29-50). Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association.
- Baron, R. A., & Richardson, D. R. (1994). *Human aggression* (2nd ed.). New York: Plenum.
- Barratt, E. (1994). Impulsiveness and aggression. In J. Monahan & H. J. Steadman (Eds.). *Violence and mental disorder: Developments in risk assessment* (pp. 61–78). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Barrick, M. R. & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 1–26.
- Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K., & Judge, T. A. (2001). Personality and performance at the beginning of the new millennium: What do we know and where do we go next? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9, 9–30.
- Behling, O. (1998). Employee selection: will intelligence and conscientiousness do the job? *Academy of Management Executive*, 12, 77–86.
- Bendig, A. W. (1961). A factor analysis of scales of emotionality and hostility. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 22, 189–192.
- Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(3), 349-360.
- Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2003). The past, present and future of workplace deviance research, In J. Greenberg (Ed.) *Organisational behaviour: The state of the science*, (2nd Ed.) Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bentall, R. P. (1994): Cognitive biases and abnormal beliefs: towards a model of persecutory delusions; in David AS, Cutting J (Eds): *The Neuropsychology of Schizophrenia*. London, Erlbaum, pp 337–360.
- Bentall, R. P. (2003): The paranoid self; in Kircher T, David AS (Eds): *The Self in Neuroscience and Psychiatry*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, , pp 293–318.
- Bentall, R. P., Corcoran, R., Howard, R., Blackwood, N., & Kinderman, P. (2001). Persecutory delusions: A review and theoretical integration. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 21, 1143–1192.
- Berkowitz, L. (1993). *Aggression: its causes, consequences, and control*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Berkowitz, L. (1994). Is something missing? Some observations prompted by the cognitive-neoassociationist view of anger and emotional aggression. In L. R. Huesmann (Ed.), *Aggressive behavior: current perspectives* (pp. 35–57). New York: Plenum.
- Bettencourt, A., Talley, A., Arlin, J. & Valentine, J. (2006). Personality and Aggressive Behavior Under Provoking and Neutral Conditions: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 132 (5) 751–777
- Björkly, S. (2002). Psychotic symptoms and violence towards others. A literature review of some preliminary findings: Part 1. Delusions. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 7, 617–631.
- Björkqvist K., (1994). Sex differences in physical, verbal and indirect aggression: A review of recent research. *Sex Roles*, 30:177-188.
- Bjorkvist, K., Osterman, K., & Hjelt-Back, M (1994). Aggression among university employees. *Aggressive Behavior*, 20, 173-184.
- Blackwood, N. J., Bentall, R. P., Fytche, D. H., Simmons. A., Murray, R. M., & Howard, R. J. (2004): Persecutory delusions and the determination of self-relevance: an fMRI investigation. *Psychol Med*; 34: 591–596.
- Blackwood, N. J., Howard, R. J., Fytche, D. H., Simmons, A., Bentall, R. P., & Murray, R. M. (2000): Imaging attentional and attributional bias: An fMRI approach to the paranoid delusion. *Psychol Med*; 30: 873–383.
- Borman, W. C., Penner, L. A., Allen, T. D., & Motowidlo, S. J. (2001). Personality predictors of citizenship performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9, 52–69.
- Browning, V. (2009). An exploratory study into deviant behaviour in the service encounter: How and why front-line employees engage in deviant behaviour. *Journal of Management*, 14(4), 451-464.
- Bushman, B. J., & Anderson, C. A. (2011). Is it time to pull the plug on the hostile versus instrumental aggression dichotomy? *Psychological Review*, 108, 273 – 279.
- Buss, A. H. (1961). *The psychology of aggression*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Campbell, M. C., & Morrison, A. P. (2007). The relationship between bullying, psychotic-like experiences and appraisals in 14-16-year olds. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 45, 1579–1591.
- Cankaya, B. (2011). *Anger as a Mediator of the Effects of Anxiety on Aggressiveness in teacher Trainees*: Firat University, Elazig, Turkey.
- Caprara, G. V., Regalia, C., & Bandura, A. (2002). Longitudinal impact of perceived self regulatory efficacy on violent conduct. *European Psychologist*, 7, 63–69.

- Carter, C. S., Mintun, M., Nichols, T., & Cohen, J. D. (1997): Anterior cingulate gyrus dysfunction and selective attention deficits in schizophrenia: [15 O]H₂O PET study during single-trial Stroop task performance. *Am J Psychiatry*; 154: 1670–1675.
- Combs, D. R., Penn, D.L., & Michael, C.O. (2009). Paranoia and emotion perception across the continuum. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 45, 19-31.
- Conard, M. A. (2006). Aptitude is not enough: How personality and behavior predict academic performance. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40, 339–346.
- Cortina, L. M., Magley, V. J., Williams, J. H., & Langhout, R. D. (2001). Incivility in the workplace: Incidence and impact. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 6, 64-80.
- Costa, P., & McCrae, R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R) and NEO*
- Damasio, A. R., (1996): The somatic marker hypothesis and the possible functions of the prefrontal cortex. *Phil Trans R Soc Lond B BiolSci*; 351: 1413–1420.
- De Loore, E., Drukker, M., Gunther, N., Feron, F., Deboutte, D., Sabbe, B., et al. (2007). Childhood negative experiences and subclinical psychosis in adolescence: A longitudinal general population study. *Early Intervention in Psychiatry*, 1, 201–207.
- De Raad, B., & Peabody, D. (2005). Cross-culturally recurrent personality factors: Analyses of three factors. *European Journal of Personality*, 19, 451–474.
- De Raad, B., Barelds, D. P. H., Levert, E., Ostendorf, F., Mlac'i'c, B., Di Blas, L., Katigbak, M. S. (2010). Only three factors of personality description are fully replicable across languages: A comparison of 14 trait taxonomies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98, 160–173.
- DeCastro, B. O., Veerman, J. W., Koops, W., Bosch, J. D., & Monshouwer, H. J. (2002). Hostile attribution of intent and aggressive behavior: A meta-analysis. *Child Development*, 73, 916–934.
- Deregotis, I.R., Lipman & Covi, L. (1977). *Symptoms Distress Checklist* 90. Lagos: PPC Nigerian Agency, Lagos Nigeria.
- DeYoung, C. G., Quilty, L. C., & Peterson, J. B. (2007). Between facets and domains: 10 Aspects of the Big Five. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93, 880–896.
- Dollard, J., Doob, L., Miller, N., Mowrer, O., & Seers, R. (1939) '*Frustration and Aggression*'. Yale University Press, New Haven.
- Douglas, S. C., & Martinko, M. J. (2001). Exploring the role of individual differences in the prediction of workplace *Journal* <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.4.547> of *Applied Psychology*, 86, 846-859.
- Dudley, N. M., Orvis, K. A., Lebiecki, J. E., & Cortina, J. M. (2006). A meta-analytic investigation of conscientiousness in the prediction of job performance: Examining the

- intercorrelations and the incremental validity of narrow traits. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 40–57.
- Duffy, M. K., Ganster, D. C., & Pagon, M. (2002). Social undermining in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45, 331-351.
- Dupre, K. E., Inness, M., LeBlanc, M., & Sivanathan, N. (2003). Predicting Workplace Aggression: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 228-238.
- Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. L. Cooper (2003). *Bullying and Emotional Abuse in the Workplace: International Perspectives in Research and Practice*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Ermakov, P., & Fedotova, O. (2015). Characteristics of aggression reflection in the psychological educational books of the “Graphic Guide” type. *Procedia – Social and behavioral Sciences*, 214, 876-881.
- Ermakov, P. N., Skirtach, I. A., & Kovsh, E. M. (2015). Features of Frequency-Spatial Organization of the Cerebral Cortex at Musicians during the Creation of Improvisation Based on Stimulus Material with Aggressive and Peaceful “Characters”. *Russian psychological Journal*, 12(4), 127-136.
- Etim, V. N., & Okey, S. M. (2013). Conflict Management in the Nigerian University System. *Journal of Educational and Social Research. Psychology* 18(2) Pp. 24-32.
- Eysenck, H.J. (1967): *The biological basis of personality*. Springfield, 111: Thomas.
- Eysenck, S. B. J., Pearson, P. R., Easting, G., & Allsop, J. F. (1985). Age norms for impulsiveness, venturesomeness and empathy in adults. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 6, 613–619.
- Fedotova, O. & Chigisheva, O. (2015). Comparative analysis: Methodological optics in the ideological context. *International Perspectives on Education and Society*, 26, 57-82.
- Fedotova, O. (2013). The content of a site of the President of Russia as the information indicator of realization of counter-terrorism strategy in Russia. *Middle East Journal of Scientific Research*, 16(3), 392-396.
- Fisher, C. D. (2003). Why do lay people believe that satisfaction and performance are correlated? Possible sources of a common sense theory. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 24, 753-777.
- Fisher, C. D. (2002). Antecedents and consequences of real-time affective reactions at work. *Motivation and Emotion*, 26, 3-30.
- Fisher, C.D. (2000). Mood and emotions while working: Missing pieces of job satisfaction?. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 21, 185-202.
Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI). Odessa, FL Psychological Assessment Resources.

- Fox, S. & Spector, E. (2005). Counterproductive work behavior: Investigations of actors and targets. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Fox, S., Spector, P. E., & Miles, D. (2001). Counter productive work behaviour (CWB) in response to job stressors and organisational justice: Some mediator and moderator tests for autonomy and emotions. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 59, (3), 291-309.
- Fox, S., & Spector, P. E. (1999). A model of work frustration-aggression. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 20, 915-913.
- Freeman, D. & Freema C (2008). 'Virtual reality study of paranoid thinking in the general population': Author's reply. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 192, 81-82.
- Freud, S. (1950). *Beyond the pleasure principle*. SE, 18: 1-64.
- Gallese, V. (1998). Goldman A: Mirror neurons and the simulation theory of mind-reading. *Trends CognSci*; 2: 493-501.
- Gallese, V. (2003): The roots of empathy: the shared manifold hypothesis and the neural basis of intersubjectivity. *Psychopathology*; 36: 171-180.
- Galperin, B., & Burke, R. J. (2006). Uncovering the Relationship between Workaholism and Workplace Destructive and Constructive Deviance: An Exploratory Study. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 17, 331-347.
- Garety, P. A., & Freeman, D. (1999). Cognitive approaches to delusions: A critical review of theories and evidence. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 38, 113-154.
- Gleason, K. A., Jensen-Campbell, L. A., & Richardson, D. S. (2004). Agreeableness as a predictor of aggression in adolescence. *Aggressive Behavior*, 30, 43-61.
- Glomb, T. M., Steel, P. D. G., & Arvey, R. D. (2003). Office sneers, snipes, and stab wounds: Antecedents, consequences, and implications of workplace violence and aggression. In R. Lord, R. Klimoski & R. Kanfer (Eds.), *Emotions and Work*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1993). The structure of phenotypic personality traits. *American Psychologist*, 48, 26-34.
- Griffin, R.W., & Lopez Y. P. (2005). "Bad behavior" in organizations: A review and typology for future research. *Journal of Management*, 31, 988.
- Haggard-Grann, U., Hallqvist, J., Langstrom, N., & Moller, J. (2006). Shortterm effects of psychiatric symptoms and interpersonal stressors on criminal violence: A case-crossover study. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 41, 532-540.
- Harper, D. (1990). Spotlight abuse-save profits. *Industrial distribution*, 79, 47-51.

- Heckers, S. (1997): Neuropathology of schizophrenia: cortex, thalamus, basal ganglia, and neurotransmitter-specific projection systems. *Schizophrenia Bull* 1997; 23: 403–421. 113 White NM: Mnemonic functions of the basal ganglia. *Curr Opin Neurobiol*; 7: 164169.
- Hershcovis, M. S., Turner, N., Barling, J., Arnold, K. A, Dupre, K. E., Inness, M., LeBlanc, M., & Sivanathan, N. (2007). Predicting Workplace Aggression: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 228-238.
- Hills, D. J., Joyce, C. M. & Humphreys, J. S. (2012) ‘A national study of workplace aggression in Australian clinical medical practice’ *Medical Journal Australian*; 197 (6): 336-340. doi: 10.5694/mja12.10444
- Hoel, H., Einarsen, S., Keashly, L., Zapf, D., Cooper, C. L. (2003). Bullying at work: The wayforward. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C.L. Cooper (Eds.) *Bullying and Emotional Abuse in the Workplace: International Perspectives in Research and Practice* (pp. 412-416). London:
- Hogan, J. & Holland, B. (2003). Using theory to evaluate personality and job-performance relations: A socio-analytic perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 100–112.
- Hollinger, R.C., & Clark, J.P. (1982). Formal and informal social controls of employees deviance. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 23, 333-343. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.1982.tb01016.x>
- Hough, L. M., & Ones, D. S. (2001). The structure, measurement, validity, and use of personality variables in industrial, work, and organizational psychology. In Handbook of industrial. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.). *Handbook of industrial work and organizational psychology. Personnel psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 233–277). London, UK: Sage..
- Hough, L. M., & Oswald, F. L. (2008). Personality testing and industrial-organizational psychology: Reflections, progress, and prospects. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1, 272–290.
- Hurtz, G. M. & Donovan, J. J. (2000). Personality and job performance: The Big Five revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 869–879.
- Iancu A .E, Andrea Hoge, & Alexandru F. Olteanu .(2016): Romanian Journal of Applied
- Jackson, J. J., Bogg, T., Walton, K., Wood, D., Harms, P. D., Lodi-Smith, J. L., et al. (2009). Not all conscientiousness scales change alike: A multi-method, multisample study of age differences in the facets of conscientiousness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96, 446–459.
- Jensen-Campbell, L. A., & Graziano, W. G. (2001). Agreeableness as a moderator of interpersonal conflict. *Journal of Personality*, 69, 323–362.

- Johns, G. (1997). "Contemporary research on absence from work: correlates, causes, and consequences", In Cooper, C.L. and Robertson, I.T. (Eds.), *International Review of Industrial and Organisational Psychology*, 12, John Wiley & Sons, London, 115-174.
- Judge, T. A. & Ilies, R. (2002). Relationship of personality to performance motivation: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 797–807.
- Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 765–780.
- Kaufmann, H. (1970). *Aggression and Altruism*. Rinehart and Winston, Holt.
- Kendler, K. S., & Myers, J. (2010). The genetic and environmental relationship between major depression and the five-factor model of personality. *Psychological Medicine*, 40, 801–806.
- Kidwell, R. E., & Bennett, N. (1993). Employee propensity to withhold effort: A Conceptual model to intersect three avenues of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 18, 429–456.
- Kinderman, P., & Bentall, R. P. (1997). Causal attributions in paranoia and depression: Internal, personal, and situational attributions for negative events. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 106, 341–345.
- Lataster, T., van Os, J., Drukker, M., Henquet, C., Feron, F., Gunther, N., et al. (2006). Childhood victimisation and developmental expression of non-clinical delusional ideation and hallucinatory experiences: Victimisation and non-clinical psychotic experiences. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 41, 423–428.
- Lawrie, S. M., & Abukmeil, S. S. (1998): Brain abnormality in schizophrenia: a systematic and quantitative review of volumetric magnetic resonance imaging studies. *Br J Psychiatry*, 172: 110–120.
- Lee, K., & Allen, N. J. (2002). Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Workplace Deviance: The role of affect and cognitions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 131-142.
- Lewis, A. (1970). Paranoia and paranoid: A historical perspective. *Psychological Medicine*, 1, 2–12.
- Lutgen-Sandvik, P. (2005). Take this job and . . . quitting and other forms of resistance to workplace bullying. *Communication Monographs*, 73, pp. 406–433.
- MacCann, C., Duckworth, A. L., & Roberts, R. D. (2009). Empirical identification of the major facets of conscientiousness. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 19, 451–458.
- Merriam-Webster. (2012). Paranoia. Retrieved February 20, 2012, from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/paranoia>

- Miller, T. Q., Smith, T. W., Turner, C. W., Guijarro, M. L., & Hallet, A. J. (1996). A meta-analytic review of research on hostility and physical health. *Psychological Bulletin*, 119, 322–348.
- Moffitt, T. E., Arseneault, L., Belsky, D., Dickson, N., Hancox, & R. J., Harrington (2011). Review of General Psychology. . Review of General Psychology Caspi, A. A gradient of childhood self-control predicts health, wealth, and public safety. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 108, 2693–2698.
- Muafi, J. (2011). Causes and Consequences of deviant workplace behavior. *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology*, 2(2), 123-126.
- Murphy, K. R. (1993). *Honesty in the workplace*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole
- Namie, G., & Namie, R. (2003). *The bully at work: What you can do to stop the hurt and reclaim your dignity on the job*. Naperville, IL: Sourcebooks.
- Namie, R., & Namie, G. (2003). *The Bully at Work*. DoubleDoc Press.
- Natsuaki, M. N., Cicchetti, D., & Rogosch, F. A. (2009). Examining the developmental history of child maltreatment, peer relations, and externalizing problems among adolescents with symptoms of paranoid personality disorder. *Development and Psychopathology*, 21, 1181–1193.
- Noftle, & Robins., (2007). Personality predictors of academic outcomes: Big five correlates of GPA and SAT scores. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93, 116–130.
- O’Leary-Kelly, A. M., Duffy, M. K., & Griffin, R. W. (2000). Construct confusion in the study of antisocial work behavior. *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management*, 18, 275-303.
- Olabisi, A.; Adelanwa, O.; Amadu, S.; & Charles, U. (2003). *Cultism and youth violence in Nigerian Universities*.
- Omar, Halim, Zainah, Farhadi, Nasir & Kairudin. (2011). Stress and job satisfaction as antecedents of workplace deviant behavior. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 12, 45-51.
- Ozer, D. J., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2006). Personality and the prediction of consequential outcomes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 57, 401–421.
- Peterson. (2002). Deviant workplace behaviour and the organisation’s ethical climate. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 17(1).47-56.
- Plutchik, R., (1980). *Emotion: A Psychoevolutionary synthesis*. New York: John Wiley.
- Price, J. M., & Glad, K. (2003). Hostile attributional tendencies in maltreated children. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 31, 329–343.

- Quine, L. (1999): Workplace Bullying in NHS Community trust: Staff questionnaire survey. *BMJ*, 318:228-232.
- Rippy, A. E., & Newman, E. (2006). Perceived religious discrimination and its relationship to anxiety and paranoia among Muslim Americans. *Journal of Muslim Mental Health*, 1, 5–20.
- Roberts, B. W., & Jackson, J. J. (2008). Sociogenomic personality psychology. *Journal of Personality*, 76, 1523–1544.
- Roberts, B. W., Bogg, T., Walton, K. E., Chernyshenko, O. S., & Stark, S. E. (2004). A lexical investigation of the lower-order structure of conscientiousness. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 38, 164–178.
- Roberts, B. W., Chernyshenko, O., Stark, S., & Goldberg, L. (2005). The Structure of Conscientiousness: An empirical investigation based on seven major personality questionnaires. *Personnel Psychology*, 58, 103–139.
- Roberts, B. W., Jackson, J. J., Fayard, J. V., Edmonds, G., & Meints, J. (2009). Conscientiousness. In M. Leary & R. Hoyle (Eds.): *Handbook of individual differences in Social Behavior*. New York, NY: Guilford Press, pp. 369–381.
- Roberts, B. W., Kuncel, N., Shiner, R. N., Caspi, A., & Goldberg, L. R. (2007). The power of Personality: The comparative validity of personality traits, socio-economic status, and cognitive ability for predicting important life outcomes. *Perspectives in Psychological Science*, 2, 313-345.
- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett. R. J., (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: Amultidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(2), 555-572.
- Sackett, P. R., Berry, C. M., Wiemann, S. A., & Laczko, R. J., (2006). Citizenship and counterproductive behavior: Clarifying relations between the two domains. *Human Performance*, 19, 441–464.
- Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. (1998). The validity and utility of selection methods in personnel psychology: Practical and theoretical implications of 85 years of research findings. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124, 262–274.
- Schreier, A., Wolke, D., Thomas, K., Horwood, J., Hollis, C., Gunnell, D., et al. (2009). Prospective study of peer victimization in childhood and psychotic symptoms in a nonclinical population at age 12 years. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 66, 527–536.
- Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R., (1997). Personality as a moderator in the relationship between fairness and retaliation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42, 100-108.
- Smith, T. W. (1994). Concepts and methods in the study of anger, hostility, and health. In A. W. Siegman, & T. W. Smith (Eds.), *Anger, hostility, and the heart* (pp. 23–42). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Spielberger, C. D., Jacobs, G., Russell, J. S., & Crane, R. S. (1983). Assessment of anger: the state-trait anger scale. In J. N. Butcher, & C. D. Spielberger (Eds.), *Advances in Personality Assessment*, vol. 2. Hillside, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Sue, D., Capodilupo, C. M., & Holder, A. B. (2008). Racial micro-aggressions in the life experience of Black Americans. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 39, 329–336.
- Uguru-Okorie D.C. (2001). *The psychological dimension of crime, cultism and crises in Nigerian institutions*. A Paper presented at a seminar organized for security personnel, University of Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria.
- Ukpong, D. I., Owoeye, O., Udofia, O. & Abasiubong, F. (2011). Violence against mental health staff: A survey in a Nigerian psychiatric hospital. *The Psychiatrist*, 35, 46-49.
- Van, Os, J., & Verdoux, H. (2003). Diagnosis and classification of schizophrenia: Categories versus dimensions, distributions versus disease. In R. M. Murray, P. B. Jones, E. Susser, J. van Os, & M. Cannon (Eds.), *The epidemiology of schizophrenia* (pp. 364–410). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.