



INFLUENCE OF PROSOCIAL PERSONALITY TRAIT ON UNETHICAL BEHAVIOUR AMONG UNIVERSITY STAFF

Anyaegbunam, Michael Chibuzor

Anazonwu, Charles Okechukwu

Department of Psychology, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka

Abstract

This study investigated the influence of prosocial personality trait on unethical behaviour among University staff in Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Anambra State, and Southeast Nigeria. A total number of 209 participants comprising of 35 teaching staff who occupy administrative positions, and 174 non-teaching staff were selected using stratified sampling technique, of which 66(31.5%) were male and 143(68.4%) were female participants with an age range of 23 - 67 years ,having a mean age of 22.15 and standard deviation of 4.1. Two instruments were utilized for the study, a 12- item scale of Unethical Behaviour Tendency Scale (UBTS) (Tang & Weatherford ,(1997) and a 12- item scale of Prosocial Personality Trait Inventory (PPTI) adapted from the work of John (1991) based on the model used by Coutinho, Sampaio, Ferreira & Soares (2013), in Portugal, were used for data collection. PPTI yielded a Cronbach alpha internal consistency of .72, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) confirmed the four-factor structure of PPTI in this study. Cross-sectional study that utilized a correlational design was adopted for the study while linear regression statistics was employed for data analysis. Five hypotheses were tested in this study, hypothesis 1, which stated that prosocial personality trait will inversely predict unethical behaviour tendency among university staff, was accepted at $P < .000$. Hypothesis 2, which stated that prosocial personality trait will inversely predict administrative abuse tendency among university staff was accepted at $P < .000$. Hypothesis 3, which stated that prosocial personality trait will inversely predict corruption behaviour tendency among university staff was accepted at $P < .000$. Hypothesis 4, which stated that prosocial personality trait will inversely predict sabotage behaviour tendency among university staff was accepted at $P < .000$. Hypothesis 5, which stated that prosocial personality trait will inversely predict theft behaviour tendency among university staff was accepted at $P < .000$. Findings revealed that prosocial personality should be adopted and positively reinforced in the Nigerian University system especially in the employment, placement and redeployment of workers, to shape employee behaviour and stem the tide of unethical behaviour in the workplace.

Introduction

Unethical behaviour in the workplace is one of the most critical organizational problems in the world. It covers a broad range of workplace violations, illegal and morally unacceptable



actions. Such actions affect both the organization and employees in diverse measures. Employees sometimes engage in questionable behaviour that harm their employers, co-workers, or the general public. After years of focusing, explaining and predicting positive employee attitudes (e.g job satisfaction, employee commitment) and behaviours (e.g organizational citizenship behaviour, work performance etc), researchers have increasingly turned their attention to understanding what drives costly misconduct in organizations (Nnedum,2008 Fagbohunge, Akinbode & Ayodeji, 2012, Ugwu, 2011). Researchers have used a variety of terms to describe such employee behaviours: viz unethical behaviour, workplace deviance, antisocial behaviour, misbehaviour, counter-productive behaviour, and workplace incivility), all of them share a concern with counter normative behaviours intended to harm the organization or its stakeholders (O'leary Kelly, Duffy, & Griffin, 2000).The workplace is a forum where a variety of different positive and negative behaviours are expressed, and each behaviour leads to different consequences both to the employees and employers in an organization.

Unethical behaviours such as administrative abuse, sabotage, corruption and theft must have contributed to the collapse of several multinational , national and corporate organizations in this country. In Nigeria, unethical behaviours such as corruption and theft led to the failure of banks, and collapse of big corporations like the Railway Transport System, National Electric Power Authority (NEPA) Alike (2014) ; Nigerian Airways (Ibekwe,2013; Okafor,2015 & Business Day Newspaper,2015) ; National Fertilizer Company of Nigeria (NAFCON) (Nigerianwiki), and National Aluminium Smelting Company (ALSCON) (Udo, 2015) . In addition, sabotage behaviour was highly implicated in the failure of Ajaokuta Steel Company in Western Nigeria (Esediesa, 2013) and the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation (NNPC) (The Vanguard, 2015).. Administrative abuse had been implicated in the collapse of



Textile Factories and eight Cotton Milling Factories in Nigeria (Odedokun, 2015). In Africa, unethical behaviour was implicated in the collapse of the Zimbabwean economy under President Mugabe (Wikipedia, 2016).

In America, corruption led to the collapse of Enron (Dallas, 2004). In continental Europe, administrative abuse and corruption led to the desecration of the International Federation of Association Football (FIFA) which led to the resignation of the infamous Sepp Blatter and some of his leaders in the sport world (Assael, Forrest & Chaudhary, 2016). In Germany, corruption and sabotage behaviour led to the collapse of Volkswagen and led to the recall of millions of automobiles already sold (Bartlett, 2016). It is estimated that between 33% and 75% of all employees have engaged in aggressive behaviours such as theft, fraud, vandalism and sabotage (Harper, 1990). Others include lying (DePaulo & DePaulo, 1989), spreading rumours (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997; Fox and Spector, 1999), withholding effort (Kidwell & Bennett, 1993) and absenteeism (Johns, 1997). These attitudes violate workplace ethics and norms and therefore are considered to be unethical type of behavior (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Employee theft, fraud and sabotage, corruption as well as playing pranks, acting rudely, and arguing have been suspected to be among the fastest growing workplace deviant behaviours among Nigerian workgroups in recent times (Fagbohunge et al, 2012). A permanent secretary in collaboration with top senior officers in the Federal Civil Service in Nigeria stole billions of Naira from the Police pension fund through falsified documents (The Vanguard, 2012). The Abuja High court shocked the nation when a ridiculous sentence / fine of N750,000 (Seven hundred and fifty thousand Naira only) was issued to Mr Yakubu Yusufu who stole N23.3 Billion Naira from the Police pension fund (The Guardian, 2013). This singular act by the Abuja High Court, which is a part of the nation's Judiciary system exposed the height of unethical practices in the judicial system. It seemed that the law which



is an instrument predicated on the principle of fairness to all concerned was bent as a result of bribery and corruption due to financial influence.

Empirical research in western countries have recorded how costly unethical behaviour is to organizations, and the social and psychological effects they present (Hollinger & Clark, 1983; Murphy, 1993). In Nigeria, there is relatively, a dearth of empirical research of unethical behaviour . The Nigerian Government responded to these problems by establishing the SERVICOM compact in 2004.

SERVICOM-Service Compact Charter

The Federal government responded to the need of curbing unethical behaviour by introducing the service compact policy. Servicom is a social contract between the Federal Government of Nigeria and her people. Servicom gives Nigerians the right to demand good service. Details of these rights are contained in the Servicom charters which are available in all government agencies where services are provided to the public. The charters tell the public what to expect and what to do if the service fails or falls short of their expectation. Servicom office was established in 2004 by former President, Olusegun Obasanjo. His administration initiated the charter to manage and effect Government commitments to the people in the areas of service delivery. They monitor and report to the president on the progress made by ministries, agencies and institutions in performing their obligations. (www.servenigeria.com)

In social and organizational psychological research, there exists controversy whether there exists an independent prosocial personality trait or not. However, Organ, Podsakoff and Mackenzie (2006) proved clearly that an independent construct of prosocial personality exists, which is defined as "...an enduring predisposition and somewhat greater tendency toward helping, among those who are socially well adjusted and generally lacking in neurotic



symptoms and extroverted” (p.5). There are three major streams of research on prosocial personality trait around the world.

The first stream of research in the early 1990`s attempted to extract prosocial personality trait items from existing validated personality scales to form an aggregate of prosocial personality trait measure. In line with this orientation, Penner, Fritzsche , Craiger and Freifeld (1995) adapted 128 items that was a composition of variables from many other existing personality scales. Penner et al (1995) selected only those items that had been confirmed by other models or theories of personality to be associated with social altruistic tendencies. At the end, Penner and associates (1995) assembled the personality scale to measure prosocial personality trait in human personalities and called it Prosocial Personality Battery (PSB). The Prosocial Personality Battery is a 56-item prosocial personality trait measure that has two prosocial personality factors namely `other-oriented empathy` and `helpfulness` (p.7). In a similar study, Penner, Midili and Kegelmeyer (1997) adopted another prosocial personality trait measure that assesses a prosocial personality orientation based on the 56-item PSB previously assembled. The prosocial personality orientation was defined by Penner et al (1997) as an enduring predisposition to feel concerned about the welfare of other people, to think about their interests, and to engage in actions on their behalf (p.121). These three emerging prosocial orientation facets were framed using attitudinal colourations to explain the possibility of a link between prosocial personality trait in explaining prosocial attitudinal orientation (Penner et al, 1997). There are various versions of prosocial personality orientations that are framed in attitudinal form and used to explain human behaviours such as prosocial behaviour. So prosocial personality trait is measured using the prosocial personality battery (PSB) in the United States of America (Penner et al, 1995).



The second stream of research operationalized prosocial personality trait as an independent aggregate construct emanating from the Big Five Personality (Coutinho, Sampaio, Ferreira, Soares, & Goncalves, 2013). Robust empirical study proved that prosocial personality trait is an independent integrative construct derived from extraversion and agreeableness personality traits in a study in Portugal (p. 4710). Therefore, based on this robust study, prosocial personality trait is an integrative construct whose reliability and validity are well established in a study in Portugal (p.4711).

The third stream of research conceived and operationalized prosocial personality trait as an integrative construct comprising of personality trait and child-rearing / parental factors (Knafo-Noam, Uzefovsky, Israel, Davidov & Zahn-Waxler, 2015,p.1). Specifically they conceptualized prosocial personality trait as an independent integrative construct comprising of genetic (personality trait) and environmental (rearing / parentage) factors in a study in Israel.

Put together, all of the above three streams of research with robust methods of empirical assessment of prosocial personality trait have been found to have robust construct validity and high reliability index in North America (Florida), Europe (Portugal) and Middle-East Asia (Israel) but not in Africa.

Statement of the Problem

The University authority has established committees that handle unethical behavioural issues such as the Senior and Junior staff Disciplinary Committee/Panel. The SERVICOM compact was implemented to help curb such excesses by Civil/Public servants. For example, Olugbile and associates(1997) in their National survey on the Psychology of Work in Nigeria observed among a plethora of issues, the lateness and absenteeism behaviour among Nigerian civil and



public servants and asserted that, “Nigerians are not very time conscious” (p.135).They opined that common belief that most workers in the public sectors such as the Civil Service have a poor sense of time management, hence workers are found away from their duty post hours after they are supposed to have resumed work; they over-stay their break-time and leave the office long before closing time. Also they carry on casual trade and other inappropriate activities during the time they are supposed to be on the job. From a myriad of unethical behaviour in Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, report of unethical behaviour in (Unizik Bulletin March 01,2010),(April 12, 2010), provides evidence of lateness to work, truancy, poor attitude to work and dereliction of duty , wherein the Vice-Chancellor directed that any staff of the university queried for any problem (lateness, indolence, or any form of indiscipline) and found culpable shall not be appraised for promotion or receive any welfare from the University .This decision was based on SERVICOM reports that such behaviours in the university became rampant. Nnamdi Azikiwe University Management at its 239th meeting held on August 24, 2009 observed that some senior non-teaching staff still came to work late. They cautioned perpetual latecomers to desist from such behaviour and warned of the consequences that may follow. Other dimensions of unethical behaviour warned against include : absenteeism Unizik Bulletin (February ,15 2010), dereliction / abandonment of duty (September 14, 2009), abuse of office resources and forgery of official documents (May,16, 2011), missing examination scripts, alteration of examination results, sexual harassment, direct sale of self-authored books by lecturers (September, 7,2009), admission racketeering (November 3, 2008), bribery for examination marks commonly known as `sorting`, sexual abuse and harassment (September 21,2009), abuse of biological child opportunity (September 12, 2011), misplacement and loss of official documents (March 14, 2011), extortion, competition (September 12, 2011), theft (March 01,2010),and abuse of official work time for religious activities (June 23,2008) .



In Nigeria, to the best knowledge of the researcher, there is a lack of robust empirically known research on prosocial personality trait. This is a critical omission in the areas of Social Psychology and Organizational behaviour. This current study is an attempt to establish the prosocial personality trait construct structure and explore its relationship with social and organizational variables among workers in Nigeria using Coutinho et al (2013) prosocial personality model.

Research Questions

In order to ascertain the relationship between prosocial personality trait on unethical behaviour among University staff, the underlisted research questions are hereby engaged which are:

- a. Will prosocial personality trait inversely predict unethical behaviour tendency among University staff?
- b. Will prosocial personality trait inversely predict administrative abuse tendency among University staff?
- c. Will prosocial personality trait inversely predict corruption behaviour tendency among University staff?
- d. Will prosocial personality trait inversely predict sabotage behaviour tendency among University staff?
- e. Will prosocial personality trait inversely predict theft tendency among university staff?

Purpose of the Study.



The purpose of this study is an attempt to investigate the impact of prosocial personality trait and explore its relationship with unethical behaviour among staff in Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Anambra State, Southeast Nigeria. The aims are listed below:

- a. To investigate if prosocial personality trait will inversely predict unethical behaviour tendency among University staff.
- b. To examine if prosocial personality trait will inversely predict administrative abuse tendency among University staff.
- c. To ascertain if prosocial personality trait will inversely predict corruption behaviour tendency among University staff.
- d. To explore if prosocial personality trait will inversely predict sabotage behaviour tendency among University staff.
- e. To find out if prosocial personality trait will inversely predict theft tendency among university staff.

Contextual definition of terms

Administrative Abuse - Official misconduct and commission of an unlawful act done in an official capacity which affects the performance of official duties, it includes abuse of power (status, position) and abuse of office resources. The disorganization of human, financial and material resources which jeopardizes the attainment of specific objectives. In this study, administrative abuse is a factor of unethical behaviour.

Corruption - Corruption is 'the use of public office for private gain (World Bank, 1998). This includes bribery, extortion, fraud, embezzlement and disapprobation of public funds, inflation of contracts and sexual harassment. In this study, corruption is a dimension of unethical behaviour.



Prosocial Personality Trait – A greater tendency toward helping that exists among those who are socially well adjusted and generally lacking in neurotic symptoms and extroverted. In this study, prosocial personality was assessed as a single aggregate main construct comprising of the integration of factors – kind-hearted / cooperative, flexible / tolerant, assertive personality and optimistic / enthusiastic traits.

Sabotage - This is the deliberate or intentional damage of physical property or assets of an organization or employer. Such expressed behaviour by employees intends to reduce the productivity of the organization, coerce higher authority for special consideration by the means of tampering with equipment, intentionally damaging assets and humiliating clients. In this study, it is a dimension of unethical behaviour.

Theft- The taking of another person's property without that person's permission or consent with the intent to deprive the rightful owner of it. Employee theft is stealing the physical property of an organization or employer. Any form of stealing, use or misuse of an employer's assets without permission. Assets usually stolen include official time / work hours at the workplace, money, office supplies, resources, merchandise, classified information (e.g. product designs, trade secrets, intellectual property). In this study, theft is a domain of unethical behaviour.

Unethical Behaviour: Any action that does not conform with the standards and code of conduct in a system. It can occur interpersonally between employees, or how employees use or misuse organizational resources. Any action that falls outside what is considered normally right or proper for a worker, a profession or an industry is unethical behaviour. In the context this study, unethical behaviour was assessed as a single aggregate main construct comprising of the integration of factors – administrative abuse, corruption, sabotage and theft.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Unethical behaviour is defined as behaviour that brings harm to, and that is illegal or morally unacceptable to the larger society (Ugwu, L.I. 2011). By this definition, lying, corruption, cheating, stealing, divulging official secrets or interpersonal aggression would be examples of such behaviour. Ethical consideration goes beyond the legality of act, it extends to personal values-the underlying beliefs and attitudes that help determine individual behaviour (Ogbuehi, 1998). Researchers have investigated workplace deviance (Robinson & Bennett, 2000), counterproductive behavior (Cohen-Charash Spector, 2001), corruption (Anand ,Ashforth & Joshi,2004; Ash forth , Giola, Robinson & Trevino, 2008; Martin, Cullen, Johnson & Parboteeah,2007) and misbehaviour (Ivnceovich, Konopaske & Matteson, 2005; Vardi & Weitz, 2004).

It is very difficult to pinpoint all the predisposing variables of unethical behaviour in the world of work in Nigeria, neither is it easier to associate unethical behaviour with a single factor. Many researchers have attempted to isolate all the variables that facilitate or inhibit unethical behaviour. Tang & Liu, (2011) agree on the difficult aspect of assessing behaviour but discovered a way out, which led to the development of the Unethical Behaviour Tendency Scale (UBTS) - "It is difficult and almost impossible for researchers to directly measure people's actual unethical behaviour because most of these behaviours are performed in private or behind closed doors" (p.4). With the exception of formal criminal investigations of corruption cases, police records (Fisman & Miguel, 2007) , and laboratory experiments, there is no instrument, to the best of the researchers knowledge that could assist in observing, measuring, and quantifying unethical behaviour directly, e.g. the amount of money managers receive `under the table` or steal from the organization. Several empirical studies have

provided strong evidences to suggest that the incumbents self-report and the co-worker's peer-report converged significantly on counterproductive work behavior toward other persons (De Jonge and Peeters 2009; Fox, Spector, Goh, & Bruursema, 2007). Full knowledge of factors influencing unethical behaviour may help management and executives of organizations to better deal with them in future. These factors can be classified into three categories:

- i. **Individual variables:** Employees come to the workplace with their needs, desires, expectations, cultural values and even with their personal idiosyncrasies. Their personal experiences and background affect the way they perceive and obey the work ethics. Family needs (financial and otherwise) contribute to a large extent in influencing employees ethical conduct in any given circumstance. Employees whose moral values conflict with the company's ethical standard will strive to maximize their self-interests at the expense of the organization's general overall interest (Lim, (2002), Aquino and Reed (2002) Summer, Welsh and Crubman, 2009; Ugwu, 2009).
- ii. **Organizational Practices:** The activities of the employing organization may violate the psychological contract, which organizations entered into with employees. For instance, employees perform their duties in the organization in return for reward (wage, salary emoluments) at the end of the month. When employers fail to pay workers their salaries and other entitlements, or when workers stagnate in one grade level with little or no prospects for advancement, the stage is set for employees to circumvent the rule of law and devise survival strategies without any ethical consideration (Bichi, 2006). For example, when the management of a bread-baking industry deceives the public that the bread they manufacture is bromate-free, the employees may rationalize their unethical practices by such behaviour.

iii. **Environmental factors:** Organizations operate in external environments composed of competitors, government laws and regulations, and social norms and values, to mention but a few (Ogbuehi, 1998). To maximize profits and survive in the competitive markets, organizations may embark on questionable ethical behaviour such as setting targets for their employees, irrespective of the means through which these employees reach these targets. A case in point is the activities of some “second generation” banks where employees in the marketing section are required to hit certain financial targets. Government laws define appropriate behaviours for organizations and their members regulate these behaviours and keep them within acceptable standards. Apart from government regulation of the management behaviour, the prevailing social values also influence what happens in many organizations. A society where corruption, stealing, kidnapping and other social ills have taken front seat is bound to influence what happens in work organizations. Commenting on the influence of larger society in determining the ethical behavior of employees in work organizations, Stearns (1981) says: “it is ironic that, in a country where people are murdered, kidnapped, raped and viciously attacked by the hour, there is still room to worry about ethical issues in the illegal copying of CDs” (p.26).

Robinson and Bennett’s (1995) typology of deviant workplace behaviours using Multi-Dimensional Scaling techniques explains two major types which are organizational-wise and interpersonal-wise

a. **Organizational-Wise**

- i. Production Deviance-such as leaving early, taking excessive breaks, intentionally working slow, and wasting resources.



- ii. Property Deviance-such as sabotaging equipment, accepting kickbacks, lying about hours worked and stealing from company.

b. Interpersonal-Wise

- i. Political deviance-such as favouritism, gossiping about co-workers, blaming co-workers, and competing non-beneficially
- ii. Personal Aggression- such as gossiping, sexual harassment, verbal abuse, stealing from co-workers and endangering co-workers.

Impact of Unethical Behaviour on National Development

Lim (2002) reported that protecting organizations against unethical activities is also costly as illustrated by the estimated \$7 billion incurred by organizations to install security gadgets to guard against such activities. What is the fate of Nigeria if that is the case in developed countries like America? The effects of unethical activities on the nations socio-economic and political development cannot be easily estimated in Nigeria. Lipset and Lenz (2000) noted that unethical activities of the employees reduced the level of investment for its adds to investment risk.

Administration is a multi-dimensional concept which researchers have tried to define in several forms as a result of personal feelings and environmental factors. Administration is derived from two words `Ad`-to, and `Ministere` serve. Nwankwo (2009) defined administration as the means to serve; the organization of human, financial, and material resources for the attainment of specific objectives. Hence administrative abuse is the disorganization of human, financial and material results which jeopardizes the attainment of specific objectives. Administrative abuse refers to official misconduct and commission of an unlawful act done in an official capacity which affects the performance of official duties, it includes abuse of power (status, position) and abuse of office resources. The disorganization



of human, financial and material resources which jeopardizes the attainment of specific objectives. Administration is the organization of human, financial, and material resources for the attainment of specific objectives (Nwankwo, 2009). From the above definition, three key concepts were mentioned namely human, financial and material resource organization. In the University system, management of human capital is very key as people run the system. The organization and direction of persons in order to accomplish specific goals is very important in the University system which is the ivory tower and citadel of learning and development for any nation, especially Nigeria. When academic and non-teaching staff embark on a strike, the wheel of development in the University is halted, students go home, staff stay off work and go through financial stress when `no work-no pay` policy is enforced by the Federal Government in a bid to coerce them to get back to work. This is the core focus of human resource managers in the workplace. The second factor is financial management. Money is relevant in the efficient management of the University. Prudent management of this important resource by employers and employees is greatly sought. Corruption has been mentioned in newspaper publications, books, and journals as the `achille`s heel` in the development of the Nigeria as a nation, hence the current administration led by President Muhammed Buhari focused on fighting corruption head on to see if the nation will make a head way financially as oil prices are plunge down on a daily basis. The implementation of the single account policy (TSA) affected all Federal and State parastals to curb the financial excesses and leakages that existed heretofore. The third important factor in the definition above is effective management of material resources. Material resources are important in the University system. If they are unutilized or wasted by staff in several levels of leadership ranks and followership, this will be a sabotage behaviour and should not be encouraged in all its ramifications. Administration involves that part of management that has to do with the installation and implementation of an agreed laid down action or programme which involves all the

procedures by which a programme is communicated, regulated and valued. They include planning, organizing, commanding, co-operation, coordination and control (Nwankwo, 2009). Obikeze and Obi (2004) stressed that administration is a complex process that arises when a group of persons cooperate to enforce set objectives under defined guidelines that are inherent in the understanding of administration viz:

- a. Administration involves more than one person
- b. Cooperation between individuals is necessary
- c. There are set objectives to be accomplished
- d. There are guidelines which has to do with implementation of policies
- e. Efficiency is important in administration as resources are limited

Appelbaum, Laconi and Matousek (2007) also examined the impact of negative workplace behaviour (those that violate organizational norms, policies or internal rules), and positive work place deviant behaviours (those that normally violate them) on organization. Results showed that regardless of whether negative deviance is overt or implicit, it has negative consequences for the entity and its affiliates.

Corruption is another factor of unethical behaviour which reduces growth by lowering the quality of public infrastructure and services. Corruption has affected many in the business climates in Nigeria, disrupted governance and reduced the provisions of services by the government and its institutions. Moreover, questionable or unethical behavior breeds distrust between management and employees, creates suspicion, and negatively impacts on income distribution and consequently create income inequality, which exacerbates poverty. The situation may bring the nation into a vicious cycle since poverty has the potential of engendering corruption, and corruption inhibits the economic growth of any nation. Questionable activities of employees may also inhibit skill acquisition which can slow the



pace of the nation's technological development. Corruption implies "a willful perversion of order, ideals, and perhaps most importantly, trust- a moral deterioration" (Ashforth et al. 2008, p. 671) and involves (1) the misuse of organizational position, power, or authority for personal or organizational gain (receiving gifts, money, bribes, and kickbacks) (2) acts committed against the company (Sabotage and theft), and (3) acts conducted on behalf of the organization (laying off employees for personal gain, ghost workers e.t.c.) following the literature on corruption (e.g. Fraud, bribery, graft, embezzlement, nepotism, cronyism, and cheating (Ashforth et al, 2008, p. 677) bribery (Martin et al, 2007), and deviant workplace behavior (e.g., sabotage, kickbacks, and stealing (Robinson and Bennett, 2000 p. 565). Transparency International (n.d.) described corruption as the abuse of entrusted power for private gain. They classified it as grand, petty, and political, depending on the amount of money lost and the sector where it occurred. Corruption is an antisocial behavior conferring improper benefit contrary to legal and moral norms which also undermines the authority to improve the living conditions of the people, Edame, 2001. Sorkaa (200) viewed corruption as an unethical or deviant behavior. It connotes an erosion of ethics and accountability Nye, (1967) opined that corruption is a behavior that deviates from the formal duties of a public servant because of private gains regarding personal, close family, private clique, pecuniary or state gain; or a behaviour which violates rules against the exercise of certain types of duties for private gains regarding influence. Achebe, (1983) maintained that corruption in Nigeria spans from budgeting abuses, political patronage, public funds being ruled out to political allies and personal friends; collection of mobilization fee or full payment without executing the contract awarded; rewarding politicians who failed elections with ministerial appointment, re-assigning ministers, commissioners or council members who are involved in scandals to another ministry or department. Bichi, 2006 stressed how corruption impairs governance, which in turn, reduces capital and public trust in government institutions; this

reduces the public fund available to support effective economic, social, political and technological growth programs. Ugwu, 2011 contributed that by improving economic governance both in public and private organizations, Nigeria can set herself on the path towards attracting new investors and achieving sustainable economic growth. He further stated that, it is especially important that government should implement a transparent regulatory framework governing public safety and public infrastructure.

Another factor of unethical behaviour is sabotage. Sabotage behaviour is the deliberate destruction of property or slowing down of work with the intention of damaging a business or economic system, or weakening a government or nation in a time of national emergency. The word (sabotage) is said to date from a French railway strike in 1910 when workers destroyed the wooden shoes (sabots) that held the rails in place. A few years later sabotage was employed in the United States in the form of slowdowns, particularly in situations that made a strike untenable, such as by migratory workers whose employment was temporary. During World War II, anti-German resistance and partisan movements in Europe practiced effective sabotage against factories, military installations, railroads, bridges and so on, especially in the Soviet Union. After the war, sabotage became the basic weapon of the numerous insurgent groups associated with anti-colonial separatist and communist-backed movements (Koch,1999). Sabotage is synonymous with these words- subvert, undermine, attack, destroy (Webster's Pocket Thesaurus, 2006). It is a withdrawal behaviour from a person or group of person`s with a deliberate intention to destroy, harm and frustrate personal or group efforts. Behaviour such as a retreat of a military force in the face of enemy attack or after a defeat, leaking classified information, pilferage, subversive activity and defections by military personnel are termed military sabotage. It is also any act that may injure, interfere with or obstruct

the nation or any associate nation in preparing for or in carrying on war. It is the willful and malicious disruption of the normal processes and functions of the nation with respect to national defense. Hence sabotage is counter-productive in nature. Sabotage happens mainly due to instrumental aggression, frustration and anger (Ambrose, Seabright&Schminke, 2002). Maureen, Ambros, Mark, Seabright and Schminke (2002) examined the relationship between injustice and work place sabotage. They hypothesized that injustice will be the most common cause of sabotage, and that the source of injustice will influence the goal, target, and severity of sabotage behavior. The results generally supported their hypotheses.

Theft is another factor of unethical behaviour in the workplace. It is the taking of another person's property without that person's permission or consent with the intent to deprive the owner rightful owner or it. Employee theft is stealing the physical property of an organization or employer. Any stealing use or misuse of an employer's assets without permission. Assets usually stolen include official time at the workplace, money, office supplies, resources, merchandise, classified information (e.g. product designs, trade secrets, intellectual property). Mustaine& Tewksbury (2002) argue that theft is caused by three major reasons; economic need, job dissatisfaction and injustice. Muafi (2011) examined the causes and consequences of deviant workplace behaviour in Indonesia using a sample of 101 operational staff, results showed that

- a. Intent to quit, dissatisfaction and company contempt had positive effect on deviant work place behavior.
- b. Dissatisfaction had positive effect on intent to quit, and

c. Deviant work place behaviour have negative effect on individual performance.

Further, the results suggested that deviant workplace behaviour has high implications for organization even in manufacturing firms.

Unethical behaviour in the University system is synonymous with the corruption in other social climes in the country.

Anwar, Sarwar, and Awan (2011) investigated gender differences in workplace deviant behaviour among fifty (50) lecturers of Post Graduate level were selected randomly for the sample of these respondents, 26 were male and 24 were female. The results of this study reveal that the ratio of organizational deviance in the university's workplace is more dominant as compared to interpersonal deviance, and the male teaching staff is more deviant at workplace as compared to female teaching staff.

Fagbohumbge, Akinbode & Ayodeji (2012) examined the relationship between employees' organizational reactions and deviant behaviours in the workplace. They hypothesized that deviant workplace behaviours of males will be significantly different from that of their female counterpart. That there will be a significant positive relationship between employees organizational reactions and various facets of deviant behavior in the workplace. The results suggested that the strength of interpersonal affectivity moderated the relationship between organizational reactions and deviants behaviour. Also, high level negative reactions exacerbated workplace fraudulent behaviours for male group members compared to female members.

PERSONALITY



Personality are enduring patterns of perceiving, relating to, and thinking about the environment and oneself that are exhibited in a wide range of social and personal context (DSM –IV-TR,2000). The personality of an individual is that which enables us to predict what he will do in a given situation. Personality refers to “factors” inside people that explain their behaviour. The sum total of typical ways of acting, thinking, and feeling makes an individual unique.

Personality Trait

An individual’s personality, is his unique pattern of traits. A trait is any distinguishable, relatively enduring way in which one individual differs from others. They are enduring patterns of perceiving, relating to , and thinking about the environment and oneself in a wide range of social and personal context. A trait is what we call a characteristic way in which an individual perceives, feels , believes, or acts. Theorists generally assume that

- i. Traits are consistent and relatively stable over time
- ii. Traits differ among individuals
- iii. Traits are bipolar and
- iv. Traits influence behaviour

Personality is one of the most popular areas of research in psychology and is commonly applied in organizations for the purposes of job selection, employee development and team building. Although dozens of personality traits have been studied, a great deal of research over the past two decades has converged around the five-factor model (Costa & McCrae, 1992), which consists of five broad traits that are commonly referred to as the “Big five” (Digman, 1990). The “Big five” as they are called are five broad factors of



personality traits discovered through empirical research (Goldberg, 1993). They include Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion Agreeableness and Neuroticism (OCEAN). Of the five personality dimensions described by the Big Five Personality Model (Costa & McCrae, 1992), Agreeableness and Extraversion are the traits most commonly associated with a pro-social orientation (Coutinho, Sampaio, Ferreira, Soares & Croncalves, 2013 ; Pursell, Laursen, Rubin, Booth-Laforce, & Rose-Krasnor, 2008; Shiner, 2005)

PROSOCIAL PERSONALITY TRAIT

Prosocial personality trait is a greater tendency toward helping that exists among those who are socially well adjusted and generally lacking in neurotic symptoms and extroverted (Organ, Podsakoff & Mackenzie ,2006) . An independent construct in the human personality orientation.

Pro-social personality orientation is a lasting dispositional tendency for an individual to think about the rights and well-being of others, to feel empathy and worry for others, and to behave in a manner that benefits others (Penner, L.A., Fritzsche, Craiger, J.P., & Freifeld, T.S. 1995). An enduring predisposition to feel concern about the welfare of other people, to think about their interests, and to engage in actions on their behalf (Penner, Midili & Kegal Meyer, 1997, p. 121).

Their initial model of measurement was a 128- item scale. It is a composition of variables from many other personality measure scales. They chose only those items that had been confirmed by other models or theories of helping to be associated with prosocial tendencies. One example of such an item is empathy, because people offer help, include empathy as a main reason for helping behavior. The scale to measure prosocial tendencies in personalities

was called Prosocial Personalities Battery (PSB). The final version of the PSB consists of 56 items only (Penner, Midili and Kegelmayer, 1997, p. 121). The items were summarized to two distinguishable factors of a prosocial personality. Those factors are firstly the other-oriented empathy and secondly helpfulness. The first one means “the tendency to experience empathy for, and to feel responsibility and concern about the wellbeing of others, in other words prosocial thoughts and feelings. The letter one is a “a self-reported history of engaging in helping actions and an absence of egocentric physical reactions to other`s distress, in other words prosocial behaviours. At the behavioural level, prosocial behaviour is defined as a voluntary behavior enacted with the intent of benefitting others (Eisenberg et al, 2006). There are many kinds of prosocial behaviours, with the most concerning either sharing (giving from personal resources), providing instrumental help, or comports (supporting others emotionally in times of distress) (Knafo-Noam, Uzefovsky, Israel, Davidov & Zahn-Waxler, 2015). At the attitudinal level, persociality includes prosocial values such as benevolence (Schwartz, 2010) and positive attitudes focusing on others. Different prosocial behaviours are not always correlated with each other (e.g Bryant & Crockenberg, 1980; Knafo & Spineth, 2011).

Personality Traits and Prosocial Behaviour (PSB)

As stated earlier, personality traits are dimensions of individual differences in tendencies to show consistent patterns of thoughts, feelings and actions” (McCrae & Costa, 1990). These traits shape how individuals direct their attention and activate specific goals (McCrae & Costa, 1995). Certain traits direct attention outwardly towards others, leading to individuals paying attention to others’ needs and recognize opportunities to help others (Cote`, De Celles, McCarthy, Van Kleef, & Hideg, 2011 ; Grant & Mayer, 2009). In a situation

involving social dilemma, when individuals must decide whether to benefit the common good or the self, compassion may facilitate prosociality and pride may stand in the way of cooperation (Overs, Hoberg, & Keltner, 2010).

Prosocial tendencies give rise to responsible and helpful behaviour, constructs that characterize agreeableness and conscientiousness, prosocial behaviour requires self-regulation and self-control (Caspi, Roberts, & Shiver, 2005). Agreeableness and conscientiousness have been concurrently and prospectively linked to PSB during adolescence (Pursell, Laursen, Rubin, Booth-La Force, & Rose-Krasnor, 2008; Shiner, 2000). It was concluded that the construct PSB overlaps considerably with the constructs of agreeableness and conscientiousness. Taken together, the findings are consistent with the view that cooperative, helpful behaviour is uncharacteristic of aggressive and antisocial individuals. Given their conceptual overlap, it is not surprising that evidence ties PSB to agreeableness and conscientiousness.

Helping behaviour (Altruistic personality)

People have been particularly intrigued with the causes of altruism, which is the desire to help another person even if it involves a cost to the helper (Afolabi, 2013). One approach is evolutionary psychology which attempts to explain social behaviour in terms of genetic factors that evolved over time according to the principles of selection. (Nettle, 2006; Simpson & Beckes, 2008). According to them, prosocial behaviour has genetic roots because of the following reasons:

- (i) People further the survival of their genes by helping genetic relatives;
- (ii) There is a survival advantage to following the norm of reciprocity, whereby people help strangers in the hope that they will receive help from them when they need it,

(iii) And there is survival advantage to the social ability to learn and follow social norms of all kinds, including altruism.

Altruism involves voluntary actions that help another person with a work-related problem. Helping a colleague who is absent from work, helping others who have tight schedules and heavy workloads, being mindful of how one's own behaviour affects others' jobs, and providing help and support to new employees represent clear indications of an employee's interest for its work environment (Todd, 2003; Redman, & Snape, 2005; Pare, & Tremblay, 2000; Neihoff, & Yen, 2004; Brennan, & Skarlicki, 2004).

Personality and Unethical Behaviour

Conscientiousness have been shown to exhibit significant negative correlations with absenteeism (Conte & Jacobs, 1999; Hattrup, O' Connell, & Wingate, 1998; Judge, Martocchio, & Thoreson, 1997). Porter and Steers (1974) proposed that employees with extreme levels of emotional instability, anxiety, low achievement orientation, aggression, independence and sociability were likely to be the most frequency absentees. Asserted that those who have fairly high levels of hostility, impulsiveness, social insensitivity and alienation are more prone to engage in delinquent work behaviour such as absenteeism. Most reviews of personality-unethical behaviour (Counterproductive Behaviours) relationship have concluded that Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability (Neuroticism), and Agreeableness are the strongest predictors (e.g Cullen & Sackett, 2003; Ones, Viswesvaran, & Schmidt, 2003), with Conscientiousness being the most consistent predictor (Sackett & Devore, 2001). Salgado (2002), conducted a meta-analysis of the relationship between the Big Five personality dimension and measures of counterproductive behaviours (CPBs), and found that conscientiousness best predicted a composite measure of deviant behaviours that consisted of measures, theft, admissions of theft, disciplinary problems, substance abuse, property

damage, organizational rule breaking, and other irresponsible behaviours ($r = - 0.16$, $P = - 0.26$). Salgado (2002) also reported that Agreeableness also was a valid predictor ($r = - 0.13$, $P = - 0.20$), of this composite of deviant variables. Cullen and Sackett (2003), stated that one or more of the three traits (Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, and Emotional Stability /Neuroticism), or their facets have been shown to predict negative unethical or counterproductive behaviours such as absenteeism (Judge, Martocchio, & Thoresen, 1997), turnover (Barrick & Mount, 1996), delinquency (Hough, 1992), workplace violence (Ones & Viswesvaran, 2001), substance abuse and property damage (Schmidt, Viswesvaran, & Ones, 1997), and a wide variety of behaviours related to violent and non-violent criminal behaviours (Collins & Schmidt, 1993; Eysenck & Gudjonsson, 1988).

Tobin (2000) examined the effects of organizational structure on aggression and violence in the work place, the result of the study revealed that organizational factors interact with other behavioural determinants, such as personality and individual affectivity.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Theory of Reasoned Action

The theory of reasoned action (TRA) was propounded by Martin Fishbein and Icek Azjen in 1967. This theory states that attitudes toward a behaviour and subjective norms (perceived expectations) regarding a behaviour determines a person's intention to perform that behaviour. Intentions are in turn assumed to cause the actual behaviour. It is also called reasoned action model. According to the Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA) (Azjen & Fishbein, 1980), or the Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB), behaviour is determined by intention, which is a function of `attitude toward behaviour` and `subjective norms`. Attitude deals with the positive or negative evaluations of performing a particular behaviour.



Subjective norms refers to the individual's perception of general social pressure to perform (or not to perform) that behaviour

Theory of Planned Behaviour

The theory of planned behaviour (TPB) was propounded by Icek Ajzen (1985). The theory states that attitude toward behaviour, subjective norms, and perceived behavioural control, together shape an individual's behavioral intentions and behaviour. That perceived behavioural control is a function of one's beliefs about how likely it is that one has the resources and opportunities required to perform behaviour. It is an extended version of the theory of reasoned action, incorporating a construct of perceived behavioral control and thus enabling predictions to be made of actions that are under incomplete volitional control. Attitudes toward the behavior, subjective norms, and perceived behavioural control can be used to predict behavioural interaction tendencies that in term, can be used to predict actual behavior (Ajzen, 1991). Attitudes will predict behaviour effectively when there is a high correspondence between the attitude object and a behaviour options (Tang & Baumeister, 1984).

The theory of planned behaviour can explain people's non-volitional behaviour which cannot be explained by the theory of reasoned action. An individual's behavioral intention cannot be the exclusive determinant of behaviour where an individual's control over the behaviour is incomplete. By adding "perceived behavioral control," the theory of planned behavior can explain the relationship between behavioural intention and actual behaviour. In addition, the theory of planned behaviour as well as the theory of reasoned action can explain the individual's social behaviour by considering "social norm" as an important variable.

Social Learning Theory

Social learning theory was propounded by Albert Bandura (1963), and it posits that learning is a cognitive process that takes place in a social context and can occur purely through observation or direct instruction, even in the absence of motor reproduction or direct reinforcement. Prior research on theft and other workplace deviance suggests that managers often play a role in their subordinates deviancy (Greenberg, 1997; Thau et al, 2009). This can only be possible as a result of the operation of social learning in the workplace. Executives serve as role models for subordinates in every workplace. If they obey the code of conduct and ethics of the organization, subordinates will follow suit traditionally. But if they engage in unethical behaviour such as corruption, theft, sabotage or administrative abuse, subordinates will follow suit traditionally. In the classic case of the Enron meltdown in North America, their executives engaged in unethical behaviour, and by the operation of social learning theory, they unconsciously encouraged many subordinates to follow suit, hence institutionalizing a dysfunctional culture of deviancy that ultimately played a large role the collapse of the company. “This is the general view that learning is largely or wholly due to social interactions with others. Behaviour is assumed to be developed and regulated (a) by external stimulus events, such as the influence of other individuals; (b) by external reinforcement such as praise, blame and rewards and (c) by the effects of cognitive processes, such as thinking and judgment, on the individual’s behaviour and on the environment that influences him or her” (Obi-Nwosu,2014, p.140).

Learning is largely due to social interactions with others. Behaviour is assumed to be developed and regulated by external stimulus, such as the influence of other individuals, by external reinforcement such as praise, blame and rewards or deviant behaviour e.g. from corrupt executives in the workplace, and by the effects of cognitive processes, such as



thinking and judgment, on the individual's behaviour and on the environment that influences him or her.

The Traits Theory

The trait theory is an approach that explains personality in terms of traits which are innate characteristics that influence behavior from a dispositional stand point. Trait theories in the workplace propose that employees are people with special qualities with innate characteristics that uniquely leverage and influence their behavior in the workplace in either prosocial or antisocial dimensions. They include the Big Five personality inventory also known as the Five-factor personality model, Allport's Personality theory, and Cattell's facto

Three-Trait Theory

The three trait theory was propounded by Gordon Allport (1936). This is the theory that an individual's personality traits are the key to the uniqueness and consistency of his or her behaviour. Traits are regarded as dynamic forces that interact with each other and the environment to determine the characteristic action or reactions that define the self. They develop largely from experience, learning, and imitation and fall into three main categories (a) Cardinal traits are those traits that dominate an individual's whole life, often to the point that the person becomes known specifically for these traits e.g. Freudian, Machiavellian, Narcissism, Don Juan, Christ-like, etc. Allport suggested that cardinal traits are rare and tend to develop later in life. (b) Central traits - These are the general characteristics that form the basic foundations of personality. Terms such as intelligent, honest, shy and anxious etc. (c) Secondary traits - These are the traits that are sometimes related to attitudes or preferences, and often appear only in certain situations or under specific circumstances. An example

would be getting impatient while waiting in a queue, or getting anxious while speaking to a group.

UNIVERSAL TRAIT THEORY

Universal trait theory of personality was developed by British Psychologist, Hans Eysenck in 1952. He developed a model of personality based upon three universal traits: (a) Introversion/ Extraversion- Introversion involves directing attention on inner experiences, while extraversion relates to focusing attention outward on other people and the environment. So, a person who scores high in introversion might be quiet and reserved, while an individual who scores high in extraversion might be sociable and outgoing. (b) Neuroticism/ Emotional Stability- This dimension of Hans Eysenck's Universal trait theory is related to moodiness versus even-temperedness. Neuroticism refers to the tendency to remain emotionally constant. (c) Psychoticism- Later, after studying individuals suffering from mental illness, Eysenck added a personality dimension he called psychoticism. Individuals who score high on this trait tend to have difficulty dealing with reality and may be antisocial, hostile, non-empathetic and manipulative.

HEXACO MODEL

In 2008, Michael Ashton and Kibeom Lee, proposed a six- dimensional HEXACO model of personality structure. Ashton and Lee emphasized the Honesty-Humility (H) factor as differentiating the HEXACO model from other personality frameworks. Specifically, the H factor is described as sincere, honest, faithful/loyal, modest/ unassuming, fair-minded, VERSUS sly, deceitful, greedy, pretentious, hypocritical, boastful and pompous. The H factor has been linked to criminal, materialistic, power-seeking and unethical tendencies.

Wertag and Bratko (2015) conducted an empirical study on personality and prosociality. 689 students from various Universities in Croatia (552 female and 137 male). They administered the Prosocial Personality Battery (PBS) Penner et al, 2002) the short Dark Triad Scale (SD3) Johnes & Paulhus, 2014) that measured machiavellianism, narcissism and psychopathy, and HEXACO 60 (Ashton & Lee, 2009) to measure HEXACO personality traits: Honesty-Humility, Emotionality, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness and Openness to Experience. Results of the study showed that the “bad” traits explain prosociality above and beyond the “good” traits as well as the whole HEXACO model emphasizing the importance of the Dark triad (DT) in the personality space.

Hypotheses

- H₁: Prosocial personality trait will inversely predict unethical behaviour tendency among university staff.
- H₂: Prosocial personality trait will inversely predict unethical behaviour tendency among university staff.
- H₃: Prosocial personality trait will inversely predict corruption behaviour tendency among university staff.
- H₄: Prosocial personality trait will inversely predict sabotage behaviour tendency among university staff.
- H₅: Prosocial personality trait will inversely predict theft behaviour tendency among university staff.



CHAPTER THREE

METHOD

This chapter provides information on the participants who participated in this study, the instruments and procedure for data gathering, research design and statistics for data analysis.

Participants

Data were gathered from 209 staff of Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka who were selected using stratified sampling technique. A total of 250 copies of questionnaire were distributed, 209 returned with 23 not properly completed, and 18 which could not be collected from participants, giving a response rate of 83.6%. The responses were received over a period of one month. A total number of 66(31.5%) respondents were male, 143 (68.4%) were female. Participants had an age range of 23-67 years with mean age of 22.15 and standard deviation of 4.1. On highest educational qualification, 15 (7.2%) participants have WAEC/GCE qualification, 12 (5.7%) have Diploma/NCE qualification, 104 (49.5) participants have a Bachelor Degree/HND, 12 (5.7%) participants have a Master Degree and 14 participants have a Ph.D qualification. 34 (16.3%) participants were academic staff who occupied administrative positions, while 174 participants (83.2%) were non-teaching staff of the University. On marital status, 54 (25.8%) were single, 147 (70.3%) were married, 7(3.3%) were widows/widowers and 1(0.5%) participant was a single parent. On religious status, 204(97.6%) were Christians, 5(2.4%) were from other religious bodies. On ethnic group, 193 (92.3%) are Igbo while 6(2.9%) are from other ethnic tribes in Nigeria. 181(86.6%) participants were full time permanent staff, 1(0.5%) participant was on sabbatical leave in the University. Finally, on labour union membership, 31(14.8%) participants were ASUU members, 78 (37.3%) were NASU members, 47(22.5%) were SSANU members, 3(1.4%)



were members of other unions association and 42(20.1%) participants were non-union members respectively.

Instruments

Two instruments were employed for the study:

- a. Unethical behaviour was assessed by the 12-item Unethical Behaviour Tendency Scale (UBTS) (Tang & Weatherford, 1997). The items on the scale were adapted and used to measure unethical behaviour tendencies of participants. UBTS is a 12-item scale which comprises of 5-items for administrative abuse, 3-items for theft, 2 – items for corruption and 2-items for sabotage behaviour tendencies. The authors/developers (Tang Weatherford, 1997) reported a general Cronbach reliability coefficient of 0.99. Nnedum (2008) validated the UBT scale for use in Nigeria and obtained a Crombach alpha reliability estimate of 0.90 for the unethical behaviour tendency scale. The questionnaire used a 7-point Likert scale format ranging from 1 (Disagree strongly) to 7 (Agree strongly).

Prosocial Personality Trait Inventory (PPTI) was used to assess prosocial personality trait of participants in the study. The items of the prosocial personality trait that was used by (Coutinho, Sampaio, Ferreira & Soares, 2013) in Portugal was used in this study. However these items had earlier been established to have face validity and content validity among University staff in the Igbo cultural area (Nnedum,2013, 2014, 2015). The 17-items of prosocial personality trait (Coutinho, Sampaio, Ferreira, Soares, & Goncalves, 2013). was subjected to exploratory factor analysis (EFA) in this study to explore if the same items of prosocial personality trait in Portugal was the same in Nigeria. Results of the exploratory factor analysis (EFA) indicated that prosocial personality trait scale accounted for 50.57%



total variance. Kaiser – Meyer – Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was considered acceptable at 0.740 which is well above the .5 benchmark, while the Bartlett's test of sphericity chi-square statistic is 487.657 and is highly significant at .000 showing that the factor analysis was dependable and that the data merited further analysis. 5-items were removed as a result of the exploratory factor analysis. The list of communalities showed that all the 12-items used to measure the four explanatory variables and one dependent variable all has loadings above the 0.4 benchmark (Blunch, 2013).

Whereas factor 1- Kind – hearted / Cooperative trait (3 – items) yielded an eigen value of 3.38 and 19.86% common variance. Factor 2 – Flexible / Tolerant trait (3-items) yielded an eigen value of 1.67 and 9.84% common variance. Factor 3 – Assertive Personality trait (2-items) yielded an eigen value of 1.30 common variance. Factor 4 – Optimistic- Enthusiasm Trait (4 – items) yielded an eigen value of 1.16 and 6.84% common variance.

Factor 1 –Kind –hearted / Cooperative trait yielded a Cronbach alpha of .62. Factor 2- Flexible / Tolerance trait yielded a Cronbach alpha of .68. Factor 3 – Assertive Personality trait yielded a Cronbach (alpha of .71. Factor 4 – Optimistic - Enthusiasm trait yielded a Cronbach alpha of .74.

Hence, Prosocial personality trait inventory (PPTI) generally yielded a Cronbach alpha of .72, hence PPTI is reliable and valid for use in this study.

Procedure

The researcher merged the prosocial personality trait inventory scale with the unethical behaviour tendency scale to produce a questionnaire battery. They include items to measure prosocial personality trait and unethical behaviour tendency. In addition to the items to measure the independent and dependent variables, demographics were also included, such as



age, gender, highest level of education, job status, ethnic tribe, marital status, union membership. Data were gathered through personally administered questionnaire using stratified sampling technique at workplaces (Offices and Departments) of Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Anambra, South-East, Nigeria. Participation in the survey was strictly voluntary and anonymous. The permission of unit heads, as well as the cooperation of workers was sought. Therefore, instructions to the completion of the questionnaire were given before distribution. Out of the 250 questionnaires distributed, 209 were collected and collated giving a response rate of 83.6%. Participants were briefed about (i) the purpose of the questionnaire (ii) anonymity and confidentiality of their response, (iii) participants were assured that the instrument was not a test, hence there were no right or wrong answers.

Design and Statistics

A cross-sectional study that utilized a correlational design was used for this study. Linear regression was employed for data analysis using the statistical program for the social sciences (SPSS).

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

The result of the statistical analysis of the data obtained in the study was presented in tables 1, 2 and 3. Table 1 presented the summary of mean and standard derivation of key variables of unethical behaviour tendency. Table 2 presented the summary of mean and standard derivation of key variables of prosocial personality trait. Table 3 presented the summary of regression analysis of prosocial personality trait on unethical behaviour tendency.

Table 1: Summary Mean table for key variables of Unethical Behaviour Tendency

Variables	No of items	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Administrative Abuse	12	21.90	11.60	209
Unethical Behaviour	5	10.36	5.64	209
Corruption	2	3.49	2.48	209
Sabotage	2	3.33	2.37	209
Theft	3	4.71	2.97	209

Table 1 presents the summary of mean table for key values of unethical behaviour tendency. Unethical behaviour tendency has an overall mean value of 21.90 and standard deviation value of 11.60. Administrative abuse has a mean value of 10.36 and standard deviation value of 5.64. Corruption has a mean value of 3.49 and standard deviation value of 2.48. Sabotage has a mean value of 3.33 and standard deviation value of 2.37. Theft has a mean value of 4.71 and 2.98 standard deviation values respectively.

Table 2: Summary Mean table for key variables of Prosocial Personality Trait

Factor	Mean	Standard Deviation	No. of item	N
Kind- hearted /Cooperative trait	8.89	2.98	3	209
Flexible / Tolerant trait	15.20	3.49	3	209
Assertive Personality trait	5.64	2.57	2	209
Optimistic-Enthusiasm trait	21.23	3.66	4	209
Prosocial Personality trait	59.51	6.83	12	209

Table 2 presents the summary of mean table for key variables of prosocial personality trait factor 1- Kind-hearted / Cooperative trait (3-items) has a mean value of 8.98 and standard deviation value of 2.98. Factor 2-Flexible / Tolerant trait (3-items) has a mean value of 15.20 and standard deviation value of 3.49. Factor 3- Assertive personality trait (2-items) has a

mean value of 5.64 and a standard deviation value of 2.57. Factor 4- Optimistic- Enthusiasm Trait (4-items) has a mean value of 21.23 and standard deviation value of 3.66, prosocial personality trait (12-items) has an overall mean value of 59.51 and overall standard deviation value of 6.83 respectively.

Table 3: Summary of Regression Analysis of Prosocial Personality Trait on Unethical Behaviour Tendency (Administrative Abuse, Corruption, Sabotage and Theft behaviour tendencies)

Model	β	R	R ²	ΔR^2	Standard Error	t value	F value	P value	Correlations		
									Zero-order	Partial	Partial
UNETHICAL BEH.	-.252	.252	.063	.059	10.532	-3.746	14.03	.000	-.252	-.252	-.252
ADMIN. ABUSE	-.201	.201	.040	.040	3.838	-2.951	8.78	.004	-.201	-.201	-.201
CORRUPTION	-.239	.239	.057	.052	1.867	-3.534	12.49	.001	-.239	-.239	-.239
SABOTAGE	-.243	.243	.059	.055	1.731	-3.607	13.08	.000	-.243	-.243	-.243
THEFT	-.173	.173	.030	.025	1.531	-2.524	6.37	.012	-.173	-.173	-.173

Dependent variable: Unethical behavioural tendency and factors.

Table 3 presents a summary of regression analysis for prosocial personality trait on unethical behaviour tendency among university staff. As can be observed, the predictor variable,

(prosocial personality trait) gave an R^2 value of .063 which means that 6.3% of variations in the dependent variable (unethical behaviour) is accounted for by prosocial personality trait. The omnibus “F” statistic of 14.03 is significant at .000 and this means that the model has a good fit. Inspection of the standardized beta weight indicated the magnitude of impact and the direction of the relationship with prosocial personality trait to be negative for unethical behaviour ($\beta = -.252$, $P < .000$) therefore prosocial personality trait exerted strong negative impact on unethical behaviour. It implies that as an individual’s prosocial personality trait disposition highly dominates his/her behaviour the tendency for him to be less inclined to exhibit unethical behaviour. Therefore hypothesis 1 which stated that prosocial personality trait will inversely predict unethical behaviour tendency among university staff, on the basis of the results of table 1 was hereby accepted at $P < .000$.

Table 3 also presented a summary of regression analysis for prosocial personality trait on administrative abuse tendency among university staff. As can be observed, the predictor variable (prosocial personality trait) gave an R^2 value of .040 which means that 4.0% of variations in the dependent variable (administrative abuse) is accounted for by prosocial personality trait. The omnibus “F” statistic of 8.78 is significant at .004 and this means that the model has a good fit. Inspection of the standardized beta weight indicated the magnitude of impact and the direction of the relationship with prosocial personality trait to be negative for administrative abuse ($\beta = -.201$, $P < .000$), therefore prosocial personality exerted strong negative impact on administrative abuse. It implies that as an individual’s prosocial personality trait disposition highly dominates his / her behaviour, the tendency for him to be less inclined to exhibit administrative abuse. Therefore hypothesis 2 which stated that prosocial personality trait will inversely predict administrative abuse tendency among university staff is hereby accepted at $P < .000$.

Table 3 also presented a summary of regression analysis for prosocial personality trait on corruption tendency among university staff. As can be observed from the table, the predictor variable gave an R^2 value of .057 which means that 5.7% of variations in the dependent variable (corruption) is accounted for by prosocial personality trait. The omnibus “F” statistics of 12.49 is significant as .001, which means that the model has a good fit. Inspection of the standardized beta weight indicated the magnitude of impact and the direction of the relationship with prosocial personality trait to be negative for corruption behaviour tendency ($\beta = -.239, P < .000$), therefore prosocial personality trait exerted strong negative impact on corruption behaviour tendency. It implies that as an individual’s prosocial personality trait disposition highly dominates his / her behaviour, the tendency for him to be less likely to exhibit corruption behaviour. Hence hypothesis 3 which stated that prosocial personality trait will inversely predict corruption behaviour tendency among university staff is hereby accepted at $P < .000$.

Table 3 also presented a summary of regression analysis for prosocial personality trait on sabotage behaviour tendency among university staff. As can be seen, the predictor variable, prosocial personality trait gave an R^2 value of .059 which indicates that 5.9% of variations in the dependent variable (sabotage behaviour) is accounted for by prosocial personality trait. The omnibus “F” value of 13.08 is significant at .000 and this means that the model has a good fit. Inspection of the standardized beta weight indicated the magnitude of impact and the direction of the relationship with prosocial personality trait to be negative for sabotage behaviour tendency ($\beta = -.243, P < .000$), therefore prosocial personality trait exerted strong negative impact on sabotage behaviour tendency. It implies that as an individual’s prosocial personality trait disposition highly dominates his / her behaviour, the tendency for him to be less inclined to exhibit sabotage behaviour. Therefore hypothesis 4 which stated that

prosocial personality trait will inversely predict sabotage behaviour tendency among university staff is hereby accepted at $P < .000$.

Table 3 also presented a summary of regression analysis for prosocial personality trait on theft behaviour tendency among university staff. From the table, we can observe that the predictor variable (Prosocial personality trait) gave an R^2 value of .030 which means that 3.0% of variations in the dependent variable (theft behaviour tendency) is accounted for by prosocial personality trait. The omnibus “F” statistic of 6.37 is significant at .012 and this denotes that the model has a good fit. Inspection of the standardized beta weight indicated the magnitude of impact and the direction of the relationship with prosocial personality trait to be negative for theft behaviour tendency ($\beta = -.173$, $P < .000$) respectively. Therefore prosocial personality trait exerted strong negative impact on theft behaviour. It implies that as an individual’s prosocial personality trait disposition highly dominates his behaviour, the tendency for him / her to be less inclined to exhibit theft behaviour. Therefore hypothesis 5 which stated that prosocial personality trait will inversely predict theft behaviour tendency among university staff is hereby accepted at $P < .000$.

Three different correlations were given in evaluating the estimation process: zero order is the correlation between the dependent and the independent variable; partial correlation refers to the predictive effect controlling for other variables in the regression model; while the part correlation is the unique effect attributable to each in dependent variable.



CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this chapter, the findings of the study are discussed; recommendations and limitations for the study are hereby presented.

The primary purpose of the study was to examine the influence of prosocial personality trait on unethical behaviour in the work place.

Discussion

In the course of the study five hypotheses were tested to examine the influence of prosocial personality trait on unethical behaviour among University workers. The factors of unethical behaviour which include administrative abuse, theft, corruption and sabotage behavioural tendencies were also tested.

Hypothesis 1, which stated that prosocial personality trait will inversely predict unethical behaviour tendency among University staff was significant at .000 and was accepted at $P < .000$. It implies that as an individual's prosocial personality trait disposition dominates his / her behaviour, the tendency for him to be less inclined to exhibit unethical behaviour in the workplace. They are less likely to engage in administrative abuse, theft, corruption and sabotage behaviour tendencies.

Hypothesis 2, which stated that prosocial personality trait will inversely predict administrative abuse among University staff was significant at .004 and was accepted at $P < .000$. This implies that individuals who score high on the prosocial personality trait are less likely to use office supplies for personal purposes, make long distance calls at work using office phone lines, waste University time and bandwidth browsing the internet, playing computer games and socializing, take no action against examination malpractice by students,



or take no action against staff/ lecturers who extort money from students to award grades or non-teaching staff who take no action against lateness by staff and extort money from contractors to reveal bidding sum , because they are trustworthy, compliant , competent and disciplined.

Hypothesis 3 which stated that prosocial personality trait will inversely predict corruption behaviour tendency among University staff was significant at .001 and was accepted at $P < .000$. This implies that individuals who score high on the prosocial personality trait, are less likely to accept money, gifts, and kickbacks from clients or students, or reveal classified information / University secrets not meant for public consumption when they offer several financial inducements.

Hypothesis 4 which stated that prosocial personality trait will inversely predict sabotage behaviour tendency among University staff was significant at .000 and was accepted at $P < .000$. This implies that individuals who score high on the prosocial personality trait are less likely to sabotage the University to get even due to unfair treatment, or support the layoff of staff to save the University money and increase their personal bonus and allowances.

Hypothesis 5 stated that prosocial personality trait will inversely predict theft behaviour tendency among University staff. This implies that individuals who score high on the prosocial personality trait, are less likely to abuse University imprest / expense accounts or falsify out-of-pocket expenses, departmental dues or students dues etc.

Limitations of the study

This study was limited to the prosocial personality trait constructs of Coutinho, Sampaio, Ferreira, Soares, and Goncalves (2013) that emanated from the Big Five Personality Inventory. The study is limited to the teaching and non-teaching staff of Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Anambra State, Southeast Nigeria. It was further limited to the focal



dimensions of unethical behaviour namely administrative abuse, theft, corruption and sabotage behaviour tendencies.

Recommendation and Suggestion for future studies

Further research with larger participants and more University organizations should be conducted to more effectively explore further the nature of the relationship between prosocial personality and unethical behaviour more comprehensively. University administrators should include prosocial personality as a major employment criteria for University workers in Nigeria. Further research that will include the roles of mediating factors like poverty, pay satisfaction, greed should be further investigated.

Implication of the study

The findings of this study from a practical point of view implies that it will benefit policy makers, the National University Commission, Vice – Chancellors, administrators , consultants and all stakeholders in the tertiary educational system in the employment, promotion, selection and engagement of individuals in the University system.

Theoretically, findings from this study will extend the frontiers of knowledge of prosocial personality trait, sabotage behaviour, administrative abuse, office abuse and status abuse in organizations.

Conclusion

From findings in this study, one possible way to stem down the tide of unethical behaviour in organizations is linked to the human prosocial personality trait (Coutinho, Sampaio, Ferreira, Soares, & Goncalves, 2013).Prosocial personality among university workers is a potent issue in any systematic effort to reduce unethical behaviour in the Nigerian University system and should be adapted in the employment, placement and deployment of staff in the University system to stem the tide of unethical behaviour in the workplace.

References

- Achebe, C. (1983). *The trouble with Nigeria*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishers
- Afolabi, O.A. (2013). Roles of Personality types, Emotional Intelligence and Gender differences on Prosocial behavior. *Prosocial Behaviour*, 6(1).
- Ahmad, A. & Omar, Z. (2013). Abusive supervision and deviant workplace behavior: The mediating role of work-family conflict. *The Journal of Human Resource and Adult Learning*, 9(2).
- Ajzen, I. (1985). From intentions to actions: A theory of planned behaviour. In J. Kuhl & J. Beckmann (Eds.), *Action control: From cognition to behaviour*. Berlin, Heidelberg, New York: Springer-Verlag. (pp. 11-39).
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behaviour, *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 179-211.
- Alike, E. (2014). Will Nigerians ever enjoy stable power supply? <http://www.thisdaylive.com/articles/will-nigerians-ever-enjoy-stable-power-supply/193133/>.(retrieved on the 13th of February,2016).
- Allport, G.W. & Odbert, H.S. (1936). Trait-names: A psycho-lexical study. *Psychological Monographs*, 47 (211)



Ambrose, M.L., Seabright, M.A., & Schminke, M. (2002). Sabotage in the workplace: The role of organization injustice. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 89, 947-965.

American Psychological Association (2000). *Personality. DSM-IV-TR*

American Psychological Association (2015). *Publication manual (5th ed.)*. Washington D.C.

Anand, V. Ashforth, B.E. & Joshi, M. (2004). Business as usual: the acceptance and perpetuation of corruption in organizations. *Academy of Management Executive*, 18, 39-53.

Anwar, M.N., Sarwar, M., Awan, R.N., & Arif, M.I. (2011). Gender differences in workplace deviant behaviour of University teachers and modification techniques. *International Education Studies*, 4(1). Published by Canadian Centre for Science Education.

Appelbaum, S.H., Laconi, G.D., and Matousek, A. (2007). Positive and negative deviant work place behaviours: Causes, Impacts and Solutions. *Corporate Governance*, 7(5) 586-598.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/1472070070827176>

Aquino, K., Reed, S. (200). The Self-importance of Morality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 1423-144.

Aquino, K., Reed, S. (200). The Self-importance of Morality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 1423-144.

Aronson, E.; Wilson, T.D., & Akert, R.M. (2010). *Social Psychology (7th ed.)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Ashforth, B.E., Giola, D.A., Robinson, S.L., & Trevino, L.K (2008). Introduction to special topic forum: Re-viewing organizational corruption. *Academy of Management Review*, 33, 670-684.

Ashton, M.C. & Lee, K. (2009). The HEXACO -60: A short measure of the major dimensions of personality. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 91, 340-345.

Assael, S.; Forrest, B. & Chaudhary, V. (February 16, 2016). The FBI vs FIFA. http://espn.go.com/espn/feature/story/_/id/14767250/the-exclusive-story-how-feds-took-fifa. (retrieved on the 13th of February, 2016).

Bandura, A. (1963). *Social learning and personality development*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston

Barrick M.R, Mount, M.K. (1996) *The personal characteristics inventory*. Libertyville, IL: Wonder lib.

Bartlett, J.S. (2016). <http://www.consumerreports.org/cro/cars/guide-to-the-volkswagen-dieselgate-emissions-recall>-. (retrieved on the 13th of February, 2016).

Bennett, R.J., & Robinson, S.L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied psychology*. 85, 349-360.

Bichi, A.A. (2006). Corruption and it's implication for National Development. Paper Presented at the Conference of Nigerian Psychological Association held at Uyo, Nigeria. 28th-31st August.

Blau, P. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley.

Bouty, C. (2000). "Interpersonal and interaction influences on informal resource exchanges between R&D researchers organizational boundaries". *Academy of Management Journal*, 43: 50-65.

Bowler, W.M., and Brass, D.J. (2006). "Relational correlates of interpersonal citizenship behaviour: A social network perspective", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(1): 70–82.

Brehm ,J. W. (1966). Reactance theory. In Obi-Nwosu H. (2014). *Theories in Psychology: A compendium*. Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria. SCOA Heritage

Brehm, S. S., & Brehm, J. W. (1981). *Psychological reactance: A theory of freedom and control*. New York: Academic Press.

- Brennan, A. and Skarlicki, D. (2004). "Personality and Perceived Justice as Predictors of Survivors' Reactions Following Downsizing". *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34(6): 1306-1328
- Bryant, B.K., and Gockenberg, S.B. (1980). Correlates and dimensions of prosocial behavior: a study of female siblings with their mothers. *Child Development*, 529-44-doi:10.2307/1129288.
- Business Day Newspaper (August, 15 2015). Nigerians still baffled at Nigerian Airways scandal, collapse. <http://businessdayonline.com/2015/08/nigerians-still-baffled-at-nigeria-airways-scandal-collapse/>, (retrieved on the 13th of February, 2016).
- Buss, D.M. (1995). Evolutionary psychology: A new paradigm for psychological science. *Psychological Inquiry*, 6, 1-31.
- Carlo, G., Okun, M.A., Knight, G., & de Guzman, M.R.T. (2005). The interplay of traits and motives on volunteering: Agreeableness, extraversion and prosocial value motivation. *Personality and individual differences*, 38 (6), 61293-1305-doi: 10-1016/j.paid.2004-08-012.
- Caspi, A.; Roberts, B-W., & Shiner, R.L (2005). Personality development; stability and change. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56, 453-484. doi: 10.1146.annurev.psych.55.090902.141913.
- Clary, E.G & Snyder M. (1999). The motivations to volunteer: Theoretical and practical considerations. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*,8: contribution to psychology (pp. 156- 159). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cohen-Charash,Y., & Spector, P.E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 86 (2), 278-321.
- Collins, J.M, Schmidt, F.L. (1993). Personality, Integrity and White-collar Crime: A construct validity study. *Personnel Psychology*, 46, 295-311

- Costa, P.T. Jr., & McCrae, R.R. (1992) Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO P1-R) and NEO five-factor inventory (NEO-FF1): Professional Manual. Blau, P. (1964). Exchange and power in social life. New York: Wiley.Odessa, Fl.
- Cote, S., Decelles, K.A.; McCarthy, J.M.;Van Kleef, G.A., & Hideg, I. (2011). The Jekyll and Hyde of emotional intelligence: Emotion-regulation knowledge facilitates both prosocial and interpersonally deviant behavior. *Psychological science*, 22 (8), 81073-1080. Doi:10.1177/0956797611416251.
- Coutinho, J.F.; Sampaio, A., Ferreira, M., Soares, J.M. & Groncalves, O.F. (2013). Brain correlates of Pro-social personality traits: a voxel-based morphometry study. *Brain Imaging and Behaviour*. DOI 10.1007/s11682-013-9227-2.
- Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 31, 874–900.
- Cullen M.J. Sackett P.R. (2003). Personality and Counter Productive Workplace Behaviour. In Barrick M. Ryan Am (Eds), *Personality and Work*. New York: Jersey – Bass Pfeiffer
- Dallas, L.J. (2004). A preliminary inquiry into the responsibility of corporations and their officers and directors for and ethical corporate climate: The psychology of Enron's Demise, 35
- Davenport, T. H. and Prusak, L. (1998). *Working Knowledge: How organizations manage what they know*. Harvard: Fellows of Harvard College.
- De Jonge, J., & Peeters, M.C.W. (2009). Convergence of self-reports and co-worker reports of counter productive work behaviour: A cross-sectional multi-source survey among health care workers. *International Journal Nursery Studies*, 46, 699-707.
- Del Banto, V., Aluja, A., & Garcia, L.F. (2004). Relationship between empathy and the Big Five personality traits in a sample of Spanish adolescents. *Social Behaviour and Personality*, 32 (7), 7677-681. doi: 10.2224/sbp.2004.32.7.677.

DePaulo, P.J., & DePaulo, B.M. (1989). Can deception by salespeople and customers be detected through

Digman, J.M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. *Annual review of Psychology*, 41, 417-440.

Edame, G. (2001). *Development, economy and planning in Nigeria*. Benin: Harmony Books.

Eisenberg, N.; Fabes, R., & Spinrad, T. (2006). Prosocial development. In N. Eisenberg, W. Damon, & R. Lerner (Eds), *Handbook of Child Psychology: vol. 3. Social, emotional and personality development* (6th ed., pp. 646-718). Hoboken, N.J: John Wiley & Sons.

Esiedesa, O. (2013). Ajaokuta Steel: Storms without end. <http://dailyindependentnig.com/2013/01/ajaokuta-steel-storms-without-end/> ,(retrieved on the 13th of February,2016

Eysenck, H.J. (1992). Four ways five factors are not basic. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 13, 667-673.

Fagbohunge, B.O., Akinbode, G.A. & Ayodeji, F. (2012). Organizational Determinants of workplace deviant behaviours: An empirical analysis in Nigeria. *International Journal of Business and Management*.7(5), Canada Center of Science and Education.

Farh, L.J., Zhong, C. & Organ, W.D. (2004). Organizational citizenship behaviour in the People's Republic of China. *Organizational Science*, 15(2), 241-253.

Fiske, D. W. (1949). Consistency of the factorial structures of personality rating from different sources. *Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology*, 44, 329-344

Fisman, R., & Miguel, E. (2007). Corruption, norms, and legal enforcement: Evidence from diplomatic parking tickets. *Journal of Political Economy*, 115 (6), 1020-1048.

Fox, S., & Spector, P.E. (1999). A model of work frustration-aggression. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 20, 915-913. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1379\(199911\)20:6<915::AID-JOB918>3.0.CO;2-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199911)20:6<915::AID-JOB918>3.0.CO;2-6)

- Fox, S., Spector, P. E., Goh, A., & Bruursema, K. (2007). Does your co-worker know what you're doing? Convergence of self- and peer-reports of counterproductive work behaviour. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 14, 41–60.
- Goldberg, L.R. (1981). Language and individual differences: the search for universals in personality lexicons. In L. Wheeler (Ed.), *Review of Personality and social Psychology*, vol. 2. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Goldberg, L.R.. (1993). The structure of Phenotypic Personality Traits. *American Psychologist*., 48 (1): 26-34.
- Goma-i-Freixanet, M. (1995). Prosocial and antisocial aspects of personality. *Person Individual Differences*, 19 (2), 125-134, Great Britain .Pergamon, Elsevier.
- Grant, A.M., & Mayer, D.M. (2009). Good soldiers and good actors: prosocial and impression management motives as interactive predictors of affiliative citizenship behaviours. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(4), 4900-912, doi: 10. 1037/a0013770.
- Gray, J. (2010), the association between empathy, the Big 5 dimensions of personality and prosocial behavior: What causes individuals to act prosocially? <http://hdl.handle.net/1842.3561> Retrieved on the 20th of November, 2015
- Graziano, W.G., & Eisenberg, N. (1997). Agreeableness: A dimension of personality. In R. Hogan, J. Johnson, & S. Briggs (Eds.), *Handbook of personality psychology* (pp. 795-824). San Diego, C.A: Academic Press.
- Greenberg, J. (1997). A social influence model of employee theft: Beyond the fraud triangle. In R.J. Lewicki, R.J. Bies & B.H. Sheppard (Eds.), *Research on Negotiation in Organizations* 6, 29-51). Greenwich: Jal Press Inc.
- Grusec, J.E.; Davidov, M. & Lundell, L. (2002). Prosocial and helping behavior. In P.K. Smith & C.H. Hart (Eds.). *Blackwell handbook of childhood social development* (pp. 457-474). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

- Harper, D. (1990). Spotlight abuse-save profits. *Industrial distribution*, 79, 47-51.
- Hattrup, K.; O'Connell, M. S., & Wingate, P.H. (1998). Prediction of multi-dimensional criteria: Distinguishing task and contextual performance. *Human Performance*, 11(4), 305-319
- Hewstone, M., & Stroebe, W., (2006). *Social Psychology: Modern science*. Praha
- 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>
- Hollinger, R.C., & Clark, J.P. (1982). *Theft by employees*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.
- Homans, G. (1958). *Social behaviour: Its elementary forms*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Hough, L.M. (1992). The 'Big five' Personality variables- construct confusion: Description versus prediction. *Human performance*, 5, 139-155.
- <https://dailytimes.ng/why-nigerias-textile-industry-collapsed-odedokun/> (retrieved on the 13th of February, 2016)
- Ibekwe, N. (February 12, 2013). Investigations (Part 1): After stealing billions, grounding Nigeria Airways, indicted officials still enjoy loot, <http://www.premiumtimesng.com/news/119933-investigations-part-1-after-stealing-billions-grounding-nigeria-airways-indicted-officials-still-enjoy-loot.html>, (retrieved on the 13th of February, 2016).
- Ivancevich, J.M.; Konopaske, R. & Matteson, M.T. (2005). *Organizational Behaviour and Management (7thed.)*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- James, L.R., & Mazerolle, M.D. (2002). *Personality in work organizations*. Sage Publication: Thousand Oaks, CA.

- John, O. P. (1990). The “Big Five” Factor Taxonomy: Dimensions of Personality in the Natural Language and in Questionnaires. In L. A. Pervin (Ed), *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research* (pp. 66-100). New York Guilford Press
- 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.
- 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.
- Jones ,D.N. & Paulhus ,D.L.(2014). Introducing the Short Dark Triad (SD3): A brief measure of dark personalities. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 21, 28-41 *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(6), 1068 -1076.
- Judge T.A Martocchio J.J. Thoresen C.J. (1997). Five factor model of Personality and Employee absence. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 745-755.
- King, E.B., George, J.M., & Hebi, M.R. (2005). Linking personality to helping behaviours at work: An interactive perspective. *Journal of personality*, 73 (3), 3585-608. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.2005.00322.X.
- Knafo, A. & Spinath, E.M. (2011). Genetic and environmental influences on girls’ and boys’ gender-typed and gender neutral values. *Developmental psychology*. 47, 726-731. doi:10.1037/a 0021 910.
- Knafo-Noam, A.; Uzefovsky, F.; Israel, S., Davidov, M. & Zaha-Waxler, C. (2015). The prosocial personality and its facets: genetic and environmental architecture of mother-reported behavior of 7-year-old twins. *Frontiers in Psychology*, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg-2015.00112.
- Koch J. (1999). *The British Encyclopedia*. (Retrieved from <http://www.britannica.com> on the 3rd day of December, 2015)



- Kreitner R. & Kinicki, A. (2004). *Organizational behaviour* (6th ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Lim, V. (2002). The IT way of loafing on the job: cyber loafing, neutralizing and organization justice. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 23, 675-694.
- Lipset, S.M., Lenz, G. (2000). *Corruption, Culture*. In L.E. Harrison and S.P. Huntington (eds.) *Culture Matters*. New York: St. Martins Press.
- Lipset, S.M., Lenz, G. (2000). *Corruption, Culture*. In L.E. Harrison and S.P. Huntington (eds.) *Culture Matters*. New York: St. Martins Press.
- Martin, K.D.; Cullen, J.B.; Johnson, J.L., & Parboteeah, K.P. (2007). Decide to bribe: A cross-level analysis of firm and home country influences on bribery activity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 1401-1422.
- Maureen, Ambros, Mark, Seabright and Schminke (2002). Sabotage in the workplace: The role of organizational Injustice. *Organization Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 89(1), 949-965.
- McCrae, R.R., & Costa, P.T. (1987). Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 52, 81-90.
- McCrae, R.R., & Costa, P.T., Jr. (1990). *Personality and adulthood*. New York: Guilford.
- McCrae, R.R., & Costa, P.T., Jr. (1995). Trait explanations in personality psychology. *European Journal of personality*, 9(4), 4231-252. doi: 10.1002/per.2410090402.
- McCrae, R.R., & John, O.P. (1992). An Introduction to the five-factor model and its applications. *Journal of Personality*, 60, 175-215
- Muafi (2011). Causes and consequence of deviant behaviours. *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology*, Vol. 2, No. 2.
- Murphy, K.R. (1993). *Honesty in the workplace*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole
- Mustaine, E.E., & Tewksbury, R. (2002). Work place theft: An analysis of student employee vendors and job attributes. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*. 27, 111-127.



Nettle, D. (2006). The evolution of personality variation in humans and other animals. *The American Psychologist*, 61 (6), 6622-631. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X-61-6-622

Nigerian Wiki (n.d.) Nigerian Fertiliser Company of Nigeria. http://nigerianwiki.com/wiki/National_Fertilizer_Company_of_Nigeria.(retrieved on the 13th of February,2016)

Nnedum , O.A. U (2008).Psychological antecedents of the importance of money and unethical behaviour model. Pre-doctoral seminar paper presentation , Ebonyi State University, Abakiliki.

Nnedum, O. A. U (2013). Development and Theoretical Validation of Big-five personality Inventory. Patented Research Monograph, Department of Psychology, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka.

Nnedum, O.A.U. (2014). Scale Validation and Construct Clarification of Big-five Personality Traits. BFPI Professional Manual, Department of Psychology, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka

Nnedum, O.A.U. (2015). Standardization of a Measure of Big-five Personality Traits. in the Workplace. Patented Psychological Assessment Resources, Department of Psychology, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka. nonverbal behavioural cues?, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 19, 1552-1577.

Norman, W. T. (1967). 2,800 personality trait descriptors: Normative operating characteristics for a university population. Department of Psychology, University of Michigan

Nye, J. (1967). Corruption and political development: A cost benefit analysis. *The Journal American Political Science Review*. 3(1)570.



- O'Leary – Kelly, A.M., Duffy, M.K, & Griffin, R.W. (2000). Construct confusion in the study of antisocial behaviour at work. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 18, 275-303
- Obi-Nwosu H. (2014). *Theories in Psychology: A compendium*. Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria. SCOA Heritage
- Odedokun, D. (March 16, 2015). Why Nigeria's Textile industry collapsed
- Ogbuehi, A. (1998). Promoting International Business Ethics and Integrity among Nigerian Managers. *Nigeria Institute of Management (NIM)*, 34, 10-15.
- Okafor, N. (August 01, 2015), The real reasons why Nigerian Airways was liquidated. <http://www.thisdaylive.com/articles/the-real-reasons-why-nigeria-airways-was-liquidated/216207/>, (retrieved on the 13th of February, 2016)
- Olugbile, F. (1997). *Nigeria at work. A survey of the psychology of work among Nigerians*. Sponsored by Guaranty Trust Bank Plc. Pg. 135
- Omar, Halim, Zainah, Farhadi, Nasir & Kairudin. (2011). Stress and job satisfaction as antecedents of workplace deviant behavior. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 12, 45-51.
- Ones D.S, Viswesvaran C. (2001). Integrity tests and other criterion – focused occupational personality scales (COPS) used in personnel selection. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9, 31-3.
- Ones D.S., Viswesvaran C. Schmidt, FL (2003). Personality and Absenteeism: A meta-analysis of integrity tests. *European Journal of Personality*, 17, 39-
- Organ, D.W; Podsakoff, P.M. & Mackenzie, S. B. (2006). *Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. It's nature, antecedents and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage
- Oveis, C.; Horberg, E.J., & Keltner, D. (2010). Compassion, pride and social intuitions of self-other similarity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98 (4), 4618-630-
doi:10.1037/a0017628.

- Pare, G. and Tremblay, M. (2000). *The Measurement and Antecedents of Turnover Intentions among IT Professionals*. London: Scientific series.
- Penner, L. A. ;Medili, A. & Allison R. (1997): *Beyond job attitudes: A personality and social psychology perspective on the causes of organization citizenship behavior*. In: *Human Performance* 10 (2), 111.
- Penner, L. A., Fritzsche, B. A., Craiger, J. P., & Freifeld, T.R. (1995) *Measuring the prosocial personality*. In J. Butcher & C. D. Spielberger (Eds.) *Advances in personality assessment*. (Vol.10). Hillsdale, NJ: LEA.
- Penner, L.A., Dovidio, J.E., Piliavin, J.A. & Schroeder, D.A. (2005). *Prosocial behavior: Multilevel perspectives*. *Annual Review of psychology*, 56, 365-392. doi: 10.1146/1nnurev.psych.56.091103.070141.
- Piedmont, R.L., McCrae, R.R., & Costa P.T. Jr. (1991). *Adjective Check List Scales and the five-factor model*. *Journal of Personality and social Psychology*, 60, 630-637.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Praine, J.B. & Bachrach, D.G. (2000). *Organizational citizenship behaviour: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research*. *Journal of management*, 26(3), p. 513-563.
- Pursell, G.R.; Laursen, B.; Rubin, K.H.; Booth La Force, C., & Rose-Krasnor, L. (2008). *Gender difference in patterns of association between prosocial behavior, personality and externalizing problems*. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 42 (2), 24 72-481. doi: 1016/j.jrp.2007.06.003.
- Redman, T. & Snape, E. (2004). *Kindling activism? Union commitment and participation in the UK service*. *Human Relations*, 57 (7), pp. 845-869
- Robinson S.L. & Bennett, R.J. (2000). *Development of a measure of workplace deviance*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 349-360.

- Robinson, S.L. & Bennett, R.J. (1995). A typology of deviant work-place behaviours: A multi-dimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 555- 572.
- Robinson, S.L. & O’Leary, K.A.M (1998). Monkey see, monkey do: the influence of work groups on the antisocial behavior of employees. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41, 658-672.
- Robinson, S.L., & Bennett, R.J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviours: A multi-Dimensional Scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(2), 555-572.
- Sackett P.R., Devore, C.J. (2001). Counterproductive behaviours at work. In Anderson N., Ones D., Sinangil, C., Viswesvaran C. (Eds), *International handbook of Work Psychology* (pp.145-164). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Salgado J.F. (2002). The Big Five Personality dimensions and Counterproductive behaviours. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10, 117-125
- Schmidt, F.L, Viswesvaran V. Ones D.S (1997) Validity of Integrity tests for predicting drug and alcohol abuse: A meta – analysis, *NIDA Res Monogr*, 170,69-95.
- Schwartz, S.H. (2010). “Basic values: how they motivate and inhibit prosocial behavior”, in *prosocial motives, Emotions, and Behaviour*, eds P.R. Shaver and M. Mikulincer (Washington, D.C: American Psychological Association Publications.
- Shiner, R.L. (2000). Linking childhood personality with adaptation: Evidence for continuity and change across time into late adolescents. *Journal of Personality and social Psychology*, 78 (2), 2310-325. doi: 10-1037/0022-3514.
- Simpson, J.A., & Beckes, L. (2008). Reflections on the nature and nurture of cultures. *Biology and philosophy*, 23(2), 2257-268. doi: 10-1007/S 10539-005-4535-62.
- Skarlicki and Folger. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: the roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Psychology*, 82, 416-425.



- Smith, C. A.; Organ, D. W.; and Near, J. P. (1983). "Organizational Citizenship Behaviour : Its Nature and Antecedents". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68: 653-663.
- Smith, G.M. (1967). Usefulness of peer ratings of personality in educational research. *Educational Psychology Measures* . 27: 967- 8
- Sorkaa, A. (2002). Development as ethics and accountability in government: the way forward for Nigeria. An inaugural lecture delivered at Benue State University on Saturday 10th August.
- Spector, P.E.; Fox, S.. Penney, L.M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A. & Kessler, S., (2006). The dimensionality of counterproductivity: Are all counterproductive behaviours created equal? *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 68(3): 446-460
- Stearns, M. (1981). What are Business Ethics? *Data Management*, 19, 26.
- Summer, M., Welsh, D. and Crubman, L. (2000). The Ethical Orientation of Russian Entrepreneurs. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 49, 688-708.
- Tang, T.L.P. & Weatherford, E. J. (1997). Secondary vocational business students` ethical decision making. Paper presented at the conference of the Academy of Human Resource Development, Atlanta Georgia.
- Tang, T.L & Liu, H. (2011). Love of money and unethical behaviour intention: Does an authentic supervisor's personal integrity and character (ASPIRE) make a difference? *Journal of Business Ethics*, DOI 10.1007/S/0551-011-1040-5. Springer.Science Business media.
- Tang, T.L.P., & Baumeister, R.F. (1984). Effects of personal values, perceived surveillance, and task labels on task preference: the ideology of turning play into work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 99-105.
- Thau, S., Bennett, R.J., Mitchell, M.B. (2009). How management style moderates the relationship between abusive supervision and workplace deviance: An uncertainty



management theory perspective. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 108,79-92.

The Guardian Newspapers (2013). Ridiculous pension fraud sentence. February 14, 29(12), 467, pp. 14

The New International Webster's Pocket Thesaurus of the English Language, (2006), USA. Trident Reference Publishing

The Vanguard Newspapers (2012). Pension scam and the faces of corrupt officers. <http://www.vanguardngr.com/2012/04/pension-scam-and-the-faces-of-corrupt-officers/>

The Vanguard Newspapers, (2015). Report on the investigative forensic audit into the allegations of unremitted funds into the federation accounts by the NNPC. <http://www.vanguardngr.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/Audit-Report-on-NNPC.pdf>

Tobin, T.J. (2000). Organizational determinants of violence in the workplace. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, 6(1) 91-102.

Todd, S.Y. (2003). A causal model depicting the influence of selected task and employee variables on organizational citizenship behaviour. Florida: The Florida State University

Trevino, L.K. & Brown, M.E. (2000). The Role of Leaders in influencing Unethical behaviour in the workplace. *Human Relations*, 55, 5-37.

Udo, B. (June 2, 2015). INVESTIGATION: Inside the huge scam leading to sale of Nigeria's aluminium plant, ALSCON, to Russia's RUSAL. <http://www.premiumtimesng.com/investigationspecial-reports/184195-investigation-inside-the-huge-scam-leading-to-sale-of-nigerias-aluminium-plant-alscon-to-russias-rusal.html> . (retrieved on the 13th of February,2016)

Ugwu, L. I. (2011). Unethical behavior in Nigerian organizational settings: It's evolution, dimensions and impact on National development. *Asian Social Science*, 7(2).



Ugwu, L.I. (2009). Personal and Organization Variables as Predictors of Unethical Behaviour in the Work Place. *IFE Psychologia*, 17 (2), 250-262.

Ugwu, L.I. (2011). Unethical Behaviour in Nigerian Organization Settings: It's Evolution, Dimensions and Impact of National Development. *Asia Social Science*, Vol. 7, No. 2.

Unizik Bulletin (2008). Abuse of time-wrongful use of official hours for activities prejudicial to the interest of the University. June 23, Vol. 1, No. 20, pp. 1, Office of the Vice-Chancellor.

Unizik Bulletin (2008). Admission racketeering. November 3, Vol. 1, No. 39, pp.1, Office of the Vice-Chancellor

Unizik Bulletin (2009). Dereliction/Abandonment of duty. September 14, Vol. 2, No. 36, pp. 9, Office of the Vice-Chancellor.

Unizik Bulletin (2009). Management decision :Senior staff still come late to work, perpetual/habitual latecomers warned of eventual consequences, September 21, Vol. 2 No. 37, pp. 7, Office of the Vice-Chancellor.

Unizik Bulletin (2009). Management warns against inappropriate handling of mails and disclosure of classified documents and loss of official documents in offices. August 10, Vol. 2 No. 31 pp. 4, Office of the Vice-Chancellor.

Unizik Bulletin (2009). Sale of self-authored books, sorting, extortion of money of money from students, sexual harassment by some lecturers. September 7, Vol. 2, No. 35, Office of the Vice-chancellor.

Unizik Bulletin (2010). Rampant acts of indiscipline Aprils 12, Vol. 3, No. 15, pg. 3. Office of the Vice-Chancellor

Unizik Bulletin (2010). Stiff penalties for lateness, April 12, Vol. 3.No. 15, pp. 3, Office of the Vice-Chancellor.

Unizik Bulletin (2010). Stiff penalty for abusers. March 01, Vol. 3, No. 09, pg. 1, Office of the Vice-Chancellor



Unizik Bulletin (2010). Theft of a tipping jack at the University workshop. March 01, Vol. 3, No. 09, pp. 8, Office of the Vice-Chancellor.

Unizik Bulletin (2010). Early departure from work. February 15, Vol. 3, No. 02, pp. 4, Office of the Vice-Chancellor.

Unizik Bulletin (2011). Abuse of biological children opportunity. September 12, Vol. 4, No. 35, pp. 1, Office of the Vice-Chancellor.

Unizik Bulletin (2011). Caution of nursing mothers to stop coming to work with their babies to avoid distraction during work hours. May 16, Vol. 4, No. 18, pp. Office of the Vice-Chancellor.

Unizik Bulletin (2011). Misplacement and loss of official documents by staff. March 14, Vol. 4, No. 10, pp. 9. Office of the Vice-Chancellor.

VandeBos, G. R. (2007). *APA Dictionary of Psychology*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Wertag, A. & Bratko, D. (2015). Personality and prosociality: incremental validity of the Dark Triad over HEXACO model. *ISSID*

Wikipedia (2016). https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hyperinflation_in_Zimbabwe. (retrieved on the 13th of February, 2016)

Wikipedia (n.d.). https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kwame_Nkrumah#Overthrow. (retrieved on the 13th of February, 2016).

Wikipedia (n.d.). https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mobutu_Sese_Seko. (retrieved on the 13th of February, 2016).

Wikipedia (n.d.). https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sani_Abacha#Recovery_of_stolen_funds. (retrieved on the 13th of February, 2016).

Worchel, S. (2004). The diamond in the stone: Exploring the place of free behavior in studies of human rights and culture. In R. A.



World Bank (1998). Special report on corruption in Africa. Washington D.C.

Wright, J. Greenberg, & S. S. Brehm (Eds.), *Motivational analyses of social behavior: Building on Jack Brehm's*

www.servenigeria.com. (Retrieved on January 10th, 2016).

www.transparency.org/what-is-corruption? (Retrieved on January 10th, 2016).

Yen, H. R., Niehoff, B. P. (2004). Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Organizational Effectiveness: Examining Relationships In Taiwanese Banks. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34, 8, pp. 1617-1637.

Yen, R.H., Li, Y.E. & Niehoff, B.P. (2008). Do organizational citizenship behaviour leads to information system success? *Information and management* 45(6), 394-402.

Zellars, K. L., Tepper, B. J., & Duffy, M. K. (2002). Abusive supervision and subordinates' organizational citizenship behaviour.