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Abstract
The study examined peer influence, rank and self-esteem as predictors of psychotherapeutic view of hostile behavior among police personnel working in Awka City. A total number of two hundred and twenty-two (222) police personnel served as participant for the study. They were selected using a non probability convenient random sampling. They consisted of 96 males and 126 female. Their age ranged from 22-51 years with mean age was 34.87 and standard deviation of 7.0. Instruments use to generate data for the study were; Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire by Buss-Perry (1992), Index of Peer Relation (IPR) by Hudson (1982), Validated by Anumba (1995) and Rosenberg’s Self-Esteem (RSE) scale (1965). Multiple Linear Regression Statistics were used to analyze the data. Three hypotheses were tested. The result revealed that hypothesis one which state that peer influence will predict hostility behavior was accepted at f (β=.16, t = 2.5, p< .01), hypothesis two which state that rank will significantly predict hostility behavior was accepted at f (β=.26, t =3.9, p<.01), while hypothesis three which state that self-esteem will significantly predict hostility behavior was also accepted at f (β= -.16, t = -3.31, p< .01). Based on the findings, conclusion were made and implication of the study was also stated.
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Introduction
Police hostility is generally conceived in terms of police brutality, torture and homicide, use of excessive force, and lethal use of firearms including extra-judicial executions of suspects. In Nigeria, police hostility is widespread. Its manifestations include beating and kicking citizens, unnecessary use of restraints such as handcuffs and leg chains, unnecessary use of
lethal firearms against suspects and members of the public, torture of suspects in order to extract confession or extort gratification (Centre for Law Enforcement Education and National Human Rights Commission, 2010). However, the report of a national study of the Nigerian criminal justice system provided an insight into the extent of police violence in the country.

According to the report, of 882 respondents who were then suspects under police custody that were interviewed, 48.7 percent stated that their arrest involved insult or abuse by the police, while half (51.1%) of them indicated that their arrest did not involve use of physical force by the police, however, 35.9% were rough handled or slapped; 7.4% were beaten with a baton; and 3% were threatened with a gun. As to why force was used on them, 24.2% said they did nothing to warrant the use of force, 3% resisted arrest, while 1.6% returned verbal abuse. 5.2% were assaulted because they questioned police behaviour; and 22.5% were assaulted because they either refused to admit the offence or make a statement. For instance, Tamuno (1970) noted that “the police usually earned displeasure of some trade union leaders and members of the society, a factor which did not promote good public relations as far as the members of the society were concerned”. The frequent use of police to scuttle, disperse and break strikes led to the killing of twenty-one miners and fifty wounded workers during the Enugu colliery strike in 1949. More so, victims of hostility, on their part, suffer a myriad of negative consequences, including depression, anxiety, low self-esteem, and stress effects such as headaches, difficulty in sleeping, and In some of these cases, the police used “batons, rifles and revolvers”, to suppress, maim and at times kill innocent persons who opposed them (Alemika 1993; Ajomo & Okagbue; 1991; Cava, Buelga, Musitu, & Murgui, 2010; Crick & Bigbee, 2008; O’Moore & Kirkham, 2001). Moreover, hostile individuals show clear psychosocial maladjustment, low performance, absenteeism from duty, involvement in deviant acts, substance abuse, experience poor marital relations, criminal behavior and various mental health problems, including higher levels of depression (Alsaker & Olweus, 2002; Asberg, 2004; Coccaro, Noblett, & McCloskey, 2009; Farrington, 2001; Moffitt, 2006; Ostrov & Godleski, 2009; Piquero, Daigle, Gibson, Piquero, & Tibbetts, 2007).

**Police**

Constitutionally, the police are state officials charged with responsibility for ‘law enforcement and order maintenance’ in society. To discharge these twin responsibilities, the police are empowered by law to enforce law on offenders, and in occasions where there is resistance to arrest, police can apply force and some level of hostility. National constitutions and statutes, international conventions and rules; police departmental orders and professional ethics regulate the use of force or violence by police. But despite these provisions, the police in most societies use force and violence beyond the limits permissible by law (Centre for Law Enforcement Education and National Human Rights Commission, 2010).

**Police hostility:** is generally conceived in terms of police brutality, torture and homicide, use of excessive force, and lethal use of firearms including extra-judicial executions of suspects. Two dimensions of police hostility: These are police use of hostile behaviour against the citizens and citizens’ use of hostile behaviour against the
police. The incidence, extent and pattern of both forms of hostility in different communities are determined by social, political, economic and institutional factors.

**Hostility Behaviour:** is defined as any behavior directed toward another individual that is carried out with the proximate (immediate) intent to cause harm. In addition, the perpetrator must believe that the behavior will harm the target, and that the target is motivated to avoid the behavior (Anderson and Bushman, 2002).

**Dimensions of Hostile Behaviour**

Buss (1961) described three bipolar dimensions of hostility: physical vs. verbal; active vs. passive; and direct vs. indirect.

**Physical VS Verbal Hostility:** *Physical hostility:* harm is inflicted with physical action, and includes behaviors such as glaring at someone, making obscene gestures, assault, destroying someone’s personal property, and delaying action to make another person look bad. *Verbal hostility:* harm is inflicted through words as opposed to deeds, and includes verbal behaviors such as threats, insults, spreading rumors, and giving someone the “silent treatment.”

**Active VS Passive hostility:** *Active hostility:* harm is inflicted through the performance of some behavior, whereas Examples of active hostility include yelling at someone, lying to others to hurt someone’s reputation, making obscene gestures, and deliberately assigning work overload. *Passive hostility:* harm is accomplished through the withholding of some behavior. Examples of passive hostility include withholding needed information, not responding to requests, refusing to provide resources, and slowing down work to make someone look bad.

**Direct VS Indirect Hostility:** *Direct hostility:* the perpetrator delivers harm directly to the target. Examples include reprimanding someone too harshly, insulting one’s competence directly to one’s face, and being glared at. In contrast, *indirect hostility:* are delivered through an intermediary such as another person or something that the target values (e.g., job tasks, salary, and time). Examples of indirect forms of hostility include spreading lies or rumors, failing to support the target’s ideas or contributions, deliberately assigning work overload, and assigning the target to a physically undesirable or unsafe location. Furthermore, hostility behavior may result from the early socialization of children. Families play an important role in the socialization of children. Invariably, parental characteristics and imitation of parents by children influence social development in subtle ways (Cooper, 2008).

**Psychotherapy and Hostile Behaviour**

Psychotherapy is that process that enables people to express their feelings in a protected environment, to a person trained to listen with understanding and compassion (Madu, 2015). The process helps people reconnect with – and honour – their roots, affirm their identity, and develop healthy ways of being in the world (Pritz, Kuriansky, Nemeth, Mulcahy, Walsh & Madu, 2005). By restoring an individual’s human dignity, and personal and cultural identity through psychotherapy, the person can regain emotional resilience and achieve sustainable mental health to overcome fear and deal effectively with personnel trauma experience and hostility in the world of work.

However, most psychotherapists tend to agree that Police personnel hostility has to be dealt with during the process of psychotherapy, in order that the contact may
be successful. Generally speaking, regardless of theoretical orientation, the therapist attempts to create a milieu in which expression of hostile feelings is permitted and encouraged. Characteristically, studies noted that men are more hostile than women. This is perhaps the single most thoroughly documented finding on hostile behaviour research (Buss, 1961). Moreover, Barnes (2013) pointed out that therapists’ approach and avoidance of hostility are connected to clients expressed emotion. And Varble (2014) stated that there is a great deal of variation among therapists concerning rate of approach to personnel hostile expressions. That is to say, that some therapists tend to approach hostile expressions of police personnel more than other therapists. Also, an individual therapist tends to vary from session to session in rate of approach and avoidance of hostile expressions of police personnel. Thus, frequency of personnel hostile expressions could be significantly affected by whether a particular therapist tends to approach or avoid hostile expressions. Frequency of personnel hostile expressions at specific phases would be particularly affected by therapists who vary from session to session in rates of approach and avoidance of hostile expression.

Peer Influence and Hostile Behaviour
A peer can be anyone you look up to or someone who you would think is an equal in age or ability. Peer influence could be a friend, someone in the community or even someone on television (Hardcastle, 2002). Peer influence provides support, security, membership, autonomy, self-expression and common experiences to police officers, and peer influence is “the pressures people feel from their peers” (Adriaansz, 2002). People inevitably look to their peers for approval and support. According to Castrogiovanni (2002), peer influence is defined as a pressure between similar age, fairly close friends, and sharing the same activities.

Peer influence can exert strong influences on officer’s hostile behaviour. Specific aspects of peer influence identified include; belonging to a cult group, use of slangs, getting involved in sexual immorality and use of drugs, while destructive tendencies involve; breaking institutionalized laws, extortion of money, truancy, bullying, substance abuse and are often implicated as a key factor that places officers at risk for hostile behaviour (Henry, 2008; Nash, McQueen, & Bray, 2005).

Rank and Hostile Behaviour
Rank is an implicit or explicit hierarchy order of individuals or groups with respect to a valued social dimension. The words implicit and explicit captured the range of awareness that people have of the hierarchies in which they are embedded. Ranks can be delineated by rules and consensually agreed upon, or they can be subjectively understood and taken for granted. The phrase rank order indicated that at least one individual or group must be subordinate to at least one other individual or group (Blau & Scott, 1962). The phrase valued social dimension indicated there must be some specification and understanding of the dimension along which people are rank ordered, that dimension must have subjective value Social Hierarchy to the individuals or groups, and higher rank possesses more of the valued dimension than lower rank.

According to Wikipedia (2013), ranking in the Nigeria Police Force (NPF) are various. In the view of Ape (2005), ranking indicates orderliness. Obviously ranks have their meanings, that one in a particular rank knows one’s position in relation to other members of the force. This
means that giving and taking of orders are determined by the rank one has attained in the force. The Corporal receives orders from the Sergeant and gives same to the Constable. By this, ranking calls for respect among members of the force. Members should be conscious of their ranks and treat superior officers with respect, even if it is pretended.

**Nigeria Police Force Rank-and-files are thus classified:**

1. The Inspector-General of Police (IGP) is the highest rank; there is only one serving Inspector-General at a time in the nation.
2. Deputy Inspector-General (DIG) of Police is next in rank to the IGP; there may be more than one Deputy Inspector-General at a time.
3. Assistant Inspector-General (AIG) of Police is next to the DIG and the third highest rank in the police.
4. Commissioner of Police (CP) is the fourth rank; a CP is the one in charge of contingents in a state.
5. Deputy Commissioner of Police (DCP) is next to the CP.
6. Assistant Commissioner of Police (ACP) is the sixth and last rank of the commissioned senior officers in the police force.
7. Chief Superintendent of Police (CSP) is the seventh rank in the police and the first of the intermediate officers.
8. Superintendent of Police (SP) is the eighth rank.
9. Deputy Superintendent of Police (DSP) is the ninth rank.
10. Assistant Superintendent of Police (ASP) is the tenth rank in the police force.
11. Inspector of Police (IP) is the eleventh rank and the last of the intermediate officers in the police force.
12. Sergeant Major (SM) is the twelfth rank and the first of the rank and file junior officers in the police force.
13. Sergeant is the second of the rank and file junior officers.
14. Corporal is the first rank of promotion in the rank and file of the Nigeria Police Force (NPF).
15. Constable is the lowest rank in the Nigeria Police Force (NPF).

**The Functions of Ranks in Police Organizations**

**Social order and coordination:** Ranks arrangements provide solutions to problems inherent in organizing collections of people working toward a common goal. As a mechanism of social governance, ranks provide a powerful antidote to uncertainty and chaos (Durkheim 1893/1997; Hogg, 2001; Marx, 1844/1964; Parsons, 1961). By providing social order, rank helps fulfill an important cluster of human needs characterized by the desire for order, structure, and stability in police organization (Frenkel-Brunswik, 1949; Neuberg & Newsom, 1993; Sorrentino & Roney, 1986).

**Individual incentives:** Rank also serves a motivational function, providing incentives for individuals to try to ascend to higher positions in their groups and organizations because higher rank affords greater material and psychological rewards and comfort (Tannenbaum, 1974). Not only does rank provide order and stability, but also achieving high rank brings greater opportunity than low rank to satisfy another set of desires that could be described as control-related needs—autonomy (Deci & Ryan, 1987; Porter, 1962), Social Hierarchy internal control (Rotter, 1966), and power (McClelland, 1975; Winter, 1973). The motivational function of rank generally benefits organizations.
Rank may have some effect on police hostile behaviour. Studies (Lott, 2005; Southworth, 2010) found that rank predicted hostility, such that lower ranked policemen exhibited a higher tendency of engaging in hostility. The authors noted that this outcome might be related to the need for power and control among lower ranked policemen. They reasoned that in a rigidly controlled structure with a clear chain of command such as the police force, the lower ranks are the ones who execute orders but have little control over what they are required to do. They stated further that if an individual had limited power and control at work and experienced a need to exercise such power and control, they may then exercise that need in another context.

Self-Esteem and Hostile Behaviour
Self-esteem is a personal sense of ability that is fundamental to an individual’s identity, a motivation engine that powers one’s cognitive machinery (Dunning & Sherman, 1997).

It is characterized by one’s subjective appraisal of self-worth (Myers, 2005), and refers to a person’s overall self-evaluation (Zeigler-Hill, 2006). It is seen as how favorably individuals evaluate themselves (Baumeister & Bushman, 2008), and it is the relationship between one’s real self and one’s ideal self (Leary, 1999). Theorists have made many distinctions concerning types of self-esteem, ranging from contingent versus non contingent (Croker & Wolfe, 2001) explicit versus implicit (Hetts & Pelham, 2001), stable versus unstable (Kernis & Waschull, 1995); authentic versus False (Deci & Ryan, 1995) and global versus domain specific (Dulton & Brown, 1997). However, the themes that underlie all these conceptualizations and conceptions are that self-esteem refers to a person’s evaluation of self and that people are generally motivated to maintain high levels of self-esteem, and defend their self-esteem when it comes under threat.

High self-esteem individuals have a firing desire to maintain or enhance their self-esteem (Leary, 1999), while individuals with low self-esteem are more likely to feel awkward, shy, conspicuous and unable to express themselves with confidence (Amazue, 2011). Such individuals are always worried about making a mistake, being embarrassed, or exposed to ridicule, and they have a strong tendency to avoid people (Myers, 2005). Findings concerning the association between self-esteem and hostile behavior have been inconsistent. Some literature suggests that high self-esteem is linked to hostile behavior (Kirkpatrick, Waugh, Valencia & Webster, 2002); while some researchers have noted a link between elevated levels of self-esteem (particularly in the form of narcissism) and hostile behavior (Barry, Grafeman, Adler & Pickard, 2007), and others have shown an association between low self-esteem and hostile behavior (Donnellan, Trzesniewski, Robins, Moffitt & Caspi, 2005).

Theoretical Review

Social Learning Theory of Hostility
Bandura’s social learning theory (1983, cited in Baron & Richardson, 2004) proposes that individuals learn hostile behavior from others in the same way that they learn other complex forms of social behavior; through direct and observational learning. This theory considers hostility primarily as a learned form of social behavior adopted either as a result of experience or by observing others, performed when rewarded, and maintained through positive reinforcement (Bandura, 2001; Geen 2001). Thus, hostile behavior is acquired in the same manner as other forms of social behavior. Persons perpetrate in
assaults against others because they adopt hostile responses due to past experience, or they receive or anticipate various forms of reward for carrying out such actions, or they are directly provoked to hostility by specific social or environmental conditions (Bandura 1978, 2001). Hostile behavior is thought to be instigated by incentives, instructions, aversive treatment, and bizarre beliefs or through the influence of models such as arousal and attention. It is thought to be regulated or maintained through external sources such as rewards and punishment (for example admiration or vilification by others), vicarious experiences such as observing others being rewarded or punished for hostile behavior and by self-imposed consequences such as guilt or pride (Baron & Richardson, 2004).

**Empirical Review**

**Peer influence and Hostile behaviour**

Okoije and Asamaigo (2016), investigates peer influence and parental neglect as predictors of tantrum behaviour among dyscalculia children in Benin Edo State Nigeria. Through the use of descriptive survey research design, two research questions were answered and data collected from one hundred and sixty randomly selected primary six pupils in twenty randomly selected public schools in Benin City. Using their Mathematics cumulative cognitive scores of three consecutive examination records and two validated instruments, analysis of data was done using the multiple regression statistical tools. The result revealed that peer influence and parental neglect made a joint contribution of 23% variance on tantrum behaviour among pupils with dyscalculia. The result of the study further revealed that peer influence and parental neglect has predictive influence on tantrum behaviour of dyscalculia pupils.

Also, Ajiboye (2015) investigated the influence of parenting styles and peer pressure on delinquent behaviours among Senior Secondary School Students in Kaduna metropolis. A correlational design was adopted and data was collected from 320 students (male =164 (51.2%); female = 156 (48.8%)) age range 14–19 years drawn from the ten purposively selected schools with the population of 2256 in Kaduna metropolis. Data was collected using parenting style questionnaire that covers democratic parenting style, autocratic parenting style, and Laissez-faire parenting style. Peer Pressure Questionnaire and Delinquent Behaviour Questionnaire were also used. The data collected were subjected to statistical analysis using Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation at the .05 levels of significance to test the four hypotheses stated for the study. Result revealed that there is a significant negative correlation $r = -.188; p < .001$ between Democratic Parenting Style and Delinquent behaviour which implies that children from homes where Democratic Parenting Style is used are less likely to be delinquents. Autocratic Parenting Style and Delinquent behaviour among students strongly and positively correlate $r = .504; p < .000$ and Laisser-faire Parenting Style and Delinquent behaviour $r = .662; p < .000$ thereby strongly suggesting that children from homes where Autocratic Parenting Style and Laisser-faire Parenting Style is practiced are strongly likely to be delinquents. Peer Pressure was also found to strongly encourage Delinquent behaviour among students $r = .683; p < .000$.

**Rank and Hostile Behaviour**

Onuoha, Olapegba, and Segun-Martins (2014), examined the influence of spouse employment status and rank on domestic violence among personnel of Nigerian Police Force. Participants consisted of 212
purposely selected personnel of the Nigerian Police Force. They included 88 commissioned officers and 144 non-commissioned personnel. Their age ranged from 28 to 57 years. One hundred and forty-three had wives who were employed, while the remainder (69) had non-working wives. After a critical review of domestic violence literature, two hypotheses were tested using t-test of independent samples. Results indicated significant influence of spouse employment status on domestic violence, such that policemen with working spouse were less likely to engage in domestic violence than those with unemployed spouse. However, rank had no influence on domestic violence. While, Kraus, Horberg, Goetz and Keltner (2011), examined Social Class Rank, Threat Vigilance, and Hostile Reactivity in San Francisco California, USA. A total of 244 female undergraduates (122 friendship dyads) between the ages of 18 and 25 were recruited for the study from classroom announcements and advertisements posted around the university campus seeking friends to participate in a study. The ethnic distribution of this sample was approximately 46.1% Caucasian, 38.2% Latina, 13.2% African American, and 2.5% multiethnic. Participants had been friends for an average of 2.5 years (M=31.52 months, SD=36.32). In Study 1, participants engaged in a teasing interaction with a close friend. Lower-class participants—measured in terms of social class rank in society and within the friendship—more accurately tracked the hostile emotions of their friend. As a result, lower-class individuals experienced more hostile emotion contagion relative to upper-class participants. In Study 2, lower-class participants manipulated to experience lower subjective socioeconomic rank showed more hostile reactivity to ambiguous social scenarios relative to upper-class participants and to lower-class participants experiencing elevated socioeconomic rank.

Self-esteem and Hostile Behaviour
Ezeokana, Obi-Nwosu, and Okoye (2014), examined the influence of street life and gender on aggression and self esteem of children in two metropolitan cities of Anambra State, Nigeria. A total number of 412 participants aged from 13-17 years, comprising of 277(67.2%) males and 135(32.8%) females, with the mean age of 14.91 years and standard deviation of 1.36 took part in the study. They responded to Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire (1992), Rosenberg self-Esteem scale (1979), Picture Apperception Test (2012), observation, interview and focused Group Discussion (FGD). The study adopted a 3x2 factorial design to test the hypotheses and used multiple Analyses of variance statistic for data analysis. The results showed that street children differed significantly from non-street children on level of aggression at F (1, 1410) =108.54, p<.05. But did not differ significantly on self-esteem; F (1,410)=1.36,p>.05. Street children who had contact with their families and those who had not, did not differ in level of aggression; F(1,258)=.02,p>.05, and also did not differ in their self-esteem status; F(1,258)=.02,p>.05. Male and female street children did not differ in their level of aggression at F (1,258) =0.6, p>.05; but differed in their self esteem status; F (1,258) =4.44, p>.05. Also, Miklós (2012), examined associations between self-esteem and the forms and functions of aggression in a community sample of youth. 141 adolescents were recruited from the community with a mean age of 13.55. The sampled group was composed of 51% females and 52% Caucasians. Participants completed self-report questionnaires on self-esteem and aggression. The results provide
support for an association between proactive aggression and self-esteem. Additionally, overt aggression was more associated with self-esteem than relational aggression. The research also supports the existence of four aggressive subtypes (i.e., reactive overt, reactive relational, proactive overt, and proactive relational), and past research has found associations between aggression and self-esteem.

**Hypotheses**

1. Peer Influence significantly predict hostile behaviour among police personnel working in Awka city.
2. Rank will significantly predict hostile behaviour among police personnel working in Awka city.
3. Self-esteem will significantly predict hostile behaviour among police personnel working in Awka city.

**Method**

**Participant**

A total number of two hundred and twenty-two (222) Nigeria police force (NPF) personnel working in Awka city; served as participant for the study. They were selected using convenient sampling; because the participants work on duty shift and researchers cannot access the entire participants at a given time and the ranks of officers used were corporal, constable, sergeant, inspector and assistant superintendent of police. They consist of 96 (43.2%) females and 126 (56.8%) males and their gender mean is 1.43 with standard deviation of .49; their age range from 22-51 years and their mean age was 34.87 with standard deviation of 7.0; their educational level shows that 85 (38.3%) have senior secondary certificate examination (SSCE), 48 (21.6%) have ordinary national diploma certificate (OND), 48 (21.6%) have higher national diploma certificate (HND), while 41 (18.5%) have bachelor of science certificate (BSc) respectively and their educational mean is 2.79 with standard deviation of 1.14.

**Instruments**

Three instruments were adopted in the study. The first was Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire (BPAQ), developed by Buss-Perry (1992), a 29 items scale: designed to measure physical aggression, verbal aggression, hostility. It was a 7-point response format scale: “extremely uncharacteristic of me =1, extreme uncharacteristic of me = 2, uncharacteristic of me =3, Neutral=4, and characteristic of me =5, extreme characteristic of me=6, extremely characteristic of me=7”. The instrument has validity of 0.76 as was determined by the original authors (Buss-Perry, 1992). To determine the scale reliability, we conducted a pilot test using eighty two participants drawn from Nigeria Civil defence Service Corps. The Cronbach alpha coefficient reliability of 0.52 was obtained from the pilot study. This scores shows that the scale is reliable.

The second instrument adopted was Index of Peer Relation (IPR) by Hudson (1982): A twenty-five (25) items scale constructed to measure the way people relate with co-workers in the work place. It has 5-Point response format classified as Rarely of the time=1, A little of the time=2, Some of the time=3, A good part of the time=4, Most of the time=5. The instrument has validity of 0.84 as was determined by Hudson (1982), and Anumba (1995), confirmed cronbach’s alpha of .94 and validity of .62 by correlating IPR with Hare Self-esteem Scale. Its use in this study was adopted through a reliability test using eighty two participants from Nigeria Civil defence Service Corps.
for the pilot test. And Cronbach alpha coefficient reliability of -.58 was confirmed.

The third instrument is Rosenberg Self-Esteem (RSE) scale, a 10 items scale, developed by Rosenberg, (1965); designed to measures global self-worth of positive and negative feelings about oneself. The positive has 5 items and negative 5 items, Items 2, 5, 6, 8, 9 are reverse scored. All items are answered using a 4-point Likert scale format ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The scale has high reliability, with test-retest correlation value between .82 and .88 for college samples and the validity was convergent and discriminant (Rosenberg, 1989). Its use in this study was adopted through a reliability test using eighty two participants from Nigeria Civil defence Service Corps for the pilot test. And Cronbach alpha coefficient reliability of .78 was confirmed.

**Procedure**
The researchers went to Nigeria police force (NPF) division headquarter Awka, Anambra State. With the help of his friend that is a police officer obtained permission from the Assistant commissioner of police Anambra State command through the station officer (SO) of the command and then, proceeded to the personnel’s individually. They introduced themselves to them and the purpose of the study. After gaining their consent they assure them of confidentiality and gave out the necessary instructions and administered the copies of the questionnaire to them. He encouraged them to answer all the questions and do that with honesty; emphasizing that no answer is either right or wrong. However, the researchers was able to administer two hundred and forty-five (245) copies of the questionnaire but two hundred and thirty-five (235) copies returned while two hundred and twenty-two (222) copies were properly answered which was used as sample for the study.

**Design and Statistics**
The study adopted Predictive correlational design and Multiple Linear Regression statistics was used to analyze the data.

**Results**
The result of the statistical analysis of the data obtained in the study is presented in this section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P. Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Std. D</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer Influence</td>
<td>74.22</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>13.35</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-3.31</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dependent Variables:** Hostile Behaviour

**Interpretation**
Results from the table above, indicated that peer influence, rank and self-esteem accounted for hostile behavior, with R = .33, R² = .11, adjusted R²=.10, F (2, 219) = 0.33, p>.01. Peer influence predicted hostile behavior at F (β=.26, t =3.9, p<.01) with mean of 74.22 and standard deviation of 4.7, while rank predicted hostile behavior at F (β=.16, t = 2.5, p< .01) with mean of 2.46...
and standard deviation of 1.33, and also self-esteem negatively predicted hostile behavior at \((β = -.16, t = -3.31, p<.001)\) with mean of 28.3 and standard deviation of 4.5. Thus, hypothesis one which states that rank will predict hostility behavior, hypothesis two which states that peer influence will significantly predict hostility behavior and hypothesis three that states that self-esteem will significantly predict hostility behavior were both confirmed at p<.01.

**Discussion**

Based on the findings, hypothesis one which stated that peer influence will significantly predict hostile behavior was accepted. This result is in consonance with the findings Okoiye and Asamaigo (2016), investigated peer influence and parental neglect as predictors of tantrum behaviour among children with dyscalculia in Benin Edo State Nigeria. Their result revealed that peer influence and parental neglect made a joint contribution variance on tantrum behaviour among pupils with dyscalculia. The result of the study further revealed that peer influence and parental neglect has predictive influence on tantrum behaviour of dyscalculia pupils. Furthermore, The result is in consonance with the findings Ajiboye (2015), investigated the influence of parenting styles and peer pressure on delinquent behaviours among Senior Secondary School Students in Kaduna metropolis. This shows that the level of peer influence increase hostility behavior among police personnel. This may be because those personnel with hostile tendency tend to be easily influence by their peers due to their inability to be in control of their own life and duty except push and pull from a friend, colleagues and family which usually affect their act of responsibility and engagement in deviant act.

Hypothesis two which stated that rank will significantly predict hostile behavior among police personnel was accepted. This result is in not consonance with the findings of Onuoha, Olapegba, and Segun-Martins (2014), examined the influence of spouse employment status and rank on domestic violence among personnel of Nigerian Police Force. Results indicated rank had no influence on domestic violence. Furthermore, Kraus, Horberg, Goetz and Keltner (2011), examined Social Class Rank, Threat Vigilance, and Hostile Reactivity in San Francisco California, USA. In Study 1, participants engaged in a teasing interaction with a close friend. Lower-class participants—measured in terms of social class rank in society and within the friendship—more accurately tracked the hostile emotions of their friend. As a result, lower-class individuals experienced more hostile emotion contagion relative to upper-class participants. In Study 2, lower-class participants manipulated to experience lower subjective socioeconomic rank showed more hostile reactivity to ambiguous social scenarios relative to upper-class participants and to lower-class participants experiencing elevated socioeconomic rank. This shows that the level of rank police personnel possess does increase their hostile behavior. This suggest that rank inspire hope, insight, and experience of hostile feelings among police personnel particularly in situations in which lower-rank individuals perceive themselves to be sub change, this perhaps make them to engage in hostile behavior which invariably affect social order, prestige and stability in police organization in Awka.

Hypothesis three which stated that student self-esteem will significantly predict hostile behavior was also accepted. The findings indicate that self-esteem has a negative significant relationship on gender-
based-violence. This finding is in line with the findings of Ezeokana et al., (2014), they examined the influence of street life and gender on aggression and self-esteem of children in two metropolitan cities of Anambra State, Nigeria. The results showed that street children differed significantly from non-street children on level of aggression. But did not differ significantly on self-esteem; street children who had contact with their families and those who had not, did not differ in level of aggression, and also did not differ in their self-esteem status. It is also in line with the findings of Miklós (2012) who examined associations between self-esteem and the forms and functions of aggression in a community sample of youth. Their results provide support for an association between proactive aggression and self-esteem. Additionally, overt aggression was more associated with self-esteem than relational aggression. Also supports the existence of four aggressive subtypes (i.e., reactive overt, reactive relational, proactive overt, and proactive relational), and past research has found associations between aggression and self-esteem. This implies that self-esteem increase hostile behavior of the police personnel in Awka City. This perhaps also may be because those personnel that participated in this study have issue with understanding who they are which dent their authentic self and triggers hostile behavior at the expense of trying to proof themselves to the masses, their superiors or subordinate.

Psychotherapeutic Relevance of the Study
The findings of the study will aid psychotherapists and even police authorities on counseling police personnel on how to live a hostile free-life in the cause of their duty, and also open the eye of the personnel on the consequences of their hostile behavior on themselves and others. More so, association of self-esteem, rank and peer influence would deepen people’s ideal about the danger of hostility and psychotherapeutic strategies with which to overcome hostility tendencies.

Recommendations
Based on the findings of this study, the researcher recommends:
- Police authorities should employ the services of qualified psychologists in their organization to help educate the personnel how to manage their emotion at the cause of duty.
- There should be law and bills for check and balance in police organization in order to curtail their excesses.
- Again, hostility behavior among police personnel should be regarded as crime so that perpetrators should be dealt with according to law. Where many personnel see hostility as a means of getting what they want. Due to inability to implement the law that questions their actions they tend to perpetuate this act at ease over any little provocations.
- Psychotherapists also as a matter of urgency should embark on campaign for hostility-free action among police personnel in order to make our homes and society a habitant place, via the use of mass media (eg. television, radio, and other social network).
- Researchers in the area of hostility should investigate more in this area in order to know more dimensions and consequences of this menace called hostility.

Conclusion
Police hostility is a serious problem which is colossal in nature and there are many causes. Obviously, this problem is related to
anxiety, low-self-esteem, depression and stress. There is similarity between victims of this hostile behavior in Awka, Anambra State and other parts of the country (Nigeria). Although, many of these police hostility has been found to be associated with peer influence, family background, childhood experience, and abuse of substance which usually have negative effect on police and these cannot be neglected in our society. Therefore, this study tested for predictability of peer influence, rank and self-esteem on hostility behavior among police personnel. The study revealed that, peer influence, rank and self-esteem has significant positive prediction on hostility behavior among police personnel.

References


