

Chapter 1 : Self-Protective Behaviors and Campus Threat Assessment - CORE

protective behaviors and injury by overcoming some of the methodological limitations in previous research as well as examining a group of high risk women normally excluded from this research subject.

What gaps exist in that knowledge? What further research—both disciplinary and interdisciplinary—is needed to fill those gaps? As noted in Chapter 3, emergency response activities can be categorized usefully as expedient mitigation actions. Another common conceptual distinction in the literature on disaster response Dynes et al. Paralleling preparedness measures, disaster response activities take place at various units of analysis, from individuals and households, to organizations, communities, and intergovernmental systems. This section does not attempt to deal exhaustively with the topic of emergency response activities, which is the most-studied of all phases of hazard and disaster management. Rather, it highlights key themes in the literature, with an emphasis on NEHRP-based findings that are especially relevant in light of newly recognized human-induced threats. Warning Response, Evacuation, and Other Self-Protective Actions The decision processes and behaviors involved in public responses to disaster warnings are among the best-studied topics in the research literature. As noted in Chapter 3, warning response research overlaps to some degree with more general risk communication research. For example, both literatures emphasize the importance of considering source, message, channel, and receiver effects on the warning process. While this discussion centers mainly on responses to official warning information, it should be noted that self-protective decision-making processes are also initiated in the absence of formal warnings—for example, in response to cues that people perceive as signaling impending danger and in disasters that occur without warning. Facing Hazards and Disasters: The National Academies Press. As in other areas discussed here, empirical studies on warning response and self-protective behavior in different types of disasters and emergencies have led to the development of broadly generalizable explanatory models. According to that theory, groups faced with the potential need to act under conditions of uncertainty or potential danger engage in interaction in an attempt to develop a collective definition of the situation they face and a set of new norms that can guide their subsequent action. These collective determinations are shaped in turn by such factors as 1 the characteristics of warning recipients, including their prior experience with the hazard in question or with similar emergencies, as well as their prior preparedness efforts; 2 situational factors, including the presence of perceptual cues signaling danger; and 3 the social contexts in which decisions are made—for example, contacts among family members, coworkers, neighborhood residents, or others present in the setting, as well as the strength of preexisting social ties. Through interaction and under the influence of these kinds of factors, individuals and groups develop new norms that serve as guidelines for action. Conceptualizing warning response as a form of collective behavior that is guided by emergent norms brings several issues to the fore. One is that far from being automatic or governed by official orders, behavior undertaken in response to warnings is the product of interaction and deliberation among members of affected groups—activities that are typically accompanied by a search for additional confirmatory information. Circumstances that complicate the deliberation process, such as conflicting warning information that individuals and groups may receive, difficulties in getting in touch with others whose views are considered important for the decision-making process, or disagreements among group members about any aspect of the 1 Note that what is being discussed here are group-level deliberations and decisions, not individual ones. Actions under conditions of uncertainty and urgency such as those that accompany disaster warnings should not be conceptualized in individualistic terms. Page Share Cite Suggested Citation: Another implication of the emergent norm approach to protective action decision making is the recognition that groups may collectively define an emergency situation in ways that are at variance from official views. This is essentially what occurs in the shadow evacuation phenomenon, which has been documented in several emergency situations, including the Three Mile Island nuclear plant accident Zeigler et al. While authorities may not issue a warning for a particular geographic area or group of people, or may even tell them they are safe, groups may still collectively decide that they are at risk or that the situation is fluid and confusing enough that they should take self-protective action despite official pronouncements. The behavior of

occupants of the World Trade Center during the September 11, terrorist attack illustrates the importance of collectively developed definitions. Groups of people in Tower 2 of the World Trade Center decided that they should evacuate the building after seeing and hearing about what was happening in Tower 1 and after speaking with coworkers and loved ones, even when official announcements and other building occupants indicated that they should not do so. Others decided to remain in the tower or, perhaps more accurately, they decided to delay evacuating until receiving additional information clarifying the extent to which they were in danger. Journalistic accounts suggest that decisions were shaped in part by what people could see taking place in Tower 1, conversations with others outside the towers who had additional relevant information, and directives received from those in positions of authority in tenant firms. In that highly confusing and time-constrained situation, emergent norms guiding the behavior of occupants of the second tower meant the difference between life and death when the second plane struck NIST. The large body of research that exists regarding decision making under threat conditions points to the need to consider a wide range of individual, group, situational, and resource-related factors that facilitate and inhibit self-protective action. Qualitatively based decision-tree models developed by Gladwin et al. As illustrated by their work on hurricane evacuation, a number of different factors contribute to decisions on whether or not to evacuate. Such factors range from perceptions of risk and personal safety with respect to a threatened disaster, to the extent of knowledge about specific areas at risk, to constraining factors such as the presence of pets in the home that require care, lack of a suitable place to go, counterarguments by other family members, fears of looting shown by the literature to be unjustified; see, for example, Fischer, , and fear that the evacuation process may Page Share Cite Suggested Citation: Warning recipients may decide that they should wait before evacuating, ultimately missing the opportunity to escape, or they may decide to shelter in-place after concluding that their homes are strong enough to resist hurricane forces despite what they are told by authorities. In their research on Hurricane Andrew, Gladwin and Peacock describe some of the many factors that complicate the evacuation process for endangered populations Except under extreme circumstances, households cannot be compelled to evacuate or to remain where they are, much less to prepare themselves for the threat. Even under extraordinary conditions many households have to be individually located and assisted or forced to comply. Segments of a population may fail to receive, ignore, or discount official requests and orders. Still others may not have the resources or wherewithal to comply. Disputes, competition, and the lack of coordination among local, state, and federal governmental agencies and between those agencies and privately controlled media can add confusion. Businesses and governmental agencies that refuse to release their employees and suspend normal activities can add still further to the confusion and noncompliance. The normalcy bias adds other complications to the warning response process. While popular notions of crisis response behaviors seem to assume that people react automatically to messages signaling impending danger—for example, by fleeing in panic—the reality is quite different. As noted earlier, people will not act on threat information unless they perceive a personal risk to themselves. Simply knowing that a threat exists—even if that threat is described as imminent—is insufficient to motivate self-protective action. Nor can people be expected to act if warning-related guidance is not specific enough to provide them with a blueprint for what to do or if they do not believe they have the resources required to follow the guidance. One practical implication of research on warnings is that rather than being concerned about panicking the public with warning information, or about communicating too much information, authorities should instead be seeking better ways to penetrate the normalcy bias, persuade people that they should be concerned about an impending danger, provide directives that are detailed enough to follow during an emergency, and encourage pre-disaster response planning so that people have thought through what to do prior to being required to act. Decades ago, Drabek established that households constitute the basic deliberative units for evacuation decision making in community-wide disasters and that the decisions that are ultimately made tend to be consistent with pre-disaster household authority patterns. For example, gender-related concerns often enter into evacuation decision making. Women tend to be more risk-averse and more inclined to want to follow evacuation orders, while males are less inclined to do so for an extensive discussion of gender differences in vulnerability, risk perception, and responses to disasters, see Fothergill, In arriving at decisions regarding evacuation, households take official orders into account, but they weigh those

orders in light of their own priorities, other information sources, and their past experiences. Information received from media sources and from family and friends, along with confirmatory data actively sought by those at risk, generally has a greater impact on evacuation decisions than information provided by public officials Dow and Cutter, . Recent research also suggests that family evacuation patterns are undergoing change. For example, even though families decide together to evacuate and wish to stay together, they increasingly tend to use more than one vehicle to evacuate—perhaps because they want to take more of their possessions with them, make sure their valuable vehicles are protected, or return to their homes at different times Dow and Cutter, . Other social influences also play a role. Neighborhood residents may be more willing to evacuate or, conversely, more inclined to delay the decision to evacuate if they see their neighbors doing so. NEHRP-sponsored research has shown that different racial, ethnic, income, and special needs groups respond in different ways to warning information and evacuation orders, in part because of the unique characteristics of these groups, the manner in which they receive information during crises, and their varying responses to different information sources. For example, members of some minority groups tend to have large extended families, making contacting family members and deliberating on alternative courses of action a more complicated process. Lower-income groups, inner-city residents, and elderly persons are more likely to have to rely on public transportation, rather than personal vehicles, in order to evacuate. Lower-income and minority populations, who tend to have larger families, may Page Share Cite Suggested Citation: Lack of financial resources may leave less-well-off segments of the population less able to afford to take time off from work when disasters threaten, to travel long distances to avoid danger, or to pay for emergency lodging. Socially isolated individuals, such as elderly persons living alone, may lack the social support that is required to carry out self-protective actions. Members of minority groups may find majority spokespersons and official institutions less credible and believable than members of the white majority, turning instead to other sources, such as their informal social networks. Those who rely on non-English-speaking mass media for news may receive less complete warning information, or may receive warnings later than those who are tuned into mainstream media sources Aguirre et al. Hurricane Katrina vividly revealed the manner in which social factors such as those discussed above influence evacuation decisions and actions. In many respects, the Katrina experience validated what social science research had already shown with respect to evacuation behavior. Those who stayed behind did so for different reasons—all of which have been discussed in past research. Some at-risk residents lacked resources, such as automobiles and financial resources that would have enabled them to escape the city. Based on their past experiences with hurricanes like Betsey and Camille, others considered themselves not at risk and decided it was not necessary to evacuate. Still others, particularly elderly residents, felt so attached to their homes that they refused to leave even when transportation was offered. This is not to imply that evacuation-related problems stemmed solely from individual decisions. Katrina also revealed the crucial significance of evacuation planning, effective warnings, and government leadership in facilitating evacuations. Planning efforts in New Orleans were rudimentary at best, clear evacuation orders were given too late, and the hurricane rendered evacuation resources useless once the city began to flood. With respect to other patterns of evacuation behavior when they do evacuate, most people prefer to stay with relatives or friends, rather than using public shelters. Shelter use is generally limited to people who feel they have no other options—for example, those who have no close friends and relatives to take them in and cannot afford the price of lodging. Many people avoid public shelters or elect to stay in their homes because shelters do not allow pets. Following earthquakes, some victims, particularly Latinos in the United States who have experienced or learned about highly damaging earthquakes in their countries of origin, avoid indoor shelter of all types, preferring instead to sleep outdoors Tierney, ; Phillips, ; Simile, . The disaster literature shows little support for the cry-wolf hypothesis. For example, Dow and Cutter studied South Carolina residents who had been warned of impending hurricanes that ultimately struck North Carolina. However, false alarms did result in a decrease in confidence in official warning sources, as opposed to other sources of information on which people relied in making evacuation decisions—certainly not the outcome officials would have intended. Studies also suggest that it is advisable to clarify for the public why forecasts and warnings were uncertain or incorrect. Based on an extensive review of the warning literature, Sorensen Panic and Social Breakdown

Numerous individual studies and research syntheses have contrasted commonsense ideas about how people respond during crises with empirical data on actual behavior. Among the most important myths addressed in these analyses is the notion that panic and social disorganization are common responses to imminent threats and to actual disaster events Quarantelli and Dynes, ; Johnson, ; Clarke, True panic, defined as highly individualistic flight behavior that is nonsocial in nature, undertaken without regard to social norms and relationships, is extremely rare prior to and during extreme events of all types. Panic takes place under specific conditions that are almost never present in disaster situations. Panic only occurs when individuals feel completely isolated and when both social bonds and measures to promote safety break down to such a degree that individuals feel totally on their own in seeking safety. Panic results from a breakdown in the ongoing social order—a breakdown that Clarke There is a moral failure, so that people pursue their self interest regardless Page Share Cite Suggested Citation: There is a network failure, so that the resources that people can normally draw on in times of crisis are no longer there. Failures on this scale almost never occur during disasters. Panic reactions are rare in part because social bonds remain intact and extremely resilient even under conditions of severe danger Johnson, ; Johnson et al. Panic persists in public and media discourses on disasters, in part because those discourses conflate a wide range of other behaviors with panic. Often, people are described as panicking because they experience feelings of intense fear, even though fright and panic are conceptually and behaviorally distinct. Another behavioral pattern that is sometimes labeled panic involves intensified rumors and information seeking, which are common patterns among publics attempting to make sense of confusing and potentially dangerous situations. Under conditions of uncertainty, people make more frequent use of both informal ties and official information sources, as they seek to collectively define threats and decide what actions to take. Such activities are a normal extension of everyday information-seeking practices Turner, They are not indicators of panic.

Chapter 2 : self-protective response behavior | SOCIOLOGICAL METHODS & RESEARCH

Prior research on victim self-protective behavior (VSPB) has largely been void of a theoretical basis. Accordingly, it remains unclear why it would be expected that victim actions might mitigate crime incident outcomes or under which circumstances such actions might be most successful.

Other times the Self-Protective System of my brain takes over, causing automatic reactions from my emotional brain to dominate. I am sure this is the same for most people. Can we start again? Is this the case? In the workplace, this is demonstrated in various behaviors – the leader who frequently chastises employees publicly for insignificant errors putting everyone else on the defensive; an employee that fails to get their work done on time causing problems for the entire team, without comment from their leader; or employees who spend half their day in personal activities on their computer without comment from anyone. While feeling defensive and acting from our Self-Protective System is normal human behavior, we rarely talk about it as though this is the case. We are often embarrassed by our own need to protect ourselves and can even be defensive when someone points out that we are being defensive. The Physiology of Defensive Behavior The Self-Protective System of the brain is there to ensure that we, as human beings, physically and psychologically survive. Our brains have evolved so that we are now able to use reason in our responses to life as well as emotional and instinctual reactions. However, delays in brain development during childhood cause us to continue to use our instinctual and emotional self-protective behaviors without awareness of the limitations our defensive reactions put on us. We are born with our brains wired to survive and this remains our agenda in adulthood if our childhood environment is not safe and our attachment to our mother or primary caretaker is not secure. Based on the function that dominates, we are wired to use defenses that ensure we get our psychological needs met. Understanding the mechanics of the mind and how the brain develops is critical to learning how to manage and develop behavior. Behaviors of the Self-Protective System are self-focused. They are only concerned with the preservation of the self, self-image or self-concept. These emotionally charged behaviors look different in people of different brain organizations. This means that the person who is in control, perfectly rational and logical is just as self-protective as their emotionally expressive, seemingly out of control, counterpart. While the behaviors look different, the self-centered approach and the insistence that they are right and others are wrong or that they have been wronged or victimized come from the same place. I have had many clients who were so used to being self-protective by denying their needs that even when they had the opportunity to open up, they chose not to. We have some idea that when you reach a certain age we should know better, act mature, not be emotional, and certainly not show any fear or vulnerability. Many people are so busy judging themselves for not attaining their idea or image they have for the way they should be, that they ignore their gifts, talents and potential. In order to thrive, to live life from the Self-Actualizing System of the brain rational, emotional and instinctual brains with connecting neural pathways we have to learn how to work at developing the neural pathways that allow for constant communication between impulses, thoughts and feelings. As adults, we have the potential to shift from living in our Self-Protective System, but first, we have to realize that we are living in survival mode. We have to know what this looks like for our particular brain organization or Striving Style. This is not the case. If you want the Self-Actualizing System of the brain to develop so that you can live your life in the pursuit of your hearts desire, experiencing and dealing with everything life brings to you and achieving your potential, you have to strengthen the neural pathways from your emotional to your rational brain. Working on shifting from automatic self-protective behaviors and strengthening your Self-Actualizing System requires that you develop your observing self; the self that notices how you are feeling and reacting and is curious about why. Too often we keep defending ourselves even when there is no threat. Living life from the Self-Actualizing System allows us to experience ourselves and our lives to the fullest, without apology and without having to defend ourselves. How often are you Self-Protective? Check in with yourself when communicating with others and notice what your self-protective behaviors are. Here are some things that you might notice you do. You always feel that you have to justify your behavior and act as though questions are attacks on you. If someone expresses a feeling, i.

Agree with Your Attacker: Undermine or Devalue Others: Rather than asserting yourself and negotiating to get your own needs met, you say yes and give in, appearing to be cooperative. You might also fail to do what you agreed to, negatively impacting the other person who was depending on you to get what you agreed to finished. Withdraw, Deny or Avoid Conflict: You protect yourself by going inside yourself and not saying anything about what you think or feel about a situation. You might also leave the situation physically by calling in sick or not showing up to a meeting. You avoid people that make you feel nervous or who expect something from you. You might also avoid talking to someone about something you are having difficulty with. When you do talk about the issue, you deny that it is a problem and tell the other person it must just be them. When you feel someone has power and authority over you, you find a way of combating this by refusing to be helpful to them when you know they need help; you hold on to information that someone else needs so that they will make a mistake or have to work harder on their own to find it; or saying you will do something, knowing that you have no intention to at all. You complain about a problem that you are having and when someone gives you some insight into your part in the problem you attack or judge the other person. You feel wounded, misunderstood or victimized by the suggestion that you might play a role in your own problems. You might accuse them of being mean and insensitive or you counter by drawing their attention to something that they are struggling with and how ineffective they are being. You experience interpersonal conflict as a burden that you have to bear. You talk to others in a way that makes them feel that by raising a legitimate issue with you that they have mortally wounded you or caused you suffering. Somehow, your emotions become more important than the actual issue and the other person is forced to think about how you are feeling. You shift the focus from yourself by making the other person the reason for your behavior or the way you feel. When we are honest with ourselves, we will admit that we use these behaviors more frequently than we like to admit. However, recognizing them for what they are – your automatic self-protective behaviors – allows you to start shifting your behavior and strengthening your Self-Actualizing System. Strengthening Your Self-Actualizing System The Self-Actualizing System of the brain is strengthened by sustained learning, reflecting, experimenting and experiencing new activities and behavioral responses. Living from our Self-Actualizing System is key to becoming who we are meant to be and fulfilling our potential. The Self-Actualizing System must be strengthened before we can do any other developmental activity; it does not just develop on its own. I just have to By trying new things, facing your fears, having new experiences and by making different choices for how you think and behave, you can develop the neural pathways connecting your three brains in order to start living from your Self-Actualizing System. It contains everything you need to help you become who you are meant to be. It provides a complete roadmap for development with the steps required for developing your Self-Actualizing System. It offers all the information, tools and experiential activities needed to help you get to know yourself and the mechanics of your mind. You will build self-awareness through the practice of mindfulness and other developmental activities; learn the needs that drive your behavior in relationships; and build skills to create the types of relationships you want to have. Her interest in creating mental health, coupled with her interest in personality systems and the dynamics of human behavior, has influenced the development of the Striving Styles Personality System. Holistic Approach to Learning Driven by a vision for a holistic approach to emotional and physical health, Anne chose educational pursuits that aligned with her passion. Anne looked for training institutes that would help her integrate the cognitive, emotional and physical approaches to healing the mind and body. Anne continues to stay educated and informed about recent advances in neuroplasticity, brain development, mindfulness and social intelligence. She could see the direct application of the therapeutic tools to the corporate world, which drove her to expand her work into that realm. Anne began using the title of corporate therapist to indicate the depth with which she worked with leaders and teams developing emotional intelligence, behavioral competence and relationship skills in organizations. She has also used her unique approach to work through dysfunctional relationships, partnerships, teams and boards. Prior to starting SKE, Anne built several successful companies including Sage Developmental Resources, an organizational consulting firm focused on behavioral alignment, and the Centre for Mindful Therapies, which offered customized Mindfulness-based Stress Reduction Programs to organizations and individuals. Post new comment Please Register or Login to post new comment.

Chapter 3 : "Self-Protective Behaviors and Campus Threat Assessment" by Sarah Hoff

Consistent with prior research, results suggest women report lower feelings of safety and engage in more self-protective behaviors. Approximately one-third of the sample reported observing pre-incident behaviors, though only % reported these behaviors to campus police.

Numerous legal publications, academic commentaries, and reports from lawyer assistance programs document that hundreds of thousands of lawyers experience anxiety. This happens in their work. They experience anxiety as a result of doing their work. Lawyers experience nervousness, tension, dread, or apprehension because of their work or workplace environment. Instead, that issue should crystallize and appear more relevant, seem very timely, and assume a place as a critically important action issue, especially for lawyers, legal leaders, and their organizations. Lawyers, and other professionals, who adopt learning goals and take action to know more about anxiety generally, and also learn how anxiety influences our morally relevant behavior and judgment more particularly, stand to advance their possibilities not only for achieving greater personal health and well-being, but also to render to their clients, firms, and the courts more ethical, professional performance. A line of research studies over twenty years old has shown that feeling anxious and worrying about things, in small, manageable quantities, motivates most people to stay focused on goals and improve performance on tasks. But, when a person worries about work or becomes anxious about challenges, decisions which have ethical implications often coexist with these situations. Emotions play a big role in these decision making situations. Emotions can tip the balance and differentiate acceptable, even exceptional performance, from bad performance and even unethical behavior. Researchers have shown that emotions, including envy, anger, disgust, shame, sympathy, and empathy, often play a role in ethical decision-making. Relying on this past work, a research team recently investigated an important uncharted area of emotion in ethical decision-making – the effects of feeling anxious on moral behavior. State anxiety, a transitory and unpleasant emotion, occurs in reaction to an ill-defined stimulus. It does its job, i. These attributes serve roles in our defense system. They mobilize our resources which help us defend, escape, or avoid danger. State anxiety helps us reduce aversive situations. In some situations, our experience of state anxiety benefits us because these feelings of nervousness and apprehension have become programmed parts of our self-protective system. Anxiety and Ethical Decision Making. A number of research studies, pieced together, can account for the role of experienced anxiety and decision-making in ethically relevant situations. A four element process comes into play. Research shows that state anxiety has the following elements: Speed counts when it comes to dealing with threat. During the state anxiety process, stress hormones released in our brains help our cognitive resources respond quickly to threats. This speed, however, comes with a cost. It gets charged to ethics and decision-making. They rely on this foundation for their examination of the link between perceived threat, anxiety, and self-interested unethical behavior. The authors investigated how perceived threat and anxiety gets people to experience a motivational shift, and behave unethically. Examples of threats from past research include unprovoked aggression, feelings of animosity and rivalry. When employees experience anxiety, past research shows that an inner conflict often develops. We can behave ethically, and maintain a positive self-image. Or, we can behave unethically, and advance our self-interest. Research Studies, Results, and Discussion. This part very briefly describes the six 6 experimental studies which comprise this broad examination of the link between anxiety feelings of being nervous, anxious, worried, and apprehensive and also perceived threat and self-interested unethical behavior. Without getting into the particulars of the anxiety induction methods, e. The next two studies explored the psychological mechanism underlying unethical behaviors when experiencing anxiety. From the findings of studies 3 and 4, the authors suggest those findings show that anxiety increases threat perception, which, in turn, results in self-interested unethical behaviors. The fifth study showed that, relative to participants in the neutral condition, anxious individuals find their own unethical actions to be less problematic than similar actions of others. The sixth, and final, study considered survey data from subordinate-supervisor groups. The results from three laboratory experiments, two online studies, and an organizational study replicated findings in a number of settings, and provided the first

empirical demonstration that experienced anxiety at work has a positive behavioral link with experienced threat and unethical behavior. Research shows how that connection between anxiety and work can have very important ramifications for us on many fronts. These include personal well-being, health, and ethics and professional responsibility. The scientific literature shows the following important connections: Negative emotional experiences at work has an association with decreased performance, increased job-related tensions, and lower commitment, In the presence of job-related tension and stress, employees are more likely to engage in negative coping behaviors, Anxiety has been shown to lead to worse outcomes in negotiation, Anxiety has been shown to negatively impact performing tasks that require the use of creativity, Higher levels of the stress hormone cortisol are correlated with anxiety, Anxiety has been linked to diabetes and hypertension, Anxiety triggers feelings of threat, which in turn may increase unethical behavior The research featured in this post did not involve lawyers or their organizations. These alterations take aim at organizational, or corporate, culture, which includes legal organizations of all types, and the ones most applicable to legal culture include the following: Certain workplaces foster the type of anxiety featured in this research. The popular work about behavioral ethics, *Blind Spots* see source noted below , and referenced by the authors, describes this unfortunate and, for lawyers, professionally dangerous work environment. Uncertainty, time pressure, and isolation describe features of those anxiety-provoking workplaces. Much uncertainty shrouds many areas of legal work, especially in litigation. Time pressures abound in the legal environment. Time pressures divert cognitive resources. Isolation relates in part to control of information. They often control information flow. This applies to lawyers, too. Emotional intelligence can moderate the effect of anxiety on ethical behavior requirements according to the authors. They suggest consideration of emotional intelligence as a future direction for research. In the context of the anxiety, perceived threat, and self-protective and unethical behavior connection as described by the authors, this research reasonably can suggest to sincere observers that some people will not succumb to anxiety-driven ethical lapses. Others will experience perceived threats and their anxiety-driven defensive coping and self-preservation behaviors will surface. Translation of the research findings to the legal realm can show that some of those people will lie to clients or judges or colleagues. Others may misreport or misrepresent actual time worked. Anxiety-afflicted self-protective lawyers may even destroy or hide evidence. How will your legal organization make the practice of law less messy? Thank you very much. Anxious, threatened, and also unethical: How anxiety makes individuals feel threatened and commit unethical acts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 2 , Can Nervous Nelly negotiate? How anxiety causes negotiators to make low first offers, exit early, and earn less profit. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 1 , definition of anxiety. Lawyer and Legal Resources: A review of empirical research on attorney attributes bearing on professionalism. Readers will be guided through an eight-week program which will enable them to establish an ongoing meditation practice.

Chapter 4 : Understanding Defensive Behavior

Scholarly interest in self-protective behaviors is demonstrated in studies examining victimization; these behaviors are presumed to reduce the likelihood of experiencing crime. Protective behaviors are not taken by all citizens equally, however, so it is critical to explain these behaviors within.

Chapter 5 : Self-protective behaviors and campus threat assessment - CORE

Agricultural pesticide exposure has potential adverse health effects for farmworkers that may be reduced by pesticide protective behaviors (PPBs).