



PERSONALITY AND ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOR IN GRADUATE STUDENTS

Dr.R.Kannappan, D.Litt.

Associate Professor of Clinical Psychology, Vinayaka Missions Medical College's hospital Salem, Tamilnadu.

Abstract

The study examined the relationship personality and antisocial behavior of graduate male students. Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ), Antisocial Behavior Scale (ABS) and Socio Economic Status Scale (SESS) were administered to three hundred students of arts and science students. Correlation and t-test were used for analyzing the data of the arts and science groups. The results showed that the students had positive correlation between personality traits/dimensions such as psychoticism and extraversion, and antisocial behavior but they did not have significant correlation between personality trait of neuroticism and antisocial behavior. The groups of arts and science students also significantly differed in the personality traits of psychoticism and extraversion, and antisocial behavior. The findings showed that personality traits such as psychoticism and extraversion except neuroticism. In socio economic status all classes except middle class had significant correlation with antisocial behavior. The upper class differed significantly from upper middle, lower middle and lower, and the upper middle class differed significantly from lower & lower middle classes, but other classes did not differ significantly in antisocial behavior.

Key Words: *Personality Traits, Socio Economic Status and Antisocial Behavior.*

INTRODUCTION

Personality traits predict the ways of thinking which shows the characteristic of persistent criminals and individual differences in the psychological traits can have profound effects on a person who operates within an environment (Daniel et al, 2013). There has been increased interest in research from human resources professionals like psychologists, sociologists, business professionals and economists on the factors causing or influencing the deviant behaviors (Bennett & Robinson, 2003; Kannappan, 1992).

Eysenck's theory explains a significant role for biological factors in the development of antisocial behavior. The theory holds that three temperament traits/dimensions such as psychoticism and extraversion and neuroticism interact with environment to produce personality. Though environmental factors, especially between family members play minor part (Eysenck, 1970; Burgess, 1972), personality factors are responsible for antisocial behavior. The major pattern of behavior in human beings depends upon the main dimensions of personality (Eysenck, 1970a). The existence of marked importance personality is extraversion-introversion, neuroticism, and psychoticism. Experiment supports that neurosis and psychosis are entirely different and independent dimensions (Eysenck, 1970b).

The extravert is characterized by poor conditionability and emotional impulsivity as a result of poor socialization (Laser, 1977; Eysenck, 1964). Because of parental negligence, a child feels deprived of parental love and affection, fails to make a good adjustment in his family and acquires avoidance conditioning. Then this child tries to satisfy his needs and demands from the environment, irrespective of social acceptance. Research studies have showed that persons who exhibit antisocial behavior are extraverts (Eysenck, 1977, & 1998; Hare, 1970).

OBJECTIVES

The objectives were i) to find out the relationship between personality traits and antisocial behavior, ii) to find out the differences between personality traits and antisocial behavior of arts and science students, and iii) to find out the relationship between socio economic status and antisocial behavior of the male students.



METHOD

Design

Cross sectional survey design was used to the correlation, and difference in personality traits, socio economic status and antisocial behavior of under graduate male students.

Sample

The sample consisted of 300 arts and science male students, who scored less than 7 in Lie scores, were studying different graduate courses. Stratified random sampling was used to select students from various disciplines namely psychology, sociology, economics, physics, chemistry, botany etc. These students were requested to fill questionnaire individually. The students who scored more than 7 in Lie scores were excluded.

Measures

Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ): It consisted of ninety items and it measured three personality traits such as extraversion-introversion, neuroticism, and psychoticism. The EPQ differed from the Eysenck personality inventory. The raw score on Lie scale exceeded 7 was rejected in this study. Scoring sheet was used to measure each of the traits of extraversion (E), neuroticism (N), and psychoticism (P) and Lie (L). The total score was the sum of these points of each trait (Eysenck, & Eysenck, (1975).

Antisocial Behavior Scale (Bhaduri, 1987) comprised 43 items. These items include a broad rare of activities such as aggressive acts, lying, truancy, running away from home, quarrel with stranger, consuming alcohol, cheating class test, coming home late at night, making anonymous phone call etc. Scores 1 to 5 were given to like 1-never, 2 rarely, 3 sometimes, 4- quite frequently and 5 always. These scores were summed up for antisocial behavior score.

Modified version (Tamil Nadu house board criteria) of socio economic status scale was used to assess the socio economic status of the students (Kannappan, 2012).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Statistics: Correlation and t-test were used for analyzing the data of the arts and science groups of different socio economic statuses of the students.

Table 1 shows the coefficient of correlation between personality and antisocial behavior.

S.No	Students	Variables	N	r
1	Arts and science	Extraversion and antisocial behavior	300	0.68
2	Arts and science	Neuroticism and antisocial behavior	300	0.27
3	Arts and science	Psychoticism and antisocial behavior	300	0.84

The above table 1 showed a significant positive correlation between extraversion and antisocial behavior as well as psychoticism and antisocial behavior but there was no significant correlation between neuroticism and antisocial behavior. This indicates that the students who have high scores on extraversion and psychoticism are prone for involving in antisocial behavior such as aggressive acts, lying, truancy, quarrel with stranger, consuming alcohol, etc.

Table 2 shows mean, standard deviation, and t-value of the groups of arts and science students in personality and antisocial behavior.

S.No	Students	n	Personality	Mean	S.D	t-value
1	Arts	150	Extraversion	12.21	4.72	
2	Science	150	Extraversion	9.45	4.54	5.20*



3	Arts	150	Nueroticism	9.34	5.11	
4	Science	150	Nueroticism	9.62	5.03	0.48
5	Arts	150	Psychoticism	4.91	3.43	
6	Science	150	Psychoticism	4.04	3.57	2.21**
7	Arts	150	Antisocial behavior	70.47	12.06	
8	Science	150	Antisocial behavior	72.52	11.92	5.76*

*P>0.01; **P>0.05

Mean and standard deviation were calculated for arts and science graduates to compare the personality traits. t-test showed significant differences between the arts and science students in the personality traits of extraversion and psychoticism as well as antisocial behavior. But the groups did not differ in the trait of neuroticism. This showed that the arts students, who scored high have many friends, crave excitement, act on the spur of the moment, like changes, aggressive, unrealizable, uncontrollable feelings, impulsive, outgoing, uninhibited and social than science students. These groups of students had equal level of neuroticism in the personality. This revealed that the groups had general emotional liability; emotional responsiveness and fewer neurotics break down. The science students who scored high had high proneness towards antisocial behavior.

Table 3 shows the coefficient of correlation between socio economic status and antisocial behavior.

S.No	Students	Variables	n	r
1	Arts and science students	Upper class & antisocial behavior	62	0.30
2		Upper middle class & antisocial behavior	82	0.34
3		Middle class & antisocial behavior	96	0.22
4		Lower class & Lower middle class and antisocial behavior	60	0.72

The socio economic status of all graduate students had high positive correlations between lower middle and lower-class and antisocial behavior. Especially lower class & lower middle class had very high correlations with antisocial behavior. There were low correlations between upper and upper middle and antisocial behavior. It is inferred that middle and upper middle class did not have much proneness to antisocial behavior.

Table 4 shows mean, standard deviation and t-value of the arts and science students in socio economic status and antisocial behavior.

S.No	Class	Code	Variable	n	Mean	S.D.	t- value
1	Upper	A	ASB	62	66.70	12.60	
2	Upper middle	B (A&B)	ASB	82	67.21	11.42	0.25
3	Middle	C (A&C)	ASB	96	71.56	12.91	2.35**
4	Lower& Lower middle	D (A&D)	ASB	60	72.54	10.65	2.91*
5	Upper middle& middle	B&C	ASB	-	-	-	0.69
6	Upper middle& Lower middle	B&D	ASB	-	-	-	2.34**
7	Middle, Lower& Lower middle	C&D	ASB	-	-	-	0.67

*P>0.01; SD- standard deviation; ASB- antisocial behavior

Mean and standard deviation were calculated for arts and science graduates to compare the different socioeconomic statuses of all students with antisocial behavior. T-test showed significant differences between different socioeconomic classes of the students. The Upper class (A) differed significantly from other classes such as middle class(C) and lower& lower middle (D); Upper middle class (B) differed significantly from middle class



and lower & lower middle (D); and other combination any other two classes did not differ significantly in antisocial behavior. i.e., the students in upper and upper middle classes and middle and lower & lower middle did not differ significantly in antisocial behavior.

CONCLUSION

There is a significant positive correlation between psychoticism and extraversion traits and antisocial behavior. The personality traits such as psychoticism and extraversion except neuroticism and all classes except middle class had significant correlation with antisocial behavior in arts and science students. The arts and science students also significantly differed in psychoticism and extraversion, and antisocial behavior.

In socio economic status, the upper class differed significantly from upper middle, lower middle and lower, and the upper middle class differed significantly from lower & lower middle classes, but other classes did not differ significantly in antisocial behavior. The findings of the research are particularly useful for identifying youth who are at risk for developing serious antisocial behavior and becoming adult criminals.

REFERENCES

1. Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2003). The past, present and future of workplace deviance research. In J.Greenberg (Ed.), *Organizational behaviour. The state of the science*, (2nd ed.) (247 – 281).
2. Bhaduri, J.(1987). *Development of Antisocial Behavior Scale*, Punjab University, Ph.D dissertation.
3. Burgess, P.K. (1972). Eysenck's theory of criminality; A new approach, *British journal of criminology*, 12, 74-82.
4. Daniel, ,B., Mark, S., Gary, A., & Philip, H.(2013). Eysenck's Personality Model and Criminal Thinking Style within a Violent and Nonviolent Offender Sample: Application of Propensity Score Analysis, 34(6), 483–493.
5. Eysenck, H.J.& Eysenck,S.B.G. (1964). Crime and personality: An empirical study of the three factor theory, *British journal of criminology*, 10, 225–239.
6. Eysenck,H.J.(1970a). *The structure of human personality*, London: Methuen.
7. Eysenck,H.J.(1970b). A dimension system of psycho diagnosis tics, in A.R. Maher (ED) *new approach to personality to personality classification*, New York: Columbia University press.
8. Eysenck, S. (1970). Psychoticism as a dimension of personality. In H.Nyborg(ED) *the scientific study of human nature: tribute to Hans, J.Eysenck at eight Amsterdam*, Netherlands: Pergamon/Elsevier science inc.
9. Eysenck, H.J.& Eysenck, S.B.G.(1975). *Psychoticism: A dimension of personality*, London.
10. Eysenck, H.J. (1998). Personality and crime. In T.Millon, E. Simonsen, M.Birket-smith, & R.D. (Eds) *psychopathology: Antisocial, criminal, and violent Behavior*, New York: Guilford press.
11. Hare, R.D. (1970). *Psychopathology: Theory and Research*, New York: John wiley and sons, Inc
12. Kannappan, R. (1992). *A model of social deviance and its modification in adolescent boys*, Doctor of Letters Thesis, University of Madras.
13. Kannappan, R. (2012). *Modified version of Socioeconomic Status Scale* based on Kuppusamy, B. (2012) *Manual of Socioeconomic Status Scale*, Delhi: Manasayan.
14. Lester, D. (1977). The psychological description of delinquents: A synthesis, *Corrective social psychiatry and Journal of behavioral technology method and therapy*, 23, 33-35.