Antisocial behaviour has been with the mankind from the time immemorial. It is a persistent evil. Crime has been presenting multifaceted problems to the various governments and is a heavy burden upon the society. Statistics of crime in India reveal an upward trend in its incidence. It is not uncommon even in some materially advanced countries like U.S.A. and U.K. Naturally, the date is increasingly concerned with the problem of crime. The task of control and elimination, however, is intricate and arduous.
It is obvious that economic and social progress of any country largely depends upon the massess constituting the society. The moral, social and material disorder caused by crime/antisocial behaviour is considerable. Both the offender and his victim are affected. Therefore, it is of prime importance that a solution to this menacing problem is sought. An effective solution is possible only if the problem is understood properly. One sure way to reduce the crime/antisocial behaviour rate is to understand the criminal/antisocial as well as the causes which enter into its.

Crime (Antisocial behaviour - hereafter ASB is endemic throughout the world. The consequences of crime/ASB in human suffering and anguish cannot be measured in terms of sufficiently strong to reflect their poignancy. The severity of this problem in our country can hardly be a matter of controversy. It not only costs millions of rupees every year but represents, also, an even greater loss in terms of human happiness and human welfare. Crime/ASB, then, is a problem of the whole society not simply the problem of one home or one person.

Antisocial behaviors are disruptive acts characterized by covert and overt hostility and intentional aggression toward others. Antisocial behaviours exist along a severity continuum and include repeated violations of social rules, defiance of authority and of the rights of others, deceitfulness, theft, and reckless disregard for self and others. Antisocial behaviour can be identified in children as young as three or four years of age. If unchecked these coercive behaviour patterns will persist and escalate in severity over time, becoming a chronic behavioral disorder.

Although ASB affects everyone, few people are fully aware of its implications. Its far reaching consequences may be viewed from two aspects: the criminal and his victim:
Meaning thereby, the problem of ASB can be regarded both from the standpoint of the individual and that of society.

The antisocials can be viewed as an individual with his own inner dynamics and interrelationships. Psychologically speaking, he can be looked upon as a sick person and the causes of his antisocial behaviour and tendencies may be found in the person.

In the modern age, there has been a wide spread interest in ASB (Crime). It has been stimulated not merely by events, but by the press, the cinema, radio, the theatre, and the detective stories. The world is passing through critical times and experiencing changes almost of indiscernible nature. The alarming increase of ASB in every society and country since the war and its continuance in what has been called “affluent society” has sadly shaken the hopes so confidently founded on the assumption that improved educational and social conditions that would retard the incidence of ASB. The goodman is as unsafe as he ever was. Quite a large part of national revenue is spent on police, law courts, prisons and their maintenance, but all these has not succeeded in abolishing antisocial behaviour and crime. Punishment meted out by the state to antisocials/criminals has had little effect. ASB/Crime remains the most intractable problem that faces a modern government, and vast expenditure on the welfare state and a higher standard of living have not brought us any nearer to the solution.

ASB/Crime is an indication of social maladjustment which is more prevalent in periods and regions of rapid changes. Many of the countries of the world are undergoing a rapid change. Civilization is heading fast towards industrialization and automation. New heights of exploitation of the natural energies and resources are being touched. Worldwide industrialization and urbanization exhibit the same features of unwholesome congestion,
loss of privacy, ASB/Crime, delinquency, rising cost of living, population migrating to
cities in search of job and better life facility of communication, breaking of the joint family
system, and, the like everywhere including even the ecological patterns of distributions of
the criminals and delinquents and their antisocial behaviour.

ASB is a universal phenomenon. Its etiology is extremely complex and the
manifestations are varied according to time, place and the individual. It also varies with
historical periods, modes of life, economic conditions and social attitudes. Social customs
and conventions vary from country to country and ASB is to be judged against their specific
backgrounds.

The growing complexities of life and living create increasing number of problems,
which demand the application of the highest capabilities and resource to solve them. In a
society, as that of ours, marked with intense competition, conflicts, disappointments,
frustration and insecurity, Crime/ASB is inevitable. Individuals are impelled to ASB by
feelings which have their origins in frustrations and disappointments. So long as
people are frustrated, maladjustments are bound to occur and “general criminal behaviour” is
defective adjustment. Antisocials are non-conformists. They show utter disregard for
socially approved ways in the attainment of their goals. Lack of respect for social and moral
codes, is a symptom of maladjustment and indicative of conflicts.

A key question in study of Antisocials is the study of their needs or motivation,
because motives are the main springs of behaviour. But motivating causes are not always
easy to find out. Though some ASBs are found to be motivated by single desires, the
motivating conditions are complex in most cases. Unsatisfied tension of the individuals
leads to frustration. If the individual has a low frustration tolerance, has a strong demand but weak resistance he breaks up into a antisocial, criminal behaviour.

In recent years, psychology has done much to uncover hitherto unsuspected springs of human action. It has shown beyond doubt that physical and psychic disturbances are often the cause of ASB/Crime through unsuspected by the Anti-social himself. Unconscious forces mould their emotional reactions and attitudes beyond the awareness of the offenders. The ASB and criminal conduct must be considered as symptomatic of profound maladjustment and as a means of escape from stress. Therefore, emphasis exclusively on the removal of the antisocial symptoms will not do. ASB is not the causal satisfaction of some wanderlust but fulfils some basic urges, however, warped and malformed they may be. It is the way of life which distinguishes Antisocials/Criminal from all from all others, which has been acquired, learned, accepted as his own and used in interpersonal interactions. Consequently, psychologists have been struggling to understand ASB as a product of human behaviour and are naturally interested in the personality traits which characterize Antisocials/criminals in the belief that certain traits must differentiate the Antisocials from the Normals.

Antisocial behaviour may be overt, involving aggressive actions against siblings, peers, parents, teachers, or other adults, such as verbal abuse, bullying and hitting; or covert, involving aggressive actions against property, such as theft, vandalism, and fire-setting. Covert antisocial behaviours in early childhood may include noncompliance, sneaking, lying, or secretly destroying another’s property. Antisocial behaviours also include drug and alcohol abuse and high-risk activities involving self and others.
Genetic factors are thought to contribute substantially to the development of antisocial behaviors. Genetic factors, including abnormalities in the structure of the prefrontal cortex of the brain, may play a role in an inherited predisposition to antisocial behaviors.

Neurobiological risks include maternal drug use during pregnancy, birth complications, low birth weight, prenatal brain damage, traumatic head injury, and chronic illness.

High-risk factors in the family setting include the following:

* parental history of antisocial behaviors
* parental alcohol and drug abuse
* chaotic and unstable home life
* absence of good parenting skills
* use of coercive and corporal punishment
* parental disruption due to divorce, death, or other separation
* parental psychiatric disorders, especially maternal depression
* economic distress due to poverty and unemployment

Heavy exposure to media violence through television, movies, Internet sites, video games, and even cartoons has long been associated with an increase in the likelihood that a child will become desensitized to violence and behave in aggressive and antisocial ways. However, research relating the use of violent video games with antisocial behaviour is inconsistent and varies in design and quality, with findings of both increased and decreased aggression after exposure to violent video games.
Companions and peers are influential in the development of antisocial behaviors. Some studies of boys with antisocial behaviors have found that companions are mutually reinforcing with their talk of rule breaking in ways that predict later delinquency and substance abuse.

Antisocial behaviour develops and is shaped in the context of coercive social interactions within the family, community, and educational environment. It is also influenced by the child’s temperament and irritability, cognitive ability, the level of involvement with deviant peers, exposure to violence, and deficit of cooperative problem-solving skills. Antisocial behavior is frequently accompanied by other behavioral and developmental problems such as hyperactivity, depression, learning disabilities, and impulsivity.

Multiple risk factors for development and persistence of antisocial behaviors include genetic, neurobiological, and environmental stressors beginning at the prenatal stage and often continuing throughout the childhood years.

**Difference between Antisocial Behaviour and Crime**

Antisocial behaviour are actions which undermine social cohesion. Antisocial behaviour is “Causing harrasment alarm or distress”. This doesn’t necessarily break the law. They include things such a vandalism, begging, and theft, but Antisocial behaviour is unacceptable behaviour in public places and crime is something done to someone or for gain.

Antisocial behaviour is simple yet annoying things e.g. neighbours playing music too loud, chaws gratifiying fighting while drunk, etc. Crime is something the law forbides, anti-social behaviour is something immoral but not necessarily illegal. Being antisocial just
means that individual avoid contact with society. Crime is an offence against the state and thus punishable by the state. So things such as theft, murder, rape etc. are crimes. Antisocial behaviour has many causes and reasons to easily explained by a bad note on a group of people.

Crime includes antisocial behaviour but antisocial behaviour doesn’t necessarily to be crime if it does little harm to society. Crime is a criminal act that breaks the law such as causing damage to property, theft, assult; Antisocial behaviour can be anything which breaches criminal or civil law, it upsets certain sections of society who have to bring legal action to deal with it, so it could even be wider than crime. Crime is committed for gain but anti-social behaviour is committed for entertainment.

**Antisocial Behaviour**

Before exploring people’s views and experiences, it is important first to consider what ASB means. The term antisocial behaviour has grown in its use and meaning over time and has been constructed as a significant social problem. The meaning of this term has also changed over time, moving from a moral and political category defining overtly political acts and ideas that were seen to be in opposition to those of the existing social order, to include (and increasingly focused upon the petty nuisance behaviour of individuals and particularly that of children and young people. This change in the meaning of the term ‘antisocial’ suggests a change in the outlook of society, an elevation is significance of personal interactions and an increasing problematisation of the behaviour of children. This problematisation is reflected in the amount of news coverage and research being carried out on the subject of the ASB of young people. The changing meanings and
preoccupation with ‘antisocial behaviour’ is reflected in social science research-especially those connected to psychological studies of behaviour.

In general, behaviour was regarded as being antisocial when it impacted on the freedom or rights of other individuals, if it was disrespectful and if it infringed a societal rule of behaviour. Some people also felt that other factors come into play, such as intimidation and whether the behaviour was deliberate. Although it became clear that not all ASB was intimidating and sometimes was not deliberate.

Antisocial behaviour doesn’t just make life unpleasant. It holds back the regeneration of disadvantaged areas and creates an environment where more serious crime can take hold.

It was largely agreed that young people are antisocial (particularly those in gangs-but that ASB is not exclusively carried out by young people. Adults across the board were felt to be antisocial to different extents. Some adults in the focus groups even felt sorry for ‘the young’ as they are blamed for a lot of things.

The defining feature that makes behaviour antisocial is its cumulative impact on individuals or groups (Millie et. al., 2007); thus, behaviour that is annoying or offensive may become antisocial, if this is repeated, especially if specifically targeted. In simple terms, ASB can be regarded as straddling both ‘sub-criminal’ and minor criminal behaviour-but excluding serious criminal activity. This is despite many ASB-targeted sanctions, especially Antisocial Behaviour Orders (ASBOs), also being used against very serious criminal behaviour indeed.

There is a wide acceptance that ASB may be explained in terms of social processes. Research has been done to identify risk factors in offenders, considering personal
characteristics as well as socio-economic circumstances (Farrington, 2005). On the other hand, risk factors have been identified for perceiving ASB (Upson, 2006). Results suggest factors like deprivation, substance misuses, and anti-social familiar backgrounds are significant for ASB.

**Antisocial behaviour ...**

* Is caused by people of all ages.
* Has a negative impact on the quality of life of individuals, families and communities.
* Damages the environment, especially disadvantaged areas.
* Is regularly identified as a top priority for Neighbourhood Policing teams to tackle.

The term antisocial, as well as having the meaning ‘opposed to sociality’ - which has not changed over time - also has another meaning. ‘Antisocial’ - ‘Opposed to the principles on which society is constituted’. (Oxford English Dictionary 1885). There was also a sociological meaning added to the definition of the word in 1933. ‘Antisocial’ - ‘pertaining to a class of person or actions devoid of or antagonistic to normal social instincts or practices’. In the New Oxford English Dictionary (1989) the definition of antisocial has changed to, ‘Contrary to the laws and customs of society; causing annoyance and disapproval in others: children’s antisocial behaviour’.

Looking at the first use of the term antisocial (excluding the use of the words as simply ‘opposed to sociality’) we find this attributed to James Mackintosh in 1802, who wrote about, ‘A collection of all the rebellious, antisocial blasphemous... books ... published during ... the Revolution’.
Here the word antisocial is used with ‘rebellious’ and ‘blasphemous’ to describe those involved with the French Revolution - Republicans.

In 1844 in ‘Dublin Revolution. Mar. 34 - the following is written. ‘The dark, malignant, atrocious, and utterly anti-social character, which the Republican Party in its contest with the new government has exhibited.’

In examining the changes in the dictionary definition of the word antisocial and the various ways it has been used and classified over time, there are a few interesting points to note. The first use of the term in 1802 was highly political and referred to other people and their political and moral standpoint that was perceived to be a threat to society and its social and religious/moral norms. The sociological definition added in the 1930’s is similar to the original use as being ‘opposed to the principles on which society is constituted’, it is still largely a term that gives reference to society and its values. The modern definition while retaining this aspect of the definition has a number of variations. Firstly it adds, ‘causing annoyance and disapproval in others’, secondly it specifically gives the example of the antisocial behaviour of children and finally it points the reader in the direction, not of a sociological definition, but a reference to a word related to Psychiatry - sociopathic.

The changing definition of the word antisocial at one level simply tells us how a word is used differently. However the changes also suggests changes societies outlook, concerns and pre-occupations.

That children are now used as significant to the term antisocial gives us a sense of the concern about the behaviour of young people. There is also, especially in comparing the original uses of the term to today’s uses, a de-politicisation or demoralisation of the term. Comparing the two extremes, whereas revolutionaries who were challenging the
political and moral norms of society were first seen to be antisocial, today it is the misbehaviour of children that is so defined. In this respect the term is now less about ‘social’ norms and values and very little to do with politics and morals but much more to do with the annoyance caused by the individual behaviour of one person to another. The term therefore has less of a social and more of an individual meaning, while also, adding a new focus upon the feelings of those suffering from the antisocial act i.e. the causing of annoyance and disapproval in others.

The definition of antisocial as, ‘Contrary to the laws and customs of society; causing annoyance and disapproval in others: children’s antisocial behaviour’, does not mean that there are not two meanings presented here for the word antisocial, but rather the semicolon links the original meaning of contrary to the laws and customs of society with the acts that cause disapproval in others. This is then directly linked to the example of children. In other words, the word antisocial is equating the mischievous behaviour of children with a threat, challenge or opposition to the laws and customs of society. There is thus a certain significance being given to those who are deemed to act in an antisocial manner i.e. in a manner against society.

Also, the development of the term in this way implies a certain loss of social morals and political gravitas, i.e. that a challenge to societies norms can come from a misbehaving child rather than, for example, and atheist republican, raises questions about the depth or lack of depth in the existing norms and values of modern society.

Equally, the focus of the word antisocial being upon unpleasant individual interactions, suggests that societies norms and values are less about Politics and Morals (with a big P and M) and more about the defence of the individual from annoying behaviour
by others. While the first use of the word antisocial was predicated upon the assertion of a certain political and moral will in opposition to antisocial republicans, the second is related to protecting the individual from the disruptive will of others. This can be seen as a process of politicising and moralising the interpersonal relationships between people.

Finally, the act of being antisocial has gone from being a conscious act by adults - with certain political and moral beliefs - to the relatively unconscious act of misbehaving children.

Antisocial Behaviour includes a variety of behaviour covering a whole complex of unacceptable activity that can blight the quality of community life.

Antisocial behaviour includes a range of negative, selfish and unacceptable activity that affects the quality of neighbourhood life. Some of the activities need to be tackled by the police, while others are the responsibility of the local council. Antisocial Behaviour is generally defined as behaviour that causes or is likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress to another individual. Anti-social behaviour is behaviour, which causes alarm, harassment or distress to the community. Incidents of antisocial behaviour can include:

* Abusive verbal behaviour
* Arson
* Assault
* Begging
* Behaviour which is abusive to other individuals
* Boom-box cars/vehicles (noisy car stereos)
* Bullies and Bullying
* Children and Young People who are bullied in public places
* Criminal Behaviour
* Criminal Damage
* Damage to property
* Distressing behaviour
* Domestic violence
* Drug and alcohol misuse/abuse
* Handling stolen property
* Harassment/Harassing passers - by or local residents
* Homophobic Behaviour
* Illegal use of fireworks
* Intimidating gangs of people (including young people)
* Joy riders
* Kerb crawling and prostitution
* Neighbour Intimidation
* Noise Pollution
* Nuisance Animals
* Other Damage
* Overgrown, unkempt gardens
* Parking illegally & abandoned vehicles
* Racist Behaviour/Racial Harassment
* Rubbish and dumping of litter
* Running a business from home
* Stalking
* Threatening Behaviour
* Threats made in person or via the telephone
* Throwing any kind of ‘missile’
* Underage or illegal sales
* Use of inappropriate places for sport/activities
* Vandalism, Graffiti
* Youths and young people who cause problems

The spectrum of ASB

It was agreed that there is a spectrum of ASB that looks like this:

It was felt that the spectrum differs slightly from person to person and with experience. It also depends on whether the act was personal or not, such as stealing a bag of crisps from a supermarket compared to stealing from a person’s home—the latter being much worse. It was also agreed that people on drugs were seen as a ‘special case’ as they
were not in control of their actions. Therefore, the expression of what peoples saw as being antisocial was subjective to some extent and depends on the following:

* Whether it is a personal experience;
* Whether it is a personal circumstance;
* Where the behaviour was observed;
* Who is observing the behaviour (victims’s perspective vs. perpetrators perspective).

**When is it acceptable to be antisocial ?**

ASB was felt to be more acceptable in these cases :

* For one-off celebrations;
* At sports events (swearing, littering);
* At protests;
* When it doesn’t affect other people;
* During the day (loud music).

The behaviour of a person’s own peers was felt to be much more acceptable than the behaviour of other people’s peers.

In general, ASB is an act which negatively impacts on another person. These acts can range from mildly annoying to criminal. How these acts are defined and interpreted depends on the perspective of the observer. ASB is felt to have gotten worse, partly because of media portrayal and partly because of changes in society more broadly.

**Why are people antisocial ?**

The consensus was that people are antisocial for the following reasons:

* Lack of parental control;
* Disregard for the law;
* Situations getting exacerbated by the police;
* Peer pressure;
* Lack of discipline;
* Boredom;
* Lack of respect for other people;
* Drink or drugs;
* Children of single parents;
* Selfishness;
* Poverty;
* Broad societal change.

**Appearance of ASB**

Respondents were asked to visualise an areas, near to where they live, which they would regard as being vulnerable to acts of ASB and to desirable what they saw. These were the common signifiers of ASB that people mentioned; listed in no particular order:

* Litter;
* Vandalised bus shelters;
* Neglected gardens;
* Gangs of teenagers;
* Smashed windows;
* Needles;
* Graffiti;
* Speeding cars;
* Boarded up houses;
* Smashed phone box;
* Boarded up shops;
* Broken walls/fences;
* Poor lighting;
* Abandoned cars;
* General neglect.

**Types of Antisocial Behaviour**

Different types of antisocial behaviour can be categorized into three groups - authority defying behaviours overt and covert anti-social acts. Less serious anti-social behaviour in childhood tend to be characterized as defiance, or defying authority figures. Covert antisocial behaviours, such as stealing, typically occurs in later childhood, whereas the most severe overt antisocial acts, such as violent behaviours, do not usually emerge until adolescence.

Sampson & Lamb (1995) categorized antisocial behaviour into three categories.

1. **Street Scene** - begging; antisocial drinking; street prostitution and kerb-crawling; street drugs market.

   An antisocial street scene, with begging, street drinking, a street sex market or groups of people hanging around can make people feel unsafe. Litter, fly-posting, graffiti and other criminal damage also degrade the street environment and are major factors in determining people’s quality of life, perception of personal safety and attitude towards public services.
2. **Nuisance Neighbours** - intimidation and harassment; noise rowdy and nuisance behaviour; hoax calls; animal related problems; vehicle related nuisance. Nuisance neighbours are the persistent antisocial minority who impact directly on whole communities. They can live in any tenure of housing, live next door or live nearby. They are in essence people or families who show a selfish inability or unwillingness or recognise when their behaviour is often to others and refuse to take responsibility for it. They show a lack of regard for the community and a disrespect for other people’s quality of life and enjoyment of the local area. This form of anti-social behaviour affects people’s feelings of community safety, can result in a heightened fear of crime and a lack of confidence in public services and ultimately may impact upon community empowerment.

3. **Environmental Crime** - criminal damage/vandalism; graffiti and fly-posting; fly-tipping; litter and waste; nuisance vehicles; drugs paraphernalia; fireworks misuses. Environmental antisocial behaviour includes littering, nuisance vehicles, graffiti, drug related paraphernalia, fly posting, dog fouling, fly-tipping, dumped business wastes, vandalism, abandoned shopping trolleys and noise nuisance. Its presence encourages a spiral of decline, which can undermine community cohesion and the efforts of public agencies. When graffiti, fly-tipping and litter are allowed to take over an area, other forms of anti-social behaviour seem more normal and are more likely to be tolerated too. Crime and the fear of crime undermine local investment in regeneration, education and jobs.

**Adult Antisocial Behaviour**

We can define antisocial behaviour as a cluster of related behaviours including disobedievement, aggression, temperatanturns, lying, stealing, and violence. Youth who become involved in criminal behaviours at young ages (i.e. late childhood or early
adolescence) appear to be at an especially high risk for continuing such behaviours during adulthood (Gerodrean, Little & Goggin 1996; Loeb, Stouthamer - Loeb & Green 1991, Moffitt 1993; Peterson, Capaldi & Bank 1991). These same youth are also at high risk for other problems such as academic difficulties, substance abuse and early sexual behaviour, each of which may have serious long term consequence (Dryfoos, 1990; Hawkins 1995, Howell 1995). Accordingly, during young adulthood, individuals who displayed more serious antisocial behaviours in childhood tend to have greater difficulties than their peers in work; tend to abuse substances, and tend to have problems in interpersonal relationships such as marriage or parenting (Caspi, Elder & Herener 1990. Ferrington 1991, Magnusson 1992; Quinton & Rutter 1988l, Rubbins 1993; Ronka & Pulkkinen 1995).

Adult antisocial behaviour may be characterized by activities that are illegal, immoral or both, antisocial behaviour usually begins in childhood and often persists throughout life. DSM - IV - TR includes the following statement about adult anti-social behaviour.

“The category can be used when the focus of clinical attention is adult antisocial behaviour that is not due to mental disorder (e.g. conduct disorder, Antisocial Personality Disorder, or an Impulse-Control Disorder). Examples include the behaviour of some professional thieves, racketeers or deals in illegal substances.”

**Epidemiology**

Depending on the criteria and sampling, estimates of the prevalence of adult antisocial behaviour range from 5 to 15 percent of the population. Within prison populations, investigating report prevalence figures between 20 to 80 percent. Men account for more adult antisocial behaviour than do women.
Etiology

Antisocial behaviour in adulthood are characteristic of a variety of persons, ranging from those with no demonstrable psychopathology to those who are severely impaired and have psychotic disorders and retardation among other conditions. Only in absence of mental disorders can patient be characterized as displaying adult antisocial behaviour. Adult antisocial behaviour may be influenced by genetic - 60% in monogygotic and 30% in dizygotic twins, biological relatives prenatal and perinatal periods etc. and social factors - neighbourhood with low SES, family training and negative parental attitudes toward aggressive behaviour, Adult antisocial behaviour is associated with the use and abuse of alcohol and other substances and with the easy availability of handguns.

Diagnosis and Clinical features -

The diagnosis of adult antisocial behaviour is one of exclusion. Persons with adult antisocial behaviour have difficulties in work, marriage, and money matters and conflicts with various authorities. The symptoms of adult antisocial behaviour are work problems, marital problems, financial dependence, arrests, alcohol abuse, school problems, impulsiveness, sexual behaviour, wild adolescence, vagrancy belligerence, social isolation, military record, lack of guilt, somatic complaints, use of aliases, pathological lying, doing abuse and suicide attempts.

Antisocial Personality Disorder

Antisocial personality disorder (ASPD) is described by the American Psychiatric Association’s Diagnostic and Statistical Manual, fourth edition (DSM-IV-TR), as an Axis II personality disorder characterized by” ..... a pervasive pattern of disregard for, and violation of, the rights of others that begins in childhood or early adolescence and continues
They have “an”, impoverished sense moral sense or conscience” and may have a, “history of crime, legal problems, impulsive or aggressive behaviour”. The antisocial personality disorder falls under the dramatic/erratic cluster of personality disorder.

The essential feature of antisocial personality disorder is a pervasive pattern of disregard for, and violation of, the rights of others that begins in childhood or early adolescence and continues into adulthood. This pattern has also been referred to as psychopathy, sociopathy, or dyssocial personality disorder. Because deceit or manipulation are central features of Antisocial Personality Disorder.

Antisocial personality disorder is an inability to conform to the social norms that ordinarily govern many aspects of a persons adolescent and adult behaviour. Although characterized by continual anti-social or criminal acts, the disorder is not synonymous with criminality.

**Epidemiology**

The prevalence of this disorder is 3% in men and 1% in women. It is most common in poor urban areas and among mobile residents in these areas. In prison populatoin, the prevalence of anti-social personality disorder may be high as 75%.

**Clinical Features**

Patients with antisocial personality disorder can often seem to be normal and even charming and ingratiating, lying, truancy, running away from the home, thefts, fights, substance abuse and illegal activities, are typical experiences that patients report as beginning in childhood. Patients with antisocial personality disorder exhibit no anxiety or depression. These patients often impress opposite sex-clinicians with colourful, seductive
aspects of their personalities, but same sex-clinicians may regard them as manipulative and demanding. Their own explanations of their anti-social behaviour make it seem mindless, but their mental content reveals the complete absence of delusuing and other signs of irrational thinking.

**DSM - IV - TR Diagnostic Criteria for Antisocial Personality Disorder -**

A. *There is a pervasive pattern of disregard for and violation of the rights of others occurring since age 15 years, as indicated by three (or more) of the following.*
   1. *Failure to conform to social norms with respect to lawful behaviours as indicated by repeatedly performing acts that are grounds for arrest.*
   2. *deceitfulness, as indicated by repeated lying use of aliases, or conning others for personal profit or pleasure.*
   3. *impulsivity or failure to plan ahead.*
   4. *irritability and aggressiveness, as indicated by repeated physical fights or assaults.*
   5. *reckless disregard for safety of self or others.*
   6. *consistent irresponsibility, as indicated by repeated failure to sustain consistent work behaviour or honour financial obligations.*
   7. *lack of remorse, as indicated by being indifferent to or rationalizing having hurt, mistreated or stolen from another.*

B. *The individual is at least age 18 years*

C. *There is evidence of Conduct Disorder with onset before age 15 years*

D. *The occurrence of antisocial behaviour is not exclusively during the course of schizophrenia or a Manic Episode.*

**Antisocial Behaviour - Dimension or Category (ies) ?**
Current debate about categorial vs. dimensional approach to personality disorders conflicts juxtapose medical and psychological models of psychopathology. Although there is an increasing number of empirical, studies supporting the dimensional approach (Clark, 1999), some have argued that the two competing approaches should not be treated as conflicting theoretical paradigms, but rather as balancing aspects of psychology of individual differences (Loranger, 1999; Smederevac et al., 2005). Meehl (1999) criticized inflexible dimensional approach, stating that this sort of dogmatism originated from refusal to accept typologies that were formulated before the advance of multivariate quantitative revolution in psychology, and also from contemporary methodological domination of factor analysis and factor analysis-derived statistical procedures. The clash between the categorial and dimensional approach is best illustrated by difficulties encountered while operationalizing psychopathy, a traditional psychological construct.

Current characterizations of psychopathy have for the most part steemed from Cleckley’s description of “psychopathic personality” as defined by his 16 main criteria. Cleckley’s criteria mostly referred to personality traits and typical behaviours such as impulsivity, impatience, insincerity, irresponsibility, inability to love, lack of guilt and shame, poor affectivity, lack of anxiety, etc. (Cleckley, 1976).

These criteria formed a starting point for the Hare’s psychopathy Checklist (PCL), the best known and the most widely used clinical questionnaire for assessment of psychopathy. Hare’s list consists of original Cleckley’s criteria, but also the criteria that were included following Hare’s own research of the topic (Hare, 1970; Harpur et al., 1989). The list was revised in 1991 (Psychopathy Checklist - Revised, PCL - R; Hare, 2003). Factorial structure of PCL - R’s 18 items is depicted in Table 1.
Contempoary classification systems of mental disorders use different terminology for people with pronounced tendency for disrespect of socially established norms of conducts. DSM - IV (APA, 1994) uses the term Antisocial Personality Disorder (APD), while ICD - 10 (WHO, 1992) uses the term Dissocial Personality Disorder (DPD). However, the difference among APD, DPD and Hare’s psychopathy are not only terminological. DSM - IV defines APD as a pervasive pattern of disregard for, and violation of, the rights of others that begins in childhood and is diagnosed in early adolescence. APD is indicated by presence of at least three of the following characteristics: failures to confirm to social norms, deceitfulness, impulsivity, irritability, reckless disregard for safety self and others, consistent irresponsibility and lack of remorse. Each of these characteristics is behaviorally operationalize. For instance, deceitfulness is indicated by repeated lying, use of aliases, or conning others for personal profit or pleasure (Barlow & Durand, 1995).

Direct comparison of APD with Cleckley-hare’s criteria shows that only one third of DSM-IV criteria correspond to interpersonal and affective factors. That is, most of DSM IV criteria are closely related to manifestations of socially deviant behaviour. In specific only one APD symptom closely relates to Hare’s affective dimensions. Thus, many affective features of psychopathy (shallow affect, unconcern for the feelings of others and lack of guilt, remorse and empathy) are indeed omitted from DSM - IV classification (Ogloff, 2006).

ICD - 10’s Dissocial Personality Disorder (DPD) is more in line with Cleckely-Hare’s concept of psychopathy. Defining criteria of DPD are : unconcern for the feelings of others, irresponsibility and disregard of social norms, incapacity to maintain enduring
relationships, persistent irritability, very low frustration tolerance, blaming others and offering rationalizations for bringing him/her into conflict (WHO, 1992).

Thus, DPD is more closely related to traditional view of psychopathy. Nevertheless, none of the criteria from interpersonal relationships - the first of four Cleckley and Hare (Figure 1); DPD places its emphasis on affective but not on intrpersonal characteristics of the disorder. The discrepancy becomes even more obvious when one compare APD and DPD with Cleckely - Hare’s characteristics of socially deviant behaviour (Figure 1). ICD - 10’s definition of DPD consists of only 20% of life style characteristics and behavioural antisocial items.

![Figure 1. Relationship among classification attributes of Psychopathy, APD and DPD](image)

Such state of affairs led to conclusion that psychopathy is a pattern of personality characteristics which is normally distributed in the population, while APD is a distinct category, an independent entity.

**Antisocial Behaviour : Causes**

Antisocial behaviours represent a widespread and expensive social problem. Recent research has convincingly shown that there is a strong interaction between genetic inheritance and environment for development of personality and behaviour.

It appears to be common knowledge that childhood maltreatment often causes psychiatric problems (e.g. depression or anxiety) or behavioural problems (e.g. aggression
or antisocial behaviour) later in life. The risk for such a development is, however, different between individuals and can to a large extent be explained by genetic factors.

**MAOs: Key molecules for personality and behaviour**

Monoamine oxidases (MAOs) are two enzymes (MAO-A and MAO-B) which inactivate the so-called monoamine transmitter substance serotonin, noradrenalin and dopamine. The brain systems which utilise those transmitters are of great importance for the fine-tuning of personality traits, as well as state-dependent features such as mood, appetite, attention, etc. MAOs are present in almost all cells in the body, however, naturally, it is the activities of MAOs in the brain that are of major interest in relation to personality and behaviour.

In some non-clinical series of individuals the association with antisocial behaviour, however, becomes significant only if the interaction with the environment is considered, particularly in girls/females. Personality is, naturally, a result of the influence of a large number of genes, all of which result in the formation of their respective proteins, e.g. enzymes such as the MAOs. (*Buckholtz and Meyer-Lindenberg 2008; Nilsson et. al. 2006*).

**Intelligence and school adjustment**

Limited intelligence and poor school achievement show themselves as important predictors of antisocial behaviour. Several longitudinal studies present result where low verbal intelligence, low academic performance, lack of problem-solving skills and low social skills correlated with the development of violent behaviours (*Eron & Huesmann, 1993; Moffitt, 1993*). Similarly, better development of cognitive skills, especially verbal
ones, acts as a factor which decreases the probability of developing anti-social behaviours
(Lahey, 1999).

**Socio-cognitive skills**

One of the primary characteristics of persons with antisocial behaviour is that they differ in how they process social information which reaches them. There really are not many studies on conflict resolution styles used by aggressors, although research with aggressive students provides useful information on this matter. Dodge (1986) studied information processing and behaviours in a scenario with work groups and ambiguous, provocative situations. Students identified as non-aggressive students by their teachers were compared to those identified as aggressive students through use of questions about videos that describe such ambiguous, provocative situations.

**Family environment and child-raising style**

There are several functional variables related to the family context which can be triggers of antisocial behaviour, since they directly affect the child’s self-regulation and reactivity (Farrington, 2005; Patterson & Yoerger, 2002; Silver, Measelle, Armstrong & Essex, 2005; Timmerman & Emmelkamp, 2005):

* Family destructuring: death of one parent, single-parent homes, parental separation, changes of residence, etc.
* Conflicts between parents and domestic violence.
* Modeling of violence within the home.
* Child-raising styles: coercive, punitive and negligent, lack of affection from parents, maternal hostility, inconsistent discipline, lack of supervision, etc.
* Child abuse.
Negative child-raising styles (authoritarian, coercive, punitive) on one hand, or inconsistent control and low parental supervision on the other hand, negatively affect the child’s behaviour. Data exist which support the affirmation that parents of aggressive children show coercive parental styles that have a negative effect on the child’s development. In this line, evidence exists which shows that the use of corporal punishment plays a central role in the development of antisocial behaviours (Lahey & colls., 1999), since punishment is more frequent, more inconsistent and poorly reasoned.

**The media**

ASB of a greater or lesser nature is present in the media to such an extent that it is presented to us as a normal, immediate, frequent aspect of daily life. Children take in the impact of these images directly, while the responsibility is left to parents and educators to help them discern the media message and above all to be critical with the information being transmitted. The message of the media, especially television, toward our children and toward the general population, forces us to feel that it provides a seemingly global and objective interpretation of reality in the eyes of the viewer. (APA 1993)

Antisocial acts, defined as acts that seek to hurt or wound another, appear approximately 8 to 12 times per hour of television for general viewing, and some 20 times per hour in children’s programming (Sege & Dietz, 1994). Children and adolescents are frequently exposed to intense levels of televised violence whether in movies, music channels, videogames, mobile telephones, newspapers, Internet, etc., and it is reasonable to ask whether the frequent, continued exposure somehow affects the children. Some studies which specifically address this topic have shown that exposure to violent acts is strongly associated with the risk of suffering or being involved in aggressive, sometimes
violent behaviors (APA, 1993; Centerwall, 1992; Derksen & Strasburger, 1996; Gerbner & Signorielli, 1990; Huesmann, 1986). Similarly, several effects have been determined.

School

The general educational system itself, and the school in particular, can be the source of antisocial behaviour in students being educated. To begin, the school has a strong hierarchical structure and internal organization which can provoke the appearance of conflicts and tensions among the members of the educational community. Fernandez (1998) indicates the most significant components which may be risk factors.

Socio-cultural context and peer groups

The socio-cultural context in which the individual lives influences his or her violent and antisocial behaviour. Thus, it is not unusual to observe persons with delinquent behaviours who belong to depressed social and cultural contexts characterized by: rundown urban environment, neighborhood upheaval, high levels of unemployment, low police surveillance, lack of recreational facilities, existence of gangs or organized groups for drug distribution, prostitution, etc. Furthermore, we cannot ignore financial factors such as low income, precarious employment, etc.

Parenting Style

Antisocial behaviour is a major problem in childhood and beyond. More severe, persistent forms are linked to future adult crime, drug and alcohol misuse, unemployment, poor physical health and mental disorders (Cohen, 1998; Moffit et. al., 2002, Odgers, et. al., 2007).

Previous research has suggested some of the parenting behaviours that can improve or exacerbate children’s behaviour problems. Studies have reported a significant
relationship between high levels of parental warmth and lower levels of externalising behaviour problems in children (Garber, Robinson, & Valentiner, 1997). Research also suggests that a lack of involvement, as well as poor monitoring and supervision of children’s activities, strongly predicts antisocial behaviour (Loeber & Stouthamer-Loeber 1986). Parents of children with antisocial behaviour are likely to be less positive, more permissive and inconsistent, and use more violent and critical discipline (Reid, Webster - Stratton & Baydar 2004).

**Socio-economic Status**

Low socio-economic status has been linked to a higher likelihood of ASB (Egamin Ford, Greenmfield, & Crum, 1996; Straus & Gelles, 1986; Whipple & Webster - Stratton, 1991). SES may serve as a contextual factor that may affect other parental characteristics such as psychopathology early childbearing, and poor discipline, rather than as a mediating factor in the intergenerational transmission of abuse. Low SES may increase the likelihood of parent antisocial behaviour or depression. Antisocial behaviour or depression may then lower one’s SES because these characteristics interfere with employment or consistent job performance.

**Development of Super-ego**

From the point of view of inner control of action, concept of super-ego is important. If the super - ego is properly formed and organized, it maintains a check on the strivings of the Id. Individuals who fail to develop an adequate super-ego may become antisocial because of a deficiency or excessive control over their instinctual drives. In the antisocials and neurotics, development of an adequate super-ego does not take place.
Emotion and Motives

To a considerable extent, emotions and motives decide the actions of men and women and thus they direct the criminal and non-criminal mind alike. Investigators have shown that emotional conflict within the offenders themselves was responsible for specific offenses. Antisocial acts that had been regarded as fortuitous or caused by bad environment proved to be reactions to emotional stresses or to the effect of repressed instinctive urges. The criminal act has, for the individual, a certain quality that highlights the emotional tensions and stresses of which the act is resultant.

Eysenck’s PEN Model: Its Contribution to Personality Psychology

In the search for a model of individual differences in personality, many theorists have suggested criteria for a good model. Among the criteria suggested are evidence of “temporal stability and cross-observer validity” (Costa & McCrae, 1992a, p. 653), universality, testability, replicability, and practicality (Eysenck, 1991; Gray, 1981). In particular, Eysenck (1990) distinctively suggests that an adequate model of personality must have two interlocking aspects: descriptive or taxonomic, and causal or biological. From this perspective, Eysenck (1991) further claims that the PEN model constitutes a paradigm in personality research. In the course of the research, some theorists (e.g., Gray, 1981; Revelle, Humphreys, Simon, & Gilliland, 1980; Zinbarg & Revelle, 1989) have attempted to modify Eysenck’s original theory to better account for their empirical data.

Eysenck ignored theories based on nurture to focus on nature, developing a theory of personality based on three distinct categories of temperament which he referred to as PEN.
Nevertheless, the PEN model deserves a good evaluation for its contribution to the development of personality psychology. Distinctively, the PEN model strongly advocates the scientific process for evaluating theories with experimental evidence.

**Hierarchical Taxonomy**

Personality can be studied from either temparemental or cognitive aspects, or both (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1985). Eysenck (1991), however, focuses on the temperament aspect of personality in his PEN model.

Descriptively, individual differences in personality or temperament are analyzed in terms of traits, which can be defined as theoretical constructs based on “covariation of a number of behavioral acts” (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1985, p. 12). However, Eysenck (1991) further supposes that traits themselves intercorrelated and make up higher - order factors or superfactors, which Eysenck calls “types”.

As a result, the PEN model proposes a hierarchical taxonomy of personality containing four levels (Eysenck, 1990). At the very bottom level of the hierarchy are behaviors such as talking with a friend on a single occasion. At the second level are habits such as talking with friends on multiple occasions, which are comprised of recurring behaviors. The third level of the hierarchy is that of traits or factors such as sociability, which are comprised of intercorrelated sets of habits. At the top of the hierarchy are superfactors or dimensions of personality such as extraversion, which are intercorrelated sets of traits or factors. Eysenck suggests three such superfactors: extraversion (E), neuroticism (N), and psychoticism (P). These three superfactors or dimensions of personality are orthogonal to each other, which means that they do not correlate with each other (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1985).
Each superfactor in the PEN model is comprised of many different factors, habits, and behaviors, and thus reliability of measurement is increased.

**Three Dimensions of Personality**

In this respect, Eysenck strongly advocates that there are only three major dimensions or superfactors in the description of personality: extraversion - introversion; emotional stability versus instability, or neuroticism; and psychoticism versus impulse control (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1985). In the PEN model, these dimensions or superfactors are based on constitutional, genetic, or inborn factors, which are to be discovered in the physiological, neurological, and biochemical structure of the individual” (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1985, pp. 42-43).

(Eysenck, (1992 a); Eysenck & Eysenck, (1985) opine that each person does not necessarily have either 100 percent or zero percent of extraversion, neuroticism, or psychoticism. An individual may show some degree of these superfactors on the continuum. A person may have high extraversion, moderate neuroticism, and low psychoticism.

On this continuum, a person with high extraversion is sociable, popular, optimistic, and rather unreliable, whereas a person with low extraversion is quiet, introspective, reserved, and reliable. A person with high neuroticism is anxious, worried, moody, and unstable, whereas a person with low neuroticism is calm, even-tempered, carefree, and emotionally stable. A person with high psychoticism is troublesome, uncooperative, hostile, and socially withdrawl, whereas a person with low psychoticism is altruistic, socialized, empathic, and conventional (Eysenck & Eysenck 1985).

**Psychoticism**
Eysenck (1990) also provides a biological explanation of psychoticism in terms of gonadal hormones such as testosterone and enzymes such as monoamine oxidase (MAO). Although there has not been a lot of research done on psychoticism in comparison with extraversion and neuroticism, the current research shows that people who show a psychotic episode have increased testosterone levels and low MAQ levels.

For Eysenck this component was not just about psychotic episodes (a break from reality), but also aggression. He associated high levels of psychoticism with increased levels of testosterone. Characteristics include egocentric, unsympathetic, manipulative, tough minded and aggressive behaviour.

Impulsivity and aggressiveness were negatively correlated with MAO, which plays a role in the degration of the monoamines no repinephrine, dopamine, and serotonin (Eysenck, 1990, 1992a). Eysenck (1992a) reports that “low platelet monamine oxydase (MAO) has been found in psychotic patients, and also in their relatives and inpatients who have recovered, suggesting that low MAO activity may be a marker for ‘vulnerability’ (p. 774).

The following table describes the traits that are associated with the three dimensions in Eysenck’s model of personality:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychoticism</th>
<th>Extraversion</th>
<th>Neuroticism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>Sociable</td>
<td>Anxious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td>Irresponsible</td>
<td>Depressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>Guilt Feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsympathetic</td>
<td>Lack of reflection</td>
<td>Low self-esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulative</td>
<td>Sensation-seeking</td>
<td>Tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement-oriented</td>
<td>Impulsive</td>
<td>Moody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogmatic</td>
<td>Risk-taking</td>
<td>Hypochondriac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td>Lack of autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tough-minded</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Obsessive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Extraversion**

According to the arousal theory, Eysenck (1990) provides a biological explanation of extraversion in terms of cortical arousal via the ascending reticular activating system (ARAS). Activity in the ARAS stimulates the cerebral cortex, which, in turn, leads to higher cortical arousal. Cortical arousal can be measured by skin conductance, brain waves, or sweating (Eysenck, 1990). Because of the different levels of ARAS activity, introverts are characterized by higher levels of activity than extraverts and so are chronically more cortically aroused than extraverts” (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1985, p. 197, emphasis added).

Based on the Yerkes-Dodson law, the arousal theory of the PEN model assumes that “some intermediate level of arousal is optimal for performance” (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1985, p. 199). The Yerkes-Dodson law suggests that arousal and performance have an inverted - U relationship. That is, task performance is impaired when motivation is either very low or very high, and performance is maximized at some intermediate level of “optimal” motivation. Green (1984) also supports Eysenck’s arousal theory.

Geen concludes that “the best performance for both introverts and extraverts ... occurred when stimulation was given at the appropriate optimal level”, and that “the data pertaining to the measure of performance are consistent with the Yerkes - Dodson Law” (p. 1311).
Neuroticism and Visceral Brain (Activation)

Eysenck (1990) also explains neuroticism in terms of activation thresholds in the sympathetic nervous system or visceral brain. The visceral brain is also referred to as the limbic system, which consists of the hippocampus, amygdala, septum, and hypothalamus, and regulates such emotional states as sex, fear, and aggression. It is responsible for the fight-or-flight response in the face of danger. Heart rate, blood pressure, skin conductance, sweating, brteathing rate, and muscular tension in the forehead can measure activation levels of the visceral brain (Eysenck, 1990; Eysenck & Eysenck, 1985). Neurotic individuals have greater activation levels and lower thresholds within the visceral brain. They are easily upset in the face of very minor stresses. However, emotionally stable people are calm under such stresses because they have lesser activation levels and higher thresholds (Eysenck, 1990).

Empirically, Ormel and Wohlfarth (1991) report that neuroticism indeed has strong influence on psychological distress. They find that “tempermental dispositions seem more powerful than environmental factors” in predicting psychological distress, and that neuroticism is a “powerful determinant” of high psychological distress (p. 753).

Table 1.2 Theorists Comparative Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extraversion</th>
<th>Neuroticism</th>
<th>Psychoticism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson</td>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motivation/Need for</td>
<td>Motivation/Fear of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Success</td>
<td>Failure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barratt</td>
<td>Action Orientation</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloninger</td>
<td>Behavioural Activation/Novelty Seeking</td>
<td>Behavioural Inhibition/Harm Avoidance</td>
<td>Behavioural Maintenance/Reward Dependence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson</td>
<td>Approach/(Non-) Depression</td>
<td>Avoidance/Inhibition/Depression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depue</td>
<td>Behavioural Facilitation/Mania/Positive Emotionally</td>
<td>Behavioural Inhibition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollard and Millar</td>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eysenck</td>
<td>Extraversion/Arousal/Positive Affect</td>
<td>Neuroticism/Activation/Negative Affect</td>
<td>Psychoticism/Anger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fowles</td>
<td>Behavioural Activation/Impulsivity/Positive Affect</td>
<td>Behavioural Inhibition/Aversion</td>
<td>Non-Specific Arousal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>Behavioural Approach/Impulsivity/Positive Affect</td>
<td>Behavioural Inhibition/Anxiety/Negative Affect</td>
<td>Fight vs. Flight/Aggression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kagan</td>
<td>Behavioural Inhibition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newman</td>
<td>Impulsivity/Positive Affect</td>
<td>Anxiety/Negative Affect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revelle</td>
<td>Approach/Instigation of Behaviour</td>
<td>Avoidance/Inhibition of Behaviour</td>
<td>Aggression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simonov</td>
<td>“Strong” Type (Choleric) vs. “Weak” Type (Melancholic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tellegen</td>
<td>Positive Affectivity/Positive Affect</td>
<td>Negative Affectivity/Negative Affect</td>
<td>Constraint Avoidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thayer</td>
<td>Energetic Arousal</td>
<td>Tense Arousal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watson and Clark</td>
<td>Positive Affectivity</td>
<td>Negative Affectivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuckerman</td>
<td>Extraversion/Positive Affect</td>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>Psychoticism/Impulsivity/Sensation/Seeking/Agression-Anger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>