In the previous chapter, the data were presented and analyzed. It has been presented in tabular form depicting mean value and standard deviation on PEN Inventory and Socio-economic Status Scale (Rural and Urban Form). The graphic representation of the data has also been made to enable a bird’s eye view of the obtained results. It also makes the results more meaningful. In order to test the significance of mean difference, the data has been subjected to t-test. Thus, the previous section presents the results in the form of Mean value and Standard Deviations thereof on Pen Inventory and SES Scale (Rural and Urban). In
the present section, an attempt will be made to interpret and discuss the antisocial behaviour as function of Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism and Socio-Economic Status. To fulfill these objectives, the study was undertaken.

The strategy adopted by discussing the results has been made that in each case the findings have been compared with the findings of other researches in that area and then an interpretation of conversions or contradictions have been attempted. This chapter is stratified in to 5 sections.

In the first section, emphasis has been laid on the fact that antisocial behaviour of respondents is a function of multiple factors, in the light of obtained data and findings of other investigators. In the second section, the functional relationship between Psychoticism and antisocial behaviour have been interpreted with special reference to the data of the present study. In the third section of this chapter, the role of Extraversion on antisocial behaviour of respondents has been discussed. In the fourth section, the role of Neuroticism in relation to antisocial behaviour has been interpreted and discussed. Fifth section of this study, deals with the impact of Socio-economic status on the antisocial behaviour of respondents.

(I) Phenomenon of Antisocial Behaviour

Hypothesis I

The phenomenon of Antisocial Behaviour is a function of multiple factors.

A thorough review of the previous studies related to antisocial behaviour revealed that investigators have studied the phenomenon of antisocial behaviour in relation to several factors of paramount importance. These factors ranged from economic to psycho-
social variables. In the proceeding studies, a significant co-relation has been found between these factors and antisocial behaviour.

The study of antisocial, criminal and aggressive behaviours has a long and rich research history (Binder 1987). This intensive focus from research is not surprising given that these behaviours often operate at a very cost to society (Krug, Dahlberg, Mercy, Zwi & Lozano 2002, Loeber & Farrington 2001). Of importance, these behaviours have been studied from a number of different perspectives, including anthropological, evolutionary, sociological, psychological and biological perspectives, to name a few. Research from each of these disciplines provides a unique perspective for understanding the causes of antisocial behaviour.

2002; Frick et. al. 1999, Partdini, Lochman & Powell 2007), sex difference (Hipwell et. al. 2002; Moffitt & Capsi 2001; White & Piquero 2004, Frick & Dickens 2006), heritable and environmental influences (Mason & Brick 1994; Rhee & Waldman 2002), genetic behaviour (Beauchaine 2003; Vasey et. al. 2005), poor emotional regulation (Stadler et. al. 2007, Sterzer et. al. 2005), anygadala hyperactivity (Jones et. al. 2009, Marsh et. al 2008), disruption in families, school and communities (Frick et. al. 1993), substance abuse (Loeber 1982: Robbins 1966), child rearing methods (Farrington & Loeber 1999; Smith & Stern 1997), low parental involvement (Lewis et. al. 1982), child abuse and neglect (Malinosky - Rummell & Hansen 1993), etc. These investigations ascertain the influence of various psycho-social factors on antisocial behaviour of respondents. Thus, it may be argued that antisocial behaviour is a function of multiple factors, thus confirming the hypothesis I.

(II) Type of Respondents and Psychoticism

**Hypothesis - 2**

*There will be significant difference in the mean scores of Normal and Antisocial respondents on Psychoticism dimension Eysenck’s Model of Personality.*

Psychoticism is a concept, not a single thing. It is a direction of abnormality distinct from neuroticism and anxiety. Psychoticism consists of aggression, cold, ego-centric, impersonal, impulsive, antisocial, unsympathetic, creature and tough-minded behavioural characteristics (Eysenck & Eysenck 1981).

It is a serious mental disorder characterized by thinking and emotions that are so impaired that they indicate that the person experiencing them has lost contact with reality. Such individuals have false thoughts (delusions) and or see/hear thing that are not there
(hallucinations). These are related to as positive symptoms; negative symptoms like loss of motivation and social withdrawal can also occur. These experiences can be frightening and may cause people who are suffering from psychosis to hurt themselves or others.

It is diagnosed through a psychiatric evaluation. It is a symptom of mental illness rather than the name of a medical condition itself. It means experiencing things and believing them to be real when they are not: in other words, losing contact with reality. While less research has been done on Psychoticism than on Extraversion and Neuroticism, the research that has been done has indicated that Psychoticism, too, has a biological basis; increased testosterone levels.

As for the old theory of general psychoticism factors, Cattell (1965) has suggested that it is a general maladjustment of behaviour that exists when that part of unrealism due to low intelligence are partialed out. Its essence is hypothesized as an inappropriateness of emotional response to stimulate in terms of survival.

It has been specifically suggested that psychotic symptoms is not confined to mentally abnormal individual but includes so called ‘normal’ individuals, as well, just as continuum of neuroticism is not confined to neurotics but also extends to stable individuals. Though a number of studies relating E/I and N to crime has been done but the concept of Psychoticism (P) was only considered in light of criminality. It was only in the 1970’s that Eysenck and Eysenck suggested that E/I and N, P too, would be implicated in the causation of crime.

Eysenck (1968, 1969) and Cattell (1965) feel that ‘psychoticism’ or ‘schizothymic’ indicate abnormality to general public. As mental abnormality is still a stigma in the society. Eysenck has suggested to use term ‘Tough mindedness’ for psychoticism in normal
temperament. Similarly, Cattell (1965) uses schizothyme for the normal temperament of schizothyme to avoid misunderstandig. It is coldness and aloofness which more than anything else characterizes the normal sizothyme person.

Apart from E and N being related to criminality has maintained that third affective dimension of personality i.e. Psychoticism (P) is perhaps most consistently linked with crime. The work of Eysenck (1952, 1955, 1959) and in particular of SBG Eysenck (1956) and Devadasan (1964) strongly argues for a separate dimension of psychoticism on the basis of laboratory experiments. Studies of Eysenck (1968, 1969) have demonstrated the possibility of embodying this conception of P in the form of personality inventory.

The nature of this factor may be conveyed briefly by the traits characterizing it (having high loadings on this factor) (i) Solitary : not caring for other people (ii) Troublesome: not fitting in (iii) Cruel : inhuman (iv) Lack of feeling : insensitive (v) Sensation seeking, “arousal Jag” (vi) Hostile to others: aggressive (vii) Liking for odd: unusual things (viii) Disregard for danger: fool hardy (ix) Making fool of others: upsetting them.

Review of studies reported a close relationship between psychoticism and criminal behaviour (Odegard 1963; Essen-Mollor 1946; Planansky 1966; Reisly 1967; Segraves 1969, Maclean 1974; Shanmugam 1975; Nirmal 1977, Singh 1979 etc.) but relationship between psychoticism and antisocial behavioural was not directly investigated. Keeping these facts in mind the present study was designed to explore the functional relationship between level of psychoticism and ASB.

It is evident from Table 5.1 in the Chapter of Results that Antisocial respondents have scored comparatively higher mean scores (M = 8.40 ± 2.98) than Normal respondents
(M = 5.60 ± 2.59) on Psychoticism dimension of Eysenck’s PEN Inventory (See Fig. 5.1). The obtained ‘t’ - value (t = 7.68 p < .01) was also found statistically significant at respectable level of significance. Thus, the hypothesis of significant difference on Psychoticism dimension between Normal and Antisocial respondents was supported.

The result of analysis for Antisocial respondents show that Antisocial respondents possess a tendency of psychoticism resulting in the causation of antisocial behaviour. Psychoticism is polygenic in nature, which means that a large number of genes with individually small effects are inherited. The “small effect genes” are additive and the total number of genes inherited determines the degree of the P trait in the personality. An additional group of genes with large effects that are smaller in number can contribute to the manifestation of the P trait and the development of psychoses (Eysenck 1976) when they are present. Individual high on P are less responsive to social consequence and have greater difficulty than others in acquiring rule-governed social behaviour (H.I. Eysenck & S.B.G. Eysenck 1976). Thus, we can conclude that psychoticism creates an environment where antisocial behaviour and more serious crimes can take hold. The results of this personality dimension are quite in accordance with the Eysenck & Eysenck (1970) prediction relating crime to P and hypothesis framed in Chapter 3.

Eysenck & Eysenck (1981) opine that psychoticism consists of several symptoms viz. aggressive, cold, ego-centric, impersonal, withdrawal from family and friends, impulsive, anxiety, antisocial, suspiciousness, disorganized speech, unsympathetic depressive mood, creative and tough-minded, they respond less well to avoidance learning (Feldman 1976) which is an essential part of socialization process, their social method of love withdrawal might be inappropriate, they respond more strongly to positive learning
experiences concerning offending attitudes and behaviours, and, they are more exposed to learning from others and they may learn attitudes and behaviours conducive to crime and antisocial activities (Field J.G. 1960). The behavioural characteristics of antisocial respondents includes a range of negative, selfish and unacceptable activity that affect the quality of neighbourhood life.

That is why respondents possessing symptoms of psychoticism have exhibited unacceptable activity, that can blight the quality of community life, and, harmful to others, either directly or indirectly, through the violation of important, moral and social norms. They behaved contrary to the laws and customs of the society, causing annoyance and disapproval in others. Thus, we can conclude that respondent’s antisocial behaviour has a negative impact on the quality of life of individuals, families and communities because of their psychotic symptoms.

Eysenck & Eysenck (1970) suggested that in addition to E/I and N, P too would be implemented in the causation of ASB and crime. The results of the present study supported the findings of Eysenck & Eysenck (1970) and we may characterize the Antisocial respondents as odd, isolated, troublesome, lacking, human feelings for fellow human beings, aggressive and hostile to near and dear ones, we may safely conclude that such a person would feel difficulty in reducing their antagonistic conduct to normal social instincts or practices.

Another interesting finding of the present study that P is showing high positive correlations + .201, with N, SES (Rural) and SES (Urban) + .165 and + .178 respectively for Antisocial respondents. (Table 5.7). Considering the most important characteristics of High P scores, as given by Eysenck (1970) such as odd, isolated, troublesome, lacking
human feelings, aggressive and hostile to near and dear ones, we may safely conclude that such persons possess these characteristics due to their socio-economic status.

The present findings obtained on Antisocial respondents support the findings of Meadow (1914), Rudin (1916), Essen-Moller (1941), Odegard (1963) and Planansky (1966). These findings support to Eysenck & Eysenck (1970) reason for implicating P in the causation of crime, i.e. psychoticism and crime (Antisocial behaviour) have particularly close connection. Inspite of these above mentioned studies, several other studies e.g. Segraves (1969), Singh (1976), Jaspal (1977), Nirmal (1977) Eysenck et. al. (1977), Singh (1979 a), Tanuja (2008a) have also obtained the evidence that criminals tend to be more psychotic than normals.

(III) Type of respondents and Extraversion

Hypothesis - 3

There will be significant difference in the mean score of Normal and Antisocial respondents on Extraversion dimension of personality.

The PEN model is biologically based. Extraversion is based on cortical arousal. Arousal can be measured by skin conductance, brain waves, or sweating. While theoretically introverts are chronically overaroused and jittery, theoretically extraverts are chronically underaroused and bored. The theory presupposes that there is an optimal level of arousal, and that performance deteriorates as one becomes more or less aroused than this optimal level. The finding that arousal is related to performance as an inverted U-shaped curve is called the Yerkes - Dodson Law.
For at least 2500 years, some people have been described as more bold, assertive and talkative than others. For almost equally long, this set of behaviours has been thought to have a biological basis and be socially important (Wilt & Revelle 2008).

There are at least three basic characteristics of extraversion that make it important to study. First, extraversion has emerged as one of the fundamental dimensions of personality (Costa & McCrae 1992a; Digman 1990; H.J. Eysenck & Himmelweit, 1947), 1990; Second, extraversion predicts effective functioning and wellbeing across a wide variety, of domains (Ozer & Benet - Martinez 2006) from cognitive performance (Matthews 1992) and social endeavours (Eaton & Funder 2003) to social economic status (Roberts et. al. 2007). Third, predicts risk and also resilience for different forms of psychopathology (Trull & Sher 1994; Widiger 2005).

The credit is usually given to Jung (1921/1971) for originating the modern name of extraversion, the less known, but very important work of Gerard Heymanns (H.J. Eysenck 1992) had already identified extraversion more accurately as a dimension (rather than a type) along a continuum of “strong” and “weak” functioning. Standing on the shoulders of Heymanns and those who came before him, Hans Eysenck demonstrated the importance of extraversion as a fundamental dimension of personality in a series of experimental and taxometric studies in the late 1940s and early 1950s (H.J. Eysenck & Himmelweit 1947; H.J. Eysenck 1952). Hans Eysenck modernized the study of extraversion through both experimental and psychometric measures, Eysenck proposed that introverts had higher cortical excitability than extraverts, and thus would condition more efficiently (H.J. Eysenck 1967). Hans Eysenck modernized the study of extraversion through both
experimental and psychometric approaches. Eysenck argued that the major dimension of human personality have been biological basis.

According to Eysenck (1970) propersity to crime is universal but is held in check by a person’s ‘conscience’. This conscience develops through the process of socialization which occurs due to the formation of appropriate conditional response in childhood and youth, as these form less easily in extraverts, so they are more likely to commit criminal and antisocial acts than introverts. But many studies have discredited Eysenck (1964, 1970) hypothesis relating to crime with E/I (e.g. Little 1963; Jaspal 1977; Mohan and Singh 1979). Later, Eysenck modified his theory and suggested that it is the impusivity aspect of E/I rather than the sociability which is related to crime (Eysenck & Eysenck 1971a). On the basis of these studies, it was hypothesized that antisocial and normal respondents would differ significantly on Extraversion dimension as measured by the scales like PEN. A comparison of the mean scores of normal and antisocial respondents suggest that there are significant difference between these two groups.

Eysenck & Eysenck (1971) had said that criminal behaviour may be accounted for in terms of a failure to elaborate those conditioned response, which underlie what it popular parlance is frequently called ‘Conscience’. Mowrer (1950) has shown how the disciplinary activities of Barents, school teachers and the child peers may act as unconditional stimuli to produce sympathetic autonomic reaching to the undesirable a social type of behaviour which society requires to stamped out. On Eysenck’s Original theory (1964). “Extraverts, who condition poorly would therefore be predisposed towards criminal behaviour reflecting a social view points.” Gough (1948) had apply described criminals as “poorly
socialized”. But several studies by Singh (1976), Jaspal (1977), Mohan & Singh (1979) failed to find any relation between extraversion and crime.

A host of studies reveal relationship between extraversion and several other variables of psychosocial importance viz. positive effect (Emmons, Diener & Larson 1986; McGregor & Little 1998; Ryan & Deci 2001), social desirability (Lucas et. al. 2000), depression and anxiety (Widiger & Trull 1992), neuroticism (Kendler et. al. 1993; Ormel et. al. 2001), attention (Roberts et. al. 1998), subjective well-being (Deneve & Cooper 1998), life satisfaction (Hayes & Joseph 2003), subjective emotional well-being (Charles, Reynolds & Gatz 2001) etc.

In the hight of above literature, the present study was designed to highlight the impact of Extraversion on Antisocial Behaviour of respondents. Keeping these facts in mind, Eysenck's PEN Inventory was administered over Normal and Anti-social respondents. The obtained Mean and SD values were presented in Table 5.2 in Chapter of Results.

A persual of Table 5.2 makes it evident that Mean and SD values of Normal and Antisocial respondents were found 9.6 ± 2.42 and 11.2 ± 2.83 respectively (t = 4.29, p < .01). The respondents belonging to Antisocial group had slightly higher mean scores than the Normal respondents (see Fig. 5.2). The lowest extraversion score has been exhibited by respondents of Normal group, mean being the highest and the Antisocial respondents appeared to have higher extraversion characteristics. This finding contradicts those of Eysenck who did not find any significant difference between criminals and recidivist prisoners on extraversion dimension. Generally speaking within the framework of Eysenck
theory hysteries and rescidivist prisoners could be expected to be more extroverted than normals.

In support to the findings of the present and those of Eysenck and Shanmugam (1962), there are number of studies by Siegman (1962), Michael (1956), Fine (1963) Syed (1964), Warburton (1964), Pierson & Kelly (1963), Epps & Parnell (1952) and Trasler (1962) which show that criminals are markedly extroverted than the non-criminals. The possible reason why extroverts turn out to be antisocials/criminals has been advanced by Eysenck, who holds that it is the poor conditionability or the slow learning ability of the extrovert who make him run a foul of the law. To put it in another way, antisocial criminals condition poorly, and therefore, fail to acquire those adaptive conditioned response which constitute socialized behaviour. Extroverts, thus, have greater opportunities to mix with all sorts of people and as such they also can be tempted to indulge to an criminal activity more readily under social influence. Extroverts are slower than they take more risks and themselves more to social interaction.

One may infer from it that respondents belonging to Antisocial group were found more extravert because of several reasons.

Recent studies have added to our knowledge about the activation patterns that correlate with extraversion and sought to explain such patterns. It is clear that extraversion is associated with structure and function across many areas of the brain (Durbin et. al. 2005; Rothbart 1981). Eysenck (1967, 1977, 1997) found that extraversion is related to the baseline arousal level in an individual’s neocortex, which is mediated by the Ascending Reticular Activating System (ARAS). H.I. Eysenck & S.B.G. Eyesenck (1976) opine that individuals high on the E trait, exhibit under arousal in the neo cortex, which among other
things impairs the conditioning of inhibitions to control impulsive behaviour. Although, temperamental dimension of extraversion has been identified in respondents (Rothbart, Ahadi & Evans 2000), extraverts feel higher level of positive affect than intraverts (Coasta & McCrae 1980, Lucas & Baird 2004; Watson & Clark 1992, Lucas & Fujita 2000). Extraverts are happier than introverts in general (Lucas & Baird 2004; Uziel 2006). Extraverts possess some quality or characteristics that leads them to experience more happiness than introverts (Rosenberg 1998). Extroverts are closer to experiencing positive affect than introverts at baseline, require relatively less positive stimulation to feel good. According to affect-reactivity model, which states that extraverts and introverts could feel the same amount of positive affect at baseline but that extraverts react more strongly to positive stimuli than introverts. It is clear that the affect - reactivity has its roots in Reinforcement Sensitivity theory (Corr 2008; Gray 1970; 1981, 1982). Extraverts were found happier than introverts in negative, neutral and positive valance situations, because they engage in more social activities more than introverts. Extraverts were found to predict differences in categorization across various tasks. Meaning thereby they possess positive view of the world and judge neutral events more positively than introverts (Uziel 2006). Extraversion is generally associated with high motivation for social contact, power and status (Olson & Weber 2004), personal strivings (Emmons 1986), for inter dependence (King 1995).

But respondents belonging to Antisocial groups in the study, have obtained comparatively higher score on Extraversion dimension of PEN Inventory. Therefore, it would not be out of place to describe the relationships between extraversion and psychopathology (Krueger et. al 1996; Markon, Krueger & Watson 2005). Recently,
renewed interest in the relationships between normal and abnormal (antisocial) personality have led to the investigations of how extraversion relates to various forms of psychopathology (Widiger 2005).

As a general dimension of personality, extraversion most obviously has implications for personality disorders, a personality disorder is defined by the DSM - IV - R as,” an enduring pattern of inner experience and behaviour” that is “stable and of long duration, and its onset can be traced back at least to adolescence or early adulthood” (APA 2000 p. 689). In general, low extroversion is negatively correlated with presence of personality disorders, but this finding is not universal, as there are some studies implicating high extraversion in certain personality disorders (Widiger 2005). Thus, we can conclude that both low and high extraversion relate to personality disorders is reminiscent of Nettle’s suggestion that both poles of normal personality dimensions involve costs and benefits (Nettle 2006).

As for as extraversion dimension in relation to Antisocial behaviour is concerned, statistically significant difference (t = 4.29) existed between the two groups - normal and antisocial although the antisocial respondents have obtained comparatively higher mean scores than normal respondents on Extraversion dimension of Eysenck PEN Inventory. This findings corroborates those of Eysenck who obtained significant difference between the normals and recidivist prisoners on extraversion dimension. Generally speaking, within the framework of Eysenck’s theory, hysterics and recidivist prisoners could be expected to be more extroverted than normals. In support of the findings of the present investigation and those of Eysenck & Shanmugam (1962), Siegman (1962), Michael (1956), Fine (1963), Syed (1964). Warburton (1964), Pierson & Kelley (1963) Epps & Parnell (1952)
and Trasler (1962) which show that criminals are marked by extroverted than the normal (non-criminals).

The possible reason why extraverts turn out to be antisocial/criminal has been advocated by Eysenck, who holds that it is the poor conditionability or the slow learning ability that makes him run a foul of the law. To put it in another way, antisocials/criminals condition poorly and, therefore, fail to acquire those adaptive conditioned responses which constitute socialized behaviour. Extroverts, thus, have greater opportunities to mix with all sorts of people and as such they also can tempted to indulge in any antisocial and criminal activity more readily under social influence.

But generally respondents belonging to low extraversion group were found positively related to anxiety and depressive disorder (Jylla & Isometsa 2006). That is why, antisocial respondents were found comparatively more extraverted. As a result of it, their behavioural characteristics was found positively related to conduct disorder, affective disorders and substance use disorders. Their outward behaviour which is harmful to others either directly or indirectly, through the violation of important of moral or social norms.

**IV) Type of Respondents and Neuroticism**

**Hypothesis - 4**

*There will be significant difference in the mean scores of normals and antisocial respondents on Neuroticism dimension of personality.*

The second aspect of Eysenck’s personality system (dimension) which has been related to crime is that of Neuroticism though it was relegated to secondary importance by Eysenck, yet other investigators have stressed the importance of third dimension in relation to criminality. According to Burgess (1972), Eysenck’s dimensions of Neuroticism (N) is
perhaps more important and relevant to theoretical model of criminal personality proposed by him.

The term neuroses encompasses a variety of very common mental health disorders. Neurosis is actually an outdated diagnosis that is no longer used medically. The disorders that were once classified as a neurosis are now more accurately categorized as neurotic disorders. Disorders that are considered a neurosis or neurotic disorder include a post-traumatic neurotic stress disorder, somatization disorders, anxiety disorders, panic disorder, phobias, disassociation disorder, obsessive-compulsive disorder and adjustment disorder.

Neuroticism is based on activation thresholds in the sympathetic nervous system or visceral brain. This is the part of the brain that is responsible for the fight-or-flight response in the face of danger. Activation can be measured by heart rate, blood pressure, cold hands, sweating, and muscular tension (especially in the forehead). Neurotic people, who have a low activation threshold, experience negative affect (fight-or-flight) in the face of very minor stressors - i.e., they are easily upset. Emotionally stable people, who have a high activation threshold, experience negative affect only in the face of very major stressors - i.e., they are calm under pressure.

It is interesting to note that measures of activation are not highly correlated. That is, people differ in which responses are influenced by stress - some sweat, others get headaches. This is called individual response specificity. It is also interesting to note that stressors differ in the responses they elicit. This is called stimulus response specificity.

Disorders that are considered a neurosis or neurotic disorder include a variety of emotional and physical symptoms or manifestations. People with disorders that are
considered neurotic disorders do not have delusion or hallucination, which are symptoms of psychotic disorders. However, disorders that are considered a neurotic disorder can negatively affect a person’s ability to function effectively in the activities of daily living, such as going to work and school, caring for family, and taking care of basic needs. Thus, we may conclude that neurotic disorders vary between the specific disorders and from person to person. Excessive anxiety emotional distress, self awareness of psychological troubling, occupational disturbance, disturbance of social life and fear are common symptoms of neurotic disorder.

Neuroticism is a fundamental personality trait. It can be defined as an enduring tendency to experience negative emotional states. Neuroticism is the state of being neurotic. Individual who score high on neuroticism are more likely than the average to experience such feelings as anxiety, anger, guilt and clinical depression. People with neuroticism tend to have more depressed moods, they suffer from feelings of guilt, envy, anger and anxiety more frequently and more severly than other individuals. Those who score highly on neuroticism tend to be particularly sensitive to environmental stress, and respond poorly to it, they respond more poorly to environmental stress and are more likely to interpret ordinary situations as threatening, and miror frustrations as hopelessly difficult. They are self-conscious and shy, and they may have trouble controlling urges and displaying gratification. It is related to emotional intelligence, which involves emotional regulation, motivation, and interpersonal skills, we have seen that Antisocial respondents were significantly high on emotionality or neuroticism, why so? One possible explanation for antisocial behaviour has been suggested in terms of visceral brain activation (VBA).
It would not be out of place to explain ASB/Criminality in terms of Freudian concept of the Super-ego. According to psychoanalysts, a powerful Super-ego is as harmful as a weak. According to psychoanalysts, a powerful Super-ego is needed for balanced personality development. The underlying factor in the imbalance of personality of the Antisocial or criminal respondents is that they have either developed weak Super-ego or strong Super-ego. Individuals who fail to develop an adequate Super-ego become antisocial or criminal because a deficiency of control over their instinctual drives. Such respondents indulge in antisocial activity because of the excessive control of Super-ego which results in starvation of the Id’s urges and overpowering demands for satisfaction that were initially driven or not provided legitimate outlets. Such antisocial and criminal respondents are labelled as neurotic or compulsive.

With a view to comparing the mean scores of Normal and Antisocial respondents on Neuroticism dimension, the mean scores were analyzed using ‘t’ test of significance. Results are presented in Table - 5.3. It is obvious from Table 5.3 that Antisocial respondents has obtained higher mean value (M = 9.2 ± 2.89) on Neuroticism dimension of PEN Inventory than Normal respondents (M = 7.5 ± 2.39). Obtained mean difference was found statistically significant (t = 4.52, p <.01) (See Fig. 5.3).

To establish a relation between Neuroticism and Antisocial behaviour, it would be preferable to look for the common causal factors of both these variables.

H.I. Eysenck & S.B.G. Eysenck (1976) suggested that Neuroticism is based on differences in the autonomic nervous system, specifically, differences in visceral brain activation (VBA), which are dependent upon the hypothalamus and limbic system (Eysenck 1967). The basal level of responsiveness in the VBA system can produce low to
high levels of activation that affect gland activity, heart rate, respiratory level and perspiration level. High levels of VBA lead to emotionally over reactive and unstable behaviour.

There are certain aspects, which together constitute the phenomenon of Neuroticism as a whole. Thus, a person scoring high on Neuroticism dimension is likely to possess these negative personality characteristics. Persons scoring high on Neuroticism dimension may exhibit a variety of psychiatric conditions in which emotional distress or unconscious conflict is expressed through various psychiatric physiological and mental disturbances which may include physical symptoms.

The definitive symptom is anxiety. Neurotic tendencies are common and may manifest themselves as depression, acute or chronic anxiety, obsessive-compulsive tendencies, phobias and even personality disorders. Neurotic respondents may be characterized as a person having, “poor ability to adopt to one’s environment, an inability to change one’s life patterns, and the inability to develop a richer complex, and more satisfying personality.” Their behaviour causes harrassment, alarm or distress to other individual. They create an environment where more serious crime can take hold. Their behaviour includes negative, selfish and unacceptable activity that affect the quality of neighbourhood life.

Neuroticism as correlates of personality have aroused considerable interest among psychologists working on antisocial/criminal personality. The varities of anti-social personalities make it rather difficult for investigators to arrive at a definite conclusion as to which of the behaviour patterns classed as extroversion - introversion types was most like to be associated with antisocial and criminal respondents.
Eysenck (1958) has found the recidivist prisoners to be significantly more neurotic than normals. Eysenck (1959) has shown that all neurotic, psychosomatic and recidivist groups were more neurotic than normal sample. The neuroticism is associated with criminal behaviour get further support from the work of several others (Syed 1964; Warburton 1964) have also confirmed the presence of more neuroticism in delinquents and criminals.

Antisocials and delinquents usually come from slum areas, which as a matter of fact lack all facilities of congenial and healthy social learning. It is an accepted fact that new responses may be readily learned or the existing ones get modified through the observations of verbal and behavioural expressions of the social modes. Individual tends to conform to the behavioural characteristics of the models to which they are exposed. In slums, the models are inadequate or faulty. Therefore, the opportunities for adopting socio-culturally approved behaviour is lacking. On the contrary people are exposed to deviant and expressive models. As such, respondents belonging to low SES turn out to be antisocial/criminal.

Eysenck (1964) reports two studies by Syed (1964) and Warburton (1969) which support the contention that animals/criminals are not only high on neuroticism or emotionality but extraverted as well. That is why, antisocial respondents have obtained comparatively higher scores on Neuroticism scale than normal students.

The present findings on Antisocial respondents supports most of the earlier evidence that accumulated in favour of antisocial respondents having high N scores - Bartholow (1957), Field (1960), Fitch (1962) Tanuja (2008a) Mill (1971), Eysenck & Eysenck (1971 a) Burgess (1972) : all supported Eysenck’s theory regarding Neuroticism (N) and
criminality. From the studies referred to above, there appears to be simple evidence in favour of the contention that among the criminals there would be a high proportion of people who are strong on neuroticism. Thus, neuroticism can be reasonably regarded as one of the factors related to antisocial behaviour and criminal activity.

The Antisocial respondents have exhibited comparatively higher symptoms of neuroticism meaning thereby that Antisocial respondents were found possessing more neurotic symptoms than normal respondents because neurotic respondents suffer from feeling of guilt, envy, anger, anxiety, sadness or depression, irritability, mental confusion, low sense of self-worth more frequently and more severely, they have several cognitive problems such as unpleasant or disturbing thoughts, repetetion of thoughts and obsession, habitual fantasizing, negativity and cynicism etc. they possess more depressive moods, they tend to be particularly sensitive to environmental stress and respond poorly to it, they may perceive every day, run-of-the mill situations as menacing and major trivial frustrations are problematic and may lead to despair, they may be typically self-conscious and shy, they possess a tendency to internalize phobias and other neuroses such as panic disorders, aggression, negativity and depression. Most importantly, Neurotic respondents possess the characteristics of dependency, aggressiveness, perfectionism, schizoid, isolation, socio-culturally in-appropriate behaviours etc. That is why, Neurotic respondents were found possessing more symptoms of Neuroticism than Normal respondents.

According to Eysenck (1964), psychopaths were assumed to have high scores on N with consequently autonomic liability. Empirical studies have mostly confirms this assumption. The marked disregard for future consequences of acts which is observed in psychopaths, has been conceptualized as learning deficits, this implies the failure of cues
associated with punishment to arouse sufficient anxiety, to motivate avoidance behaviour. It has been asserted by Eysenck (1970) that highly liable autonomic system interferes with efficient learning of avoidance cues. On these groups and those relating Neuroticism (N) to socialization, we had framed a hypothesis that Normals and Antisocial respondents would differ significantly. The present study confirming the hypothesis.

The result of analysis of antisocial respondents show that has loading on N (PEN). This feeling has also been reported by Mohan & Singh (1979). Normal respondent has been termed as “emotional liability, physiologically related to quicker arousal of sympathetic autonomic nervous system (Mohan & Singh 1979a). As such there should be a negative relationship between N and SES (rural).

It shows that the persons high on N have also a tendency to score higher on personality. It also reveals that the higher the scores on N the lesser well be the SES (Rural). The reason why the antisocial respondents have a different factor structure might be due to the fact that they all already scoring very high on N and P than the normal respondents.

According to Jaspal (1977), “it would be reasonable to conclude that those studies which could not confirm Eysenck’s theory regarding E/I had methodological errors in that the tools used for personality measurement were not clearly differentiated into relative proportions.

(V) Type of Respondents and Lie Scores

Hypothesis - 5

Respondents belonging to Normal and Antisocial groups will differ significantly on Lie Scale.
Lie scales were originally introduced into personality measures in order to detect the “faking good” of scores on the other scales (O’Donovan 1969). The theory is that lie scales are constructed from items listing issues and behaviours which are either socially desirable but infrequently practiced or frequently practiced but socially undesirable. According to Eysenck & Eysenck (1976), the lie scale included in the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire permits lying to be diagnosed when a set of rarely performed acts are endorsed by the respondent as being habitually done and when frequently performed non-desirable acts are denied by the respondent.

While not part of the temperament based personality theory, a fourth variable that is a product of Eysenck’s measurement of personality plays a tertiary role is the Lie (L) Scale on the Eysenck’s Personality Questionnaire (Eysenck & Eysenck 1975, 1993). The current interpretation of the Lie Scale is that L is a measure of conformity to social expectations rather than a dissimulation measure. The shift in focus is due to the low L Scale scores that have been routinely obtained in samples with high P Scores e.g. Gabrys et. al. (1998). A low L score is often interpreted to indicate that an individual is indifferent to social expectations and is not well socialized.

It has been increasintly recognised, however that lie scales are open to multiple interpretations. As well as measuring the tendency to “fake good” there is evidence that lie scales should be interpreted as measuring a personality dimension in their own right (McCrae & Costa 1983; Furnhan 1968).

According to some commentators this dimension is best characterized as social acquiescence or conformity (Finlayson 1972; Powell 1977; Massey 1980; Hagen 1981; Birenbaum & Montag 1989; Granlease & Barrett 1991). According to other commentators
this dimension is best characterized as lack of self-insight (Decken 1959; Crookes & Buckley 1976; Kirton 1977; Francis et. al. 1983; Brown & Kodadek 1987).

In an attempt to solve the problem, Eysenck & Eysenck of (1967) for the first time added the L scale (L = Lie Scale) in the advanced version that they developed for the questionnaire, in the EPI version. Eysenck & Eysenck (1976) suggested that the L Scale includes something that depends on the stable personality structure. Anyway, in the opinion of Eysenck & Eysenck, high L scores always have to function as a warning signal, so it is imperative not to dismiss them.

Keeping these facts in mind, Normal and Antisocial respondents were compared on L Scale. It is evident from Table 5.4 in the Chapter of Results that Normal respondents was significantly higher (M = 6.60 ± 1.89) on L Scale than Antisocial respondents (M = 4.70 ± 1.90) (See Fig 5.4) and the obtained mean difference was found statistically significant at respectable level of significance (t = 7.03, p < .01). Obtained results support the findings of Eysenck & Eysenck (1977) Eysenck, Rust and Eysenck 1978). These investigators have obtained that the Antisocial respondents was significantly higher than the Normal respondents on P and N Scales and significantly lower on L Scale. Eysenck & Eysenck (1977, 1997) hypothesized that the elevated P, E, N and lower L temperament profile placed on individual at the greatest risk for the development of serious antisocial behaviour.

It is known from the work of Eysenck & Eysenck (1971a) with a lie scale that prisoners tend to have higher lie scores. But the present finding bear that the Normal respondents as a whole have much higher Lie Scores than Antisocial respondents. Lie scale has also emerged as one single unitary factor for both Normal and Antisocial respondents.
The result of the present study contradicts the findings of Singh (1976), Jaspal (1977), Mohan & Singh (1979) who reported criminals to be scoring high lie. Jaspal (1977) argued that this tendency may be due to two reasons. Firstly, antisocial respondents may be reluctant to admit something frowned upon by society or they may have general tendency to tell lies even when they are not called for a sort of compulsive lying pattern may be a feature of their personality. On the former case they may be overconscious of giving socially ascribe response because of the fact that society has ostracized them by putting them in prisons and secondly it may be manifestation of their psychotic tendency (Mohan & Singh 1979).

(VI) Socio-Economic Status and Antisocial Behaviour -

Hypothesis - 6

Respondents belonging to different socio-economic-status will differ significantly on various dimensions of Eysenck's Model of Personality.

Socio-economic - Status (SES) is an economic and sociological combined total measure of a persons’s work experience and of individual’s or family’s economic and social position in relation to others, based on income, education and occupation. When analyzing family’s SES, the household income, earner’s education and occupation are examined, as well as combined income, versus with an individual, when their own attributes are assessed.
Socio-economic status may be defined as the social position occupied by the individual in his/her society. Socio-economic status is a composite measure of person’s income, occupation, education and other aspects of life. This system allows for much more complex divisions of society and thus allows one to distinguish between a offices and a peon and between a person earning thousands rupees a month and the one who is hand to mouth.

SES is typically broken into three categories, high SES, middle SES and low SES to describe the three areas, a family or an individual may fall into, when placing a family or individual into one of these categories, any or all of the three variables (income, education and occupation) can be assessed.

The role of socio-economic background is of great importance information shaping, and development of human personality. Different behaviour patterns are manifested by individual from different socio-economic backgrounds. The hierarchy in the distribution of the priviledges of life in different groups determine a person’s unique status and position in the society. No two individuals have the same world. Their group, standing and status have afoot different socio-cultural environments. Their occupation, cultural background and income denote their socio-economic status. Low socio-economic status lacks skilled work and income whereas high socio-economic status, through its goods and priviledges, prepares an avenue which leads the individual leads to wholesome adjustment. It would not be out of place to mention that economic depression and dissatisfaction tend to bring the man near maladjustment. Respondents belonging to low-income group suffer severly from the sense of emotional insecurity, self devaluation and isolation. Their attitudes, interests, habits and values are changed by such feelings. On the other hand, high socio-
economic status provides a more healthy and stimulating environment for child development.

Socio-economic factors have also shown more pronounced differences in the area of mental disorder. Many neurotic and psychotic disorders are found associated with socio-economic conditions. Coleman (1976) states that there are greater differences in the relative incidence and nature of neuroses, and psychoses by social class. Low socio-economic status not only shows a higher incidence of mental disorder but also contains forces likely to maintain the undesirable conditions. Certain disorders like schizophrenia are more pronounced in the individuals of lower socio-economic levels. An economic depression tends to produce unfortunate psychological effects on the mind and behaviour of the individual. Consequently, low SES negatively affect the quality of life of individual, families and communities. They perform wide range of behaviour and incidents that can described as sub-criminal level in civilities and disorders.

Since being born and brought up in a particular type of socio-economic level conditions the growth which itself depends upon the abundance or scarcity of necessary facilities, parental education and proper perspectives on the part of the adults, therefore the material and psychological facilities or handicaps to which the individuals are exposed will directly decide the satisfaction or deprivation of related needs. Deprivation of these needs will create an irreparable psychological crippling effect upon the adjustive behaviour of the individual. “Economic factors may partially account for the relatively poor social standing of lower class children. Poverty may mean poor health, poor clothes and little participation in social activity. Any of these factors may reduce the child’s opportunities for establishing stable peer relationship, and may thus, handicap him in learning good
social techniques. Moreover, the lower child’s awareness of his lack of social know-how may produce feelings of inferiority and inadequacy, and hence withdrawal from social interactions (Mussen, Conger & Kagan 1963). Thus, increased economic status carries with it a sense of personal security which may bring better socio-emotional adjustment. As a result of this security, stress is reduced and the individual is less to tension and conflicts.

Since the socio-economic status has great significance on personality development, growth and adjustment, therefore a study of its influence on antisocial behaviour seem to be very desirable, more particularly the research project is devoted to the problem of antisocial behaviour.

In some studies, it has been reported that socio-economic status of the family influences acquisition of basic skills (Masih & Sharma 1974), level of aspiration (Epstein & McForland 1977), adjustment neuroticism (Srivastava & Singh 2009), self-esteem, depression (Kessler et. al. 1995; Dohrenwend et. al. 1992; Weigman et. al. 1991).

The data presented in Table 5.5 and 5.6 of the previous chapter depicted Mean, SD and ‘t’ values obtained on both forms of Socio-economic Status Scale by Normal and Antisocial respondents. The mean value obtained by Antisocial respondents on Urban (M = 90.40 ± 8.59) and Rural (M = 213.80 ± 9.76) forms on SES Scale was found comparatively low than the Normal respondents (Urban - M = 112.50 ± 6.34 and Rural M = 232.50 ± 7.46). The mean differences are significant as the obtained t values (Urban - t = 20.65, p < .01, Rural - t = 16.40, p < .01) are significant at .01 level of significance. Meaning thereby that magnitude of differences between means of Urban and Rural Normal and Antisocial respondents on Socio-economic Status Scale are more pronounced. The hypotheses of this study in the context of SES is confirmed. The same impression is
provided by graphic representation of data (Fig 5.5 and 5.6). Thus, a close inspection of differences in mean values of Urban and Rural Normal and Antisocial respondents on SES Scales, and graphic representation thereof, it is very obvious that Antisocial respondents scored lower than the Normal respondents.

The obtained ‘t’ values between Normal and Antisocial respondents belonging to Urban and Rural cultures on SES Scale, were found statistically significant at respectable level of significance. It may be taken as an index of the impact of SES on antisocial behaviour of respondents. These finding must have linkage with the socio-economic setting of the area from which the sample was drawn. Since the sample consisted of normal and antisocial respondents belonging to different SES, have been subjected for investigation, it seems reasonable to conjecture that cultural way of life and the prevailing socio-economic conditions of the respondents belonging to different SESs have played a definite role in the emergence of observed relationships. It exhibits beyond doubt that respondents belonging to antisocial group visualized poverty as being near and hand, they show greater awareness of the quantitative aspects, they were more conscious than others of the personal and social disorganizaiton brought about by poverty, they cannot deal their problems of everyday life, these characteristics of respondents belonging to comparatively low status may generate aggression and delinquent acts (Barrington, Morrison, Liau, Gibbs 2001; Lun 2004) and they exhibit behaviours antagonistic to normal social instincts, affecting the freedom or rights of others individuals.