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ABSTRACT
The study investigated personality traits as a determinant of antisocial behaviour of students in universities in South East, Nigeria. This study was prompted by the University students engaging in some antisocial activities such as breach of school rules and regulations, destruction of public and school property, fighting and assaults, examination malpractice, among others. The correlational survey research design was adopted for the study and the study area was South East Nigeria with a population of 60,734 third year students in both federal and state universities. A sample of 1,250 third year students was employed through a multistage sampling procedure. Data collected were analysed using correlational analysis and t-test to answer the research questions and test the null hypothesis. The findings of the study revealed that personality traits have a significant influence on students’ antisocial behaviour in both federal and state universities with an implication that if these behaviour are not monitored, it may lead to more social vices like cultism, armed robbery among others. Thus, it was recommended, among others that students should be encouraged through seminars to maintain good personality traits in order not to engage in antisocial activities in school.
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INTRODUCTION
In modern times, there are varieties of behaviour exhibited by adolescents in Nigeria which make right thinking citizens wonder if our national values have been eroded (Ikediashi & Akande, 2015). It is common to see students bath one another with acid while quarreling over trivial matters. The issues of drug abuse, smoking, stealing, alcohol abuse, and prostitution have been accompanied by an increase in levels of psychiatric admissions and dropping out of school by some university students (Crawford, 2008). Within the Campus premises, one notices some ugly behaviour like a breach of school rules, delinquency, bad dressing and appearance, destruction of public properties, hooliganism, fighting and assault, fraud, sexual immorality, examination malpractice, misappropriation of fund, lying, impersonation, persistent lateness, absenteeism, disruptiveness and academic problems (Ugwu, 2011; Obikeze & Obi, 2013). Currently, there is this sect spreading across the northern part of the country known as Boko Haram. These sects embark on rootless killings and demolition of properties belonging to both individuals and the government respectively and thereby loose terrible plague upon humanity. Most of these ungodly behaviour that are contrary to the norms and values of the society are many of the cases exhibited by the youth, many of them are still undergraduates who have seen the four walls of the campuses (Ikediashi & Akande, 2015). Behaviour, according to Burt (2012) is defined as how individual acts or conducts one’s life, which includes the way an individual acts towards others and the society in general. The term antisocial behaviour means different things to different people. Antisocial behaviour is not only found among university undergraduates but can be found at the early stage of life among children, the youth, and adults. Children exhibit antisocial behaviour like lying, stealing little things in the house like food, drinks, and money, reckless eating, and drinking (Wachikwu & Ibegbunam, 2012). The focus of this study is on the two antisocial behaviour found among students in the universities: drug abuse and examination malpractices.

The rough use and approach to drugs by students in the school environment have become one of the most disturbing health-related phenomena in university campuses in Nigeria as a country and other parts of the world (Adekeye, 2012). Many students as the aftermath of the intake of drugs suffer mental health problems either temporarily or for a long period leading to insanity, maladjustment to school situations and this may eventually lead to dropping out of school as a result of drugs abuses which they get involved in as a means of stimulation (Adekeye, 2012). The inhumane approach of drugs by the students leads to addiction among students and gradually moves to affect their academic performance and more still, bring about some evil behaviour and happenings seen in the universities and the society generally. The effects of these drug abuse may include some students becoming rude and arrogant both
to their fellow students, lecturers and parents, while the height of it will bring about causing riots and disorder in the universities and some turns to criminals in the society leading them to rehabilitation site.

Besides, some students indulge in ungodly life patterns like examination-malpractices while the light-headed among them breakdown during examinations leading to failure in examination, and even eventual dropouts. In schools, those of the students who engage in examination malpractice tries to manifest the possession of certain knowledge by illicit means. Examination malpractices do not occur in the examination hall alone. They occur before, during, and even after the examination. Some forms of examination malpractices are, taking into the hall already copied documents, exchange of answer booklets, and collusion with other candidates or external agents. Others that are seen by the authorities or the examination board are the leakage of examination questions before the designated day of examination. The implication of examination malpractice in the school is not only the decline of our educational system but the gradual practice of fraud by the students, the poor quality of education in Nigeria and finally end up becoming a reserved crew of the unemployable (Duze, 2011).

All these antisocial behaviour mentioned and others too seen among undergraduates in the universities have been on the increase, with their negative effects on societal development, health-endangering possibility, loss of self-esteem on the individual, families, and institutions (Chris, 2011). Since the behaviour of individuals, according to Bandura (1986) stems from an individual’s orientation, it becomes imperative to focus attention on other variables to determine if such variables influence the antisocial behaviour among undergraduate students. The variable to be investigated in this study is the personality trait which are enduring characteristics of the individual that summarize trans-situational consistencies in characteristic styles of responding to the environment. A growing body of evidence indicates that personality traits are endogenous basic tendencies tied to underlying biophysiological response systems (Oliver & Mooradian, 2003). In the context of this study, personality trait is a characteristic aspect of an individual’s cognition, effect, or behaviour that tends to be stable over time and consistent across relevant situations. There are five dimensions/models which describe an individual’s personality which are Openness to experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion and Introversions, Agreeableness, Neuroticism. Even though there has been a lot of research done to detect the factors that are possible contributors to antisocial behaviour among undergraduate students in universities, none, to the best knowledge of the researcher, has been done on personality traits as an influence on antisocial behaviour of undergraduate students in universities. It is against this background that the researcher is interested in investigating personality traits as a determinant of antisocial behaviour of undergraduate students in universities in South East, Nigeria.

Theoretical Framework
This study was underpinned by the Problem Behaviour Theory by Richard Jessar (1987). Problem behaviour theory was propounded by Richard Jessar (1987). The conceptual structure of problem behaviour theory is both complex and comprehensive. This theory focused on three major systems of explanatory variables - the perceived environment system, the personality system, and the behaviour system. In other words, each system is composed of variables that serve either as instigators for engaging in problem behaviour. It is the balance between instigators and controls that determines the degree of proneness for problem behaviour across all three systems. This reflects the degree of psycho-social conventionality characterising each person. For instance, the perceived environment system includes social control, models, and support. Problem behaviour proneness in the perceived environment system is low parental disapproval of problem behaviour, high peer approval of problem behaviour, low parental control and support, low peer control, low compatibility between parent and peer expectations, and low parent (relative to peer) influence. The personality system includes a patterned and interrelated set of relatively enduring, socio-cognitive variables such as values, expectations, beliefs, attitudes, orientations towards self and society that reflect social learning and development experience. Problem behaviour proneness in the personality system is greater social criticism, higher alienation, lower self-esteem, greater attitudinal tolerance of deviance, and lower religiosity. Behaviour system includes both problem behaviour and conventional behaviour. Problem behaviour includes alcohol use, the problem of excess drinking, cigarette smoking, marijuana use, and other illicit drug use, general deviance behaviour (delinquent behaviour and other norms violative acts), risky driving, and precocious sexual intercourse involvement. Any one of the problems behaviour tends to increase the tendency of involvement in others. Conventional behaviour are those behaviour that are approved and expected as good and appropriate for adolescents. Church and school are institutions of conventional socialization fostering a conventional orientation and enlisting youths into the traditional and established networks of the larger society. Problem behaviour proneness in the behaviour system includes high involvement in other problem behaviour and low involvement in conventional behaviour. The theory believes that no single constituent or domain of any young people’s behaviour can vividly explain or describe the behaviour influences that surround young people’s activities. This theory tends to relate to
the present study in that its major focus which is, the perceived environment system, the personality system, and the behaviour system is the major explanatory variables that buttress the antisocial behaviour of a person.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Personality

According to Alpatanni (2015) personality represents what you say or do, hence it defines you as a person. It informs one’s differentiating traits from others. The American Psychological Association (APA), (2014) describes personality as trait patterns in individuals that are distinct and unique such as thinking, feeling, and the way one behaves. When one talks about personality, usually it refers to the totality or whole of the person, the enduring pattern expressed by the person in various situations, this is the hallmark of personality (Jaira, 2016). However, the concept of personality in the context of this study is the theoretical perspective in other words concerned primarily with theories, hypothesis, and position which tends to direct our attention to a particular aspect of personality.

Personality Trait

Personality traits are distinguishing qualities or characteristics that are the embodiment of an individual, one’s habitual patterns of behavior, temperament, and emotion, while skills, on the other hand, are the learned capacity to carry out specific functions. Many scholars have provided evidence of personality investigated personality traits from different perspectives as is shown thus:

Bayram and Aydemir (2017) conducted a study on Decision-Making Styles and Personality Traits. The study examined the relations between decision-making styles and personality traits among a group of university students. The results showed that the rational style and intuitive style were significantly associated with four personality traits, except neuroticism where the females had significantly higher scores on agreeableness and neuroticism personality traits when compared to men.

Chibuzor (2019) investigate the problematic smartphone use and associated personality traits of undergraduate students in a Nigerian university. The personality traits measured include (loneliness, extraversion, and self-esteem) in a mixed sample of the respondent. The findings showed that a significant relationship exists between the variables of loneliness, extraversion and self-esteem, and problematic smartphone use, however, extraversion has the strongest influence on the use of a smartphone.

Ibigbami, Adewuya, Akinsulore, Aloba, Mapayi, Ibigbami and Olowookere (2019) conducted a study on the Personality traits and related factors in risky sexual behaviour among an undergraduate student population in Southwestern Nigeria. Its objective was to determine the relationship between personality traits and risky sexual behaviour in an undergraduate student population in a Southwestern Nigerian university using a multistage, stratified, systematic sampling technique. The findings showed that personality traits of conscientiousness and agreeableness, had a significant negative correlation with risky sexual behaviour, while the Extraversion personality trait had a significant positive correlation with risky sexual behaviour.

Other studies include Abimbola and Ugbede (2018), who conducted a study on gender differences in risky behaviour, learned helplessness, and school connectedness among undergraduates in Osun State. A quantitative method was used with purposive sampling and the Independent sample t-test and Pearson Product Moment Correlation were used to analysed the data. The result indicated that there was a significant difference between males and females on risky behaviour. There was no significant difference between males and females on learned helplessness. Besides, no significant difference was found between males and females on school connectedness. Finally, there was no relationship between learned helplessness and school connectedness.

El Othman, El Othman, Hallit, Obeid and Hallit (2020) investigated personality traits, emotional intelligence and decision-making styles in Lebanese university medical students. The study aimed to assess the impact of personality traits on emotional intelligence (EI) and decision-making among medical students and also to evaluate the potential mediating role-played by emotional intelligence between personality traits and decision-making styles in this population. The results showed that higher extroversion was associated with a lower rational decision-making style, whereas higher agreeableness and conscientiousness were significantly associated with a higher rational decision-making style. More extroversion and openness to experience were significantly associated with a higher intuitive style, whereas higher agreeableness and conscientiousness were significantly associated with a lower intuitive style.
Also, more agreeableness and conscientiousness were significantly associated with a higher dependent decision-making style, whereas more openness to experience was significantly associated with a less dependent decision-making style. More agreeableness, conscientiousness, and neuroticism were significantly associated with less spontaneous decision-making style. None of the personality traits was significantly associated with the avoidant decision-making style.

According to Diener and Lucas (2017), personality traits are the manifestation of people’s distinctiveness, their form of thoughts, feelings, and behaviour. The authors went further to say that these personality traits express stability and constant. Someone who scores high on a specific trait like extraversion is expected to be sociable in different situations and over time. One of the Aristotles’ student Theophrastus (371-287 BC) wrote a book describing thirty “Characters” or personality types, to which a translator remarked that Theophrastus’ title might better be rendered as traits. The most widely used system of traits is called the Five-Factor Model enacted by Costa and McCrae in 1992. This system includes five broad traits that can be remembered with the acronym OCEAN: Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism. This study focused on these five traits which are explained thus:

I.  **Openness to experience** is a personality trait that portrays a person’s tendency to seek out and to appreciate new things, including thoughts, feelings, values, and experiences. It refers to traits such as how inclined someone is to conform to societal or cultural norms, how concretely or abstractly someone thinks about things, and how open or resistant someone is to change. Such individuals are conservative, reluctant to changes, and have a traditional approach in life. This is because, in their problem-solving approach, they do not try to be explorative in finding new ways to solve a particular problem. They tend to dislike variety and change and rather love to stick to their old rigid routines (Sajjad, Muhmmed, Khurram & Syeda, 2012).

II. **Conscientiousness** is a personality trait that shows or portrays a person’s disposition to be careful, organised, hardworking, and to follow rules. This personality trait has to do with a person’s grade of organisation, level of discipline, and how prone may be to taking risks. Career success in any organization is mostly influenced by conscientiousness personality trait and always very careful about their future planning (Burch and Anderson, 2008), cautious about their surroundings, compact and fully scheduled (Cattell and Mead, 2008). Individuals with a conscientious personality trait more often abide with their conscience and act accordingly, extremely cautious and self-disciplined in dealing with others, methodical and strive to become perfectionists in their endeavours. They try to be neat, clean and would like everything to be placed in the right place. These people are not inclined to work in a concise way that can assure their work would be free of faults (Sajjad, Muhmmed, Khurram & Syeda, 2012). People with a high score on conscientiousness are always proactive, goal-oriented, and self-disciplined while those on the lower score are laid back and not goal-oriented.

III. **Extraversion** is a personality trait that indicates a person’s disposition to be sociable, outgoing, active, and assertive in approach. Extraversion is the personality trait that covers these kinds of people in our society. Extraversion depicts a state of life where individuals show more concern towards what is happening outside. Such people are generally talkative and love to interact. They fascinate the company of others and abhors staying alone. When one is at the side of being reserved always, not sociable, and tends to be uncomfortable interacting with strangers, the individual has the trait opposite to extraversion and is termed as introversion ((Sajjad, Muhmmed, Khurram and Syeda, 2012).

IV. **Agreeableness** is a personality trait that designates a person’s disposition to be compassionate, cooperative, warm, and caring towards others. It considers how kind; dependable and cooperative a person is. Agreeableness is a personality trait of people that can accommodate others not minding their shortcomings and also at disposal to help (Burch and Anderson, 2008) assisting in resolving issues by creating a win-win situation by their flexible attitude (Cattell and Mead, 2008). People with a high score on scales of agreeableness are typically more inclined in doing things for the common good, as opposed to fulfilling their self-interests. Agreeableness is a personality trait that tends to drill individuals to be adjusting in almost all situations in life. These people have a propensity to attain cooperation and social harmony (Sajjad, Muhmmed, Khurram & Syeda, 2012). Being at beck and call to assist others is their inbuilt feature and for that reason, when dealing with others also believe others are also honest and trustworthy. The individuals can adapt to all situations, kindhearted and friendly too. Individuals with a low score on agreeableness, find it very hard to adjust and are always very selfish, rough-in relationship and cares more about self. (Sajjad, Muhmmed, Khurram & Syeda, 2012).
V. Neuroticism is a personality trait that points to the disposition of an individual towards being interpersonally sensitive and the indication to experience negative emotions like anxiety, fear, sadness, frustrations, anger, depression, stress, and self-blame. All these are the personality symbol of the persons who rank high on the neuroticism trait of personality. It is a personality characteristic that explains how nervous or anxious an individual tends to be and at the same time the degree of self-confidence and self-contentment he or she possesses. The neurotic personality trait is associated with individuals who are pessimistic in approach, due to their nature, they always overreact over mistakes and faults made by them. People with these personality traits are easily trapped by stress and tend to be emotional and anxious. Moreover, when showing their feelings and exhibiting their behaviour they tend to be hopeless and frustrated. Due to neuroticism, people usually fail to achieve success in their careers including extrinsic and intrinsic success. Individuals on the high levels of neuroticism are always preoccupied in their thoughts with the notion ‘what ifs’ of life. Always worrisome and preoccupied with things especially the ones that may not be within their control (Sajjad, Muhmmed, Khurram and Syeda, 2012). Neuroticism is a trait where Individuals in neuroticism as a personality trait are always prone to negative thoughts such as anxiety, anger, envy, guilt, and so on. Such individuals tend to be in a state of depression and finds it difficult to enjoy life. The next section describes antisocial behaviour, a concept of interest to this study.

Antisocial Behaviour
Umeano (2012) is of the view that behaviour is how one acts or conducts one’s self, especially towards others. In every given society there is a peculiarly acceptable norm the citizens are expected to conform as a way of measuring acceptable behaviour and when one deviates from the acceptable norms, it is referred to as antisocial behaviour which may be seen as problematic. Anagbogu (2011) sees antisocial behaviour as when an individual’s actions, attitude to life, and approach to things differ totally from the standard behaviour of a given society. This may be either against the social norms and culture of a society or those attitudes of life that are deemed unhealthy or unacceptable to other individuals in a society. Ladipo (2010) defines antisocial behaviour as those modes of living that deviate from age, appropriate behaviour which significantly go against the individual’s growth and development and more especially the lives of others. It interferes in the sense that its mode of behaviour and that of others no longer conform, instead, it turns to be contrary to theirs. The existence of different cultures, variations in norms, and values brought about not having universally accepted behaviour that is regarded or tagged as antisocial behaviour. According Ogala, (2011) homosexuality is a practicing way of life and acceptable in some western countries such as England, the USA, Canada, while in Nigeria, on the contrary, the term homosexuality is frowned at to such an extent that over 90% of Nigerians regard it as a taboo, all because of their culture. However, relying on what is slated as the acceptable societal norms and values in Nigeria when applied to adolescents, antisocial behaviour as listed by Wachikwu and Ibegbunam (2012) are lying, deceit, stealing, love for fighting among age mates, violence, cruelty, promiscuity, aggression, bullying, which may lead to confrontation and lack of respect for elders. Others normally experienced more at the campuses are hostility, greed, forgery, thuggery, examination malpractice, cultism, rape, alcoholism, and frequent running away from home. Recently, it has been observed that many of our undergraduate students due to quest for wealth, greedy and depression engage in cyber-related crimes, such as e-mail scam, cyberbullying and intimidations, internet pornography, examination fraud, and sabotaging internet network providers (Longe, Ngwa, Wada & Mbarika, 2009). In the context of this study, antisocial behaviour is any unusual behaviour being shown by the undergraduate students which go against the school rules and regulations, against the expected behaviour of a given, with one’s growth and development and prevent the students from building and maintaining a welcoming and satisfying interpersonal relationship with others in the campus. These antisocial behaviour among undergraduate students manifest in various forms such as listed above. This study extends these concepts on antisocial behaviour to university students in terms of drug abuse and examination malpractices.

Drug Abuse
Any substance that could bring about a change in the biological function through its chemical actions can be termed drugs (Okoeye, 2011). According to Fawa (2013), any substance, which is used for curing, treating ill-health or preventing a disease in man and animals is said to be drugs. In the context of the study, the drug is that given substance that alters the body functions either positively or negatively depending on the body mechanism of the individual, this may result due to the type or amount of drugs used, and whether used appropriately as prescribed. This is because drugs in themselves as a substance do not constitute any danger because drugs, correctly administered, have been of immense help to humanity, only goes contrarily when abused. The term drug abuse is excessive and unrelenting self-medication or administration of a drug without any reference to a qualified medical practitioner or professional or to the medically or culturally accepted patterns Haladu (2013). It could also be viewed as the use of a drug to an extent that it interferes with the health and social function of an individual. In the context
of the study, drug abuse is the misuse of one particular drug or drugs among undergraduate students in universities without a prior medical diagnosis from qualified health practitioners. The use and abuse of drugs by undergraduate students in universities have become one of the most disturbing health-related phenomena in Nigeria. This leads to either temporarily or for a long period mental health problems among the undergraduates in the school, and many contribute eventually to the dropping out rate of students in the universities. Despite the unrelenting effort being made by both individuals, non-governmental agencies, mass media, and the government at different levels against drug abuse, the prevalent practice among undergraduate students continues to be in increase. According to the report of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) (2005), about 5 percent of the world’s population, resulting in 20 million people between the ages bracket of 15 and 65years have used drugs within 12 months. The youths in Nigeria, likewise many other countries of the world, are fast developing an addiction to psychoactive substances. In 2012, the National Drug Law Enforcement Agency (NDLEA) collected drug use and abuse data from institutions of learning, records of patients admitted at mental health institutions for drug-related problems and interview of some individual that was arrested for drug offenses. The result showed that the high-risk group for drug trafficking and abuse were mainly the youths. Peer groups and schoolmates account for about 90% of the source of influence of the use and abuse of various psychoactive substances (Atta et al., 2016). The abuse of these drugs which leads to addiction among these students gradually thwarts their way of reasoning and living, next affect their academic performance and cause a host of evil happenings experienced and heard about on the campus like riots and generally, in our society such as the incessant occurrence of road traffic accidents as a result of effects of these substances. Some of the students indulge in exam malpractices in an attempt to scale through the examination.

**Examination Malpractice**
Examination malpractice is another pertinent antisocial behaviour found among students of universities. Examination by general opinion is the accepted best means of assessment and a formal test of knowledge or ability. In every school setting, an examination is seen as a means of evaluating the quantity of knowledge a student has acquired within a specific period. Kpangban, Ajaja and Umedhe (2008) defined examination as an evaluation intended to checkmate the knowledge, skill, attitude, and learning outcomes at all levels of education in Nigeria and the world over. In the context of the study, examination is the process that involves an internal or external administrator that formally examines students or candidates. This may take the nature of the oral method, or on paper or the computer, in a conducive and confined area that requires an examinee to exhibit or perform a set of skills. However, despite the importance of examination in teaching and learning situations, several factors affect the credibility of examination scores. One of such practices that may affect the reliability of examination scores in examination malpractice. Examination malpractice is any illegal act committed by the students, either single-handedly or in collaboration with others; like fellow students, parents, teachers, supervisors, invigilators, printers, and anybody or a group of people. This takes effect either before, during, or after examination to obtain undeserved marks, grades, or certificates (Wilayat, 2009). Examination malpractice may be seen as misconduct or improper practice done in the school environments before, during, or after any examination by examinees or others to obtain good results by fraudulent means (Fasasi, 2006). From these definitions, it can be concluded that examination malpractice is an unethical act because it tends to encourage mediocrity, students who succeed through such tunnel will be rating themselves equal with those who struggle in their effort to excel. In schools, students who engage in examination malpractice manifest the possession of certain knowledge by illicit means. In the context of the study, examination malpractice is an act of omission or commission that goes against the universities’ examinations rules and regulations and thereby leads the extent of undermining the validity and reliability of the test and ultimately the integrity of the certificate issued by the university. Examination malpractice has become an epidemic in the nation’s educational system, the majority of students who gained admissions into tertiary institutions and universities in Nigeria are products of examination malpractice (Emaikwu & Eba, 2007). The irony of it all is that despite the several attempts made by school authorities, government agencies, parents, non-governmental agencies, and church leaders in trying to x-ray Nigerian students the evils of examination malpractice, this menace is still on the increase in the various schools. As a result of frequent cases of examination malpractice, society is losing confidence in the certificates awarded by some institutions and examination bodies (Emaikwu & Eba, 2007; Ogum, 2007). This increases daily since academic credentials are the only acceptable indices of educational attainment, the school-going population now sees passing examination as ‘a do or die affair’ in Nigeria (Duze, 2011). Examination malpractice does not occur in the examination hall alone, it occurs before, during, and even after the examination. Some forms of examination malpractices are copying on sheets of paper, handkerchiefs, desk/chairs, swapping of answer booklets, and collusion with other candidates or external agents. Others include leakage of examination questions before the actual examination day (Onyechere, 2007).

The author stressed further that, in some schools, the school authorities sometimes bribe invigilators, supervisors, and police personnel drafted to the centres so that they could turn a blind eye when malpractices are being
perpetrated. Electronic gadgets like calculators, organizers, and mobile phones are also used to carry out examination malpractices. By reviewing all these studies, it can be concluded that most of it was conducted outside Nigeria. Secondly, the studies were based on the effect of personality and separation as acculturation styles, which are predictors of disposition towards antisocial behaviour. However, none of the studies investigated personality traits as a predictor of antisocial behaviour of undergraduate students in a university context. Hence, this study intends to delineate and fill such a gap in the academic body of knowledge.

**Statement of the Problem**

In recent years, antisocial behaviour among undergraduate students in universities have been on the increase and has also become a common concern of parents, university academic and non-academic staff, the community, education stakeholders, and the government in general. This has turned to be a national issue that has attracted the attention of scholars and education stakeholders on intervention to curb all forms of factors that could be responsible for antisocial behaviour among undergraduate students in universities. In the universities, undergraduate students exhibit some of these antisocial behaviour like examination malpractices, drug abuse, and verbal abuse of the lecturers and non-academic workers. These antisocial behaviour may have a serious impact on the students’ studies thereby leading to failure or low academic performance. This ugly situation has led to apportioning blames to parents, lecturers, constitutional amendment, national orientation programmes, the school curriculum, and programmes. It may be difficult to ascertain the extent to which such factors could influence antisocial behaviour among undergraduate students in universities. It is against this background that the researcher is interested in investigating personality traits as a determinant of antisocial behaviour of undergraduate students in universities in South East, Nigeria. The objective is to determine the relationship between personality traits and antisocial behaviour of undergraduate students in universities in South East, Nigeria.

**Hypotheses**

**Ho:** There is no significant relationship between personality traits and antisocial behaviour of undergraduate students in Federal and State universities in South East, Nigeria.

**RESEARCH METHOD**

This study adopted a correlational survey research design. Achagh et al. (2020), Eya et al. (2020), Ezema et al. (2019), Gana et al. (2019), Ugwuanyi and Okeke (2020), Ugwuanyi et al. (2020a, b, c) have used this design in similar studies. The study was carried out in both federal and state universities in the South-East of Nigeria. South-East of Nigeria is made up of five states namely Abia, Anambra, Ebonyi, Enugu, and Imo States. The population of the study comprised all the 60,734 third year students from both federal and state universities in the South-East of Nigeria. The sample of the study consisted of 1,250 third year undergraduate students drawn from the population. These respondents were drawn from 3 federal and 3 state universities through a multistage sampling procedure. Stratified random sampling was used to stratify the universities based on federal and state. Secondly, a simple random sampling technique was used to draw four faculties from the university sample. This was done using the ballotting method with replacement to give every faculty an equal chance of being selected. Thirdly, the snowball sampling technique was used to sample third year undergraduate students in the faculties sampled in the second stage. The instruments for data collection are “Personality Traits Questionnaire (PTQ) and Antisocial Behaviour Questionnaire (ABQ). The Personality trait questionnaire (PTQ) was adapted from Costa and McCrae Neo Personality inventory with two parts and five clusters. Part one sought information on the personal data of the respondents while part two with 25 items elicited information on the students’ openness to experience, consciousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism. A four-point Likert scale with response options of Strongly Agree (SA-4), Agree (A-3), Disagree (D-2), and Strongly Disagree (SD-1) respectively was used to answer research question two. Antisocial Behaviour Questionnaire (ABQ) was adapted from Edinburgh’s antisocial behaviour questionnaire and has two parts. Part one sought information on demographic variables (personal data of the respondents) while part two consisted of fifteen (15) items. A four-point Likert scales with the response option of Strongly Agree (SA-4), Agree (A 3), Disagree (D 2), and Strongly Disagree (SD 1) respectively was used to answer the question. The data were analysed using regression analysis and t-test of the significance of correlation coefficients.
RESULTS

Table I: Regression analysis of the relationship between personality traits and antisocial behaviour of undergraduate students in both federal and state universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>-.169&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.028&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>9.599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>11.352</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Designed by the researcher from the statistics output

Table I shows that the correlation coefficient between the personality traits of students in federal universities and their antisocial behaviour is -0.169 with a coefficient of determination of 0.029 while the correlation coefficient between the personality traits of students in the state universities is -0.103 with a coefficient of determination of 0.011. This implies that 2.9% variation in the antisocial behaviour of students in federal universities can be because of their personality traits while 1.1% variation in the antisocial behaviour of students in state universities is a result of their personality traits. Thus, there is a negative relationship between the personality traits of students in both federal and state universities and their antisocial behaviour meaning that the better the personality traits, the less the antisocial behaviour manifestations among the students. Besides, the personality traits of students in state universities correlated highly negative than those of the students in federal universities.

**H01:** There is no significant relationship between personality traits and antisocial behaviour of undergraduate students in Federal and State universities in South East Nigeria.

Table II: t-test analysis of the relationship between personality traits and antisocial behaviour of undergraduate students in Federal and State universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Standardized Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>-.169&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>-.178</td>
<td>-3.564</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Designed by Researcher from Statistics Output

Table II shows that the probability associated with the calculated t (-3.564) for the relationship between personality traits and antisocial behaviour of undergraduate students in Federal and State universities is 0.000. Since the probability value of 0.000 is less than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis was rejected. Thus, there is a significant negative relationship between personality traits and antisocial behaviour of undergraduate students in federal and state universities in South East, Nigeria with the personality traits of students in state universities correlating significantly negative with their antisocial behaviour than those of the federal universities. The finding of the study shows that there is a negative relationship between the personality traits of students in both federal and state universities and their antisocial behaviour meaning that the better the personality traits, the less the antisocial behaviour manifestations among the students.

DISCUSSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of the study showed that there is a negative relationship between the personality traits of students in both federal and state universities and their antisocial behaviour meaning that the better the personality traits, the less the antisocial behaviour manifestations among the students. Besides, the personality traits of students in state
universities correlated highly negative than those of students in federal universities. It was further revealed that there is a significant negative relationship between personality traits and antisocial behaviour of undergraduate students in federal and state universities in South East, Nigeria with the personality traits of students in state universities correlating significantly negative with their antisocial behaviour than those of the federal university. This finding supports the findings of Sobral et al. (2013) and Lau (2013) who found out that personality variables were significantly related to antisocial behaviour. Also, Lau (2013) in a similar study found that the big five personality traits accounted for the least amount of variation in the prediction of aggression and delinquency on its own and when pitted against the other two personality approaches.

In conclusion, personality traits of students are major determinants of their exhibition of antisocial behaviour in both federal and state universities. It has been established from the outcome of this study that the better the personality traits of students, the less they exhibit antisocial behaviour. The findings of this study have several implications for the university administrators, students, and federal and state governments. The findings revealed that the personality traits of students negatively correlated with their antisocial behaviour. This implies that if the students are not properly guided to develop good personality traits, they will be prone to the exhibition of antisocial behaviour which will not create conducive atmosphere for learning. Besides, if the university administrators do not create enabling environment for the students to develop good personality traits, the students will be liable to creating unrest in schools because they manifested antisocial behaviour. It is recommended that students should be encouraged to maintain good personality traits in order not to engage in antisocial activities in school.
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