




ANTISOCIAL PERSONALITY, EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOR OF COLLEGE STUDENTS

Shazia Malik

Assistant Professor, Institute of Education and Research, University of Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan

KEYWORDS	ABSTRACT
Antisocial Personality, Emotional Intelligence, Aggressive Behavior, College Students, Pakistan	<p>In this research study, an extensive empirical investigation of antisocial personality traits, emotional intelligence & aggression has been conducted among university students in Pakistan. Through a quantitative approach and cross-sectional study design, the researcher has successfully measured the constructs as well as determined the relationships between them. The outcomes revealed that participants have quite high levels of antisocial personality traits and aggression, along with a medium level of emotional intelligence. The target population for study consisted of male and female students aged 15–18 years enrolled in public & private colleges in Pakistan. The study was conducted using cross-sectional research design with help of a multistage proportionate sampling method. The colleges and eligible students were randomly chosen within selected districts. It was concluded that antisocial personality characteristics have a positive correlation with aggression, meaning that higher levels of the impulsiveness, aggressiveness, and hostility toward individuals and institutions, the greater the chances of aggression. Conversely, emotional intelligence had inverse relationship with antisocial features and aggression. This study adds to the empirical material since it includes Pakistan youth sample that is poorly represented in empirical studies.</p>
ARTICLE HISTORY	
Date of Submission: 02-02-2026 Date of Acceptance: 04-03-2026 Date of Publication: 16-03-2026	<p>2026 Journal of Social Research Development</p>
Correspondence	Shazia Malik
Email:	shazia.ier@pu.edu.pk
DOI	https://doi.org/10.53664/JSRD/07-01-2026-09-112-126

INTRODUCTION

Aggression and behavior related to violence among the youth in Pakistan has become an important problem pertaining to education, psychology & public health. This matter gains further importance due to the composition of country's population. According to the Government of Pakistan Economic Survey 2024–25 based on the Seventh Population and Housing Census 2023, the population of the country amounts to 241.5 million, where 26% of the population belongs to age group of 15-29 years

Malik ... Antisocial Personality, Emotional

while 67% of them belong to age bracket below 30 years (Malik, Mihm, Pesando & Sucholodetz, 2025). This fact reveals that the behavior and emotion management problems of the adolescents as well as young adults are not peripheral matters; rather, they have serious repercussions. The issue of aggression in Pakistan is not limited to physical acts alone; rather, it can also be in form of bullying, intimidating, verbal abuse, hostility, and other such behaviors among peers in the education sector. In fact, the evidence provided by the empirical research done on the issue in the country shows that aggression occurs at a high enough frequency to require systematic investigation. This is supported by study conducted by Khawar and Malik (2016) among 817 individuals in Lahore, who discovered that about 65% of the respondents exhibited the acts of bullying in one way or another as bullies, victims, or even both.

Other subsequent researches carried out in various districts of the country show that the problem of bullying and peer victimization has become an important public health matter of concern (Amran, Rathakrishnan, Singh, Kamaluddin, Yahaya & Rahman, 2023). In recent times, aggressive behavior among youth has emerged as issue of increasing significance in modern societies, especially those of developing nations where fast-paced social, economic, and cultural changes are occurring. In the educational settings, students experience a variety of stressful experiences ranging from academic, social, economic, and familial pressures to exposure to digital platforms that may influence their emotional and behavioral reactions (Jaleel & Kotian, 2022). Consequently, an exploration of the psychological factors involved in the aggressive behavior has both academic importance and social significance enough frequency to require systematic investigation. Aggression refers to the multi-faceted phenomenon involving any act aimed at causing injury or hurting other individuals, be it psychological or physical in nature. Aggressive acts may take an open form by way of physical and verbal abuse or a more understated form in the case of passive aggression as well as social isolation (Sample, 2017).

In Pakistan, instances of aggression in student populations can be seen to include bullying, violence on campuses, intolerance toward peers, as well as emerging cases of cyberbullying via social media channels. This behavior poses grave threats to emotional regulation, social skills, and mental well-being of students (Malik et al., 2025). One of most important psychological variables linked with aggression is antisocial personality characteristics. An antisocial personality denotes a continuous trend of disrespecting social norms, regulations, and other people's rights. Individuals with these characteristics may exhibit impulsive tendencies, absence of empathy, irritability, and a propensity to violate social laws. While such features may not necessarily amount to a personality disorder in students, the subclinical presentation of these variables may strongly affect their behavior. These make study of antisocial personality traits, emotional intelligence, and aggressive behavior highly relevant in understanding students' psychological growth and behavioral outcomes. As Pakistan is a collectivist culture that values respect, harmony, and social solidarity, individuals with antisocial personality features practice behavioral flaws with societal demands, that can promote aggression (Antoñanzas, 2020).

On the other hand, emotional intelligence has proved to be another key variable when explaining human behavior regarding emotional regulation and social interaction. Hare and Harpur (1991),

emotional intelligence encompasses the capability of people to perceive, interpret, control, and use emotions effectively in themselves and in others. People who score high on emotional intelligence can manage themselves under stressful circumstances, solve problems related to conflict resolution & build sound interpersonal relationships. Individuals scoring low in terms of emotional intelligence, however, experience problems regulating their emotions of anger, frustration, and jealousy, which might result in aggressive behavior (Holmes & Kashani, 2001). This could be the case in Pakistani educational setting, since no formal emotional education exists in school curricula. In essence, the relationship between antisocial personality traits, emotional intelligence, and aggression allows a wide approach to assessing conduct of learners. If antisocial behaviors incline individuals toward acts of aggression, then emotional intelligence be viewed as prevailing variable that offsets effects of such behaviors.

In this case, emotional intelligence is likely to operate as an intervening variable in relation to how antisocial personality traits lead to acts of aggression. Furthermore, the behavior of students is not determined in vacuum; rather, it is affected by many different factors such as gender, socioeconomic status, family dynamics, educational environment & culture. In Pakistan, difference in educational institutions, whether they are located in the urban or rural areas and whether they are publicly or privately funded, along with socioeconomic differences, plays a role in shaping student experiences and behavioral patterns. This goal is necessary in order to establish a starting point for assessing how prevalent aggressive behavior tendencies are in the student demographic and how they are related to certain psychological factors. This research is based on the necessity of solving a particular social and psychological issue within the Pakistani setting. Through identification of levels, differences, relationships, causes, and mediators of aggressive behavior, antisocial personality, and emotional intelligence, this research gives detailed understanding of behavioral patterns of students. Not only does it donate to academic knowledge but it helps solve issues within student demographic, making the world better.

Research Objectives

1. To identify the level of aggressive behavior in the context of the emotional intelligence and antisocial personality.
2. To identify difference in antisocial personality, emotional intelligence and aggressive based on background of students.
3. To identify the existing relationship between antisocial personality, emotional intelligence and aggressive behavior.
4. To determine factors that will contribute towards tendency of aggressive behaviors in the particular research context.

Research Questions

1. What are the levels of aggressive behavior in the context of the antisocial personality and emotional intelligence?
2. What are differences in antisocial personality, emotional intelligence & aggressive behavior based on the background of the students?

3. What are the relationships between antisocial personality, emotional intelligence as well as aggressive behavior?
4. What are the factors that contribute towards the levels of aggressive behavior in particular research context?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Aggression can be defined as any emotion that has a likelihood of hurting, harming, or destroying something or someone. Thus, when discussing people, the bad intentions may be either physical or psychological. The aggression refers to anger and hostility that may result in violence. Aggressive behavior and negative attitudes lead to the creation of conflicts and misunderstandings among the masses of equal rank (Roland & Idsoe, 2001). Students coming from financially deprived families might feel stressed and frustrated, which can lead them to be more aggressive. This study aims to investigate the intricacies of such relations in an empirical fashion. First, the study will identify the levels of aggression in students about their emotional intelligence and antisocial personality. By determining the levels of aggression, the study will give insight into the extent of the problem in the Pakistani education system. This expression of such emotion is aggressive behavior; this is mild to severe and it involves people surrounding including nearest and dearest. When individual gets into some conflict it will result in some aggressive behavior that will be evident in character of aggressor (Nelson, 2006).

According to Gelman and Wellman (2007), the destructive action that was done by the person or group that has less power is tendency of aggressive behavior. Moreover, propensity of aggression behavior occurs within the environment that extends to fighting and more severe aggressive actions that are now implicated to the world (Philips 2007; Kyriakides, Kaloyirou and Lindsay, 2006). The most common belief is that the causes of aggression are in the genetic (biological) or physical factors and social factors (factors that can be learned in society). When we take the biological and social factors together there exists a high degree of interaction in both of them. The social factors have a great impact on the biological factors including neural responses. The social stimuli influence the neural responses and conversely, social response of a person. In other words, we can infer that social setup effects one's mental process and that as a result influences behavior of a person (Mayer, 1997). Mayer and Salovey (1993) defined EI as capacity to comprehend oneself and others in terms of their feelings and emotions, and have ability to describe them, and use this information to guide his/her thinking and behavior.

The outcome of a physiological stimulation and perception of the specific situation following the observation of the cues of environment we present ourselves through our face and body language. Emotional Intelligence may be defined as a set of emotional, personal and interpersonal skills that can be combined to create the coping capacity of an individual to the demands and pressures of the environment (Bar-On & Parker, 2000). Thus, the emotional intelligence of a particular person is a critical factor which can make or break a person in their life. Numerous studies have been carried out with an eye on intelligence and its types. A few scholars have subdivided it into sets of skills or the particular skills (Cattell, 1963; Guilford, 1967; Sternberg, 1988; Thorndike, 1920). Thorndike

Malik ... Antisocial Personality, Emotional

(1920) subdivided the notion of general intelligence into three: 1) abstract, analytic and verbal, 2) mechanical, performance, visual-spatial and synthetic, 3) social and practical intelligences. Among the three, social and practical intelligence has the least number of studies. In this connection, this is conceivably due to the fact that it has been hard to draw a line between it and the other (Mayer & Geher, 1996).

Intelligence studies have indicated that mental intelligence is not the only factor that determines personal and professional success. Self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy and social skills are fundamental elements of emotional intelligence. Self-awareness is foremost fundamental element of the emotional intelligence in that it is an ability of someone to be completely aware and understanding of his/her feelings, emotions, sentimental conditions, skills, weaknesses, necessities, wishes, ambitions (Goleman, 1995). These attributes make a person not unrealistic and emotional. Moreover, these individuals understand how to control their emotions and feelings which influence their own performance, other people and their environment (Goleman, 1995). Good self-regulation make good decisions in any situation in a cool and calm manner are characteristics of these types of individuals. The forefathers of the modern-day emotional intelligence were Thorndike (1920) and Gardner (1999). In this linking, various theorists believe that emotional intelligence has to do with one of two models. The ability model views EI as a type of mental ability that contends that it is pure form of intelligence.

In literature, emotional intelligence has following research model. Emotional intelligence began to be referred to in 1990 when was introduced by Salovey and Mayer. Since then, they and others have been leading research on this topic. Initial theory of emotional intelligence combined significant concepts of disciplines of emotion and intelligence. The theory of intelligence held that intelligence is a capacity to perform abstract reasoning. The research has proven that emotions are signals that communicate meanings about relationships, it is also argued that many basic emotions are universal (Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 2002). Daniel Goleman was a psychologist and science writer who was inspired by the work of Salovey and Mayer in 1990s. He did his own research in field and authored the renowned book EI (1995). Through this book, awareness of EI was raised in both the public and private sector. The model of EI proposed by Goleman has four aspects to it. To begin with, it is about self-understanding. This can be described as having capability to be conscious of one own feeling & how this affects others. It includes being guided by instincts to make decisions. Self-management is the second component.

This is related to the possibility of controlling oneself and adjust to any changes or situations. The third one is social awareness. This is concerned with knowing and having a good knowledge of the emotions of other people in the social networks. The fourth element is relationship management. This involves being able to deal with the conflict as well as inspire and invest in others development (Goleman, 1998). Goleman (1995) thus presented a list of emotional competencies in each of the elements of EI. Goleman was of the view that emotional competencies were not creative but as a matter of fact, they were learned/ acquired. In fact, they can be created in such a way that they can make a person even more successful (Jaleel & Kotian, 2022). Nevertheless, Goleman also felt that people were born with an overall emotional intelligence. This acted as precursor to be able to learn

Malik ... Antisocial Personality, Emotional

emotional competencies. With reference to psychology, personality is a dynamic, which entails all the interpersonal, biological, societal characteristics in a person. It is amalgam of all psychological mannerism and functions. The personality is the collection of inductive systematic and structured psychological traits and mechanisms of the individual that convince and interact with the physical and social conditions.

Personality plays big role in inheriting the ability to develop, maintain and adapt to inter personal, physical and social conditions (Larsen & Buss, 2005). Therefore, we can say that personality is one's pattern of traits that manipulate him/her physically, psychologically and socially. According to the research findings, in the west, prevalence of antisocial personality disorder has been reported as being two to three percent of the population. It happens more in males than the females four to five times. The diagnosis of antisocial personality disorder is more so in white people as compared to black people in the United States of America. A study conducted in Oslo found that there is a lower prevalence in the young people age 18-24 (Ackerman & Heggstad, 1997). Another survey carried out in Norway, suggest that 0.6% chances are found among people aged 16-24 years in England, Scotland and Wales (Singleton et al., 2001). The highest prevalence is in 25- to 44-year age band. This kind of individual is the one who wants to be in a domineering situation. The misconceived idea of the life is prevalent in these individuals and they feel that life has not given them any of what they really deserved.

It is noticeable that they were not loved as much, or lacked in social and economic assistance. They feel that other individuals take advantage of their rights and enjoy each and everything more than them. They experience jealousy in other people who live their life in good manner (Murphy & Vees, 2003). Like narcissistic personality, this type of antisocial personality is more concerned about their reputation. They try to be attractive for others through doing something unique such as showing bravery and toughness. They desire to be the focus of attention. They act by aiming at ensuring that individuals are attracted to them, and give them the honor they deserve (Kahiloğullari, 2016). They behave aggressively and become crazy and unsafe if their reputation is slightly under threat and aggressive activities others are trying to impress peers with leadership or violent activities (Dârjan, Predescu & Tomita, 2017). To be able to realize antisocial personality disorder, one needs to consider psychodynamic, behavioral and biological models. Like most personality disorders, it is asserted that disorder be precipitated by parental lack of love during early years, which brings about a lack of trust (Sperry, 2003).

This theory presumes that the individuals who go upon to develop this disorder grow emotionally detached and their mode of connecting with other people is by utilizing the power and aggression. Some studies support this theory, and reveal that individuals with this disorder are more inclined than others to have been exposed to certain factors during their childhood. These are: high levels of stress, socio economic deprivation, family violence and/or parent-parent conflict (Martens, 2005). Behavioral theorists on the other hand hold the view that antisocial behavior might be acquired by means of modeling or invitation. In this linking, such behaviors may result in conflicts with peers, poor academic adjustment, disciplinary issues, and emotional instability. They claim that there is evidence that antisocial personality disorder individuals tend to have parents who have the same

symptoms (Paris, 2004). In this connection, there has also been an argument that parents can teach antisocial behavior unwillingly as result of rewarding aggressive behavior of a child (Capaldi et al., 1997; Patterson, 1986).

This occurs when a child misbehaves due to the teaching of a parent. Nonetheless, the parent can succumb to ensure that the child is calm. It is then taught to the child that it can have its own way either by being stubborn or aggressive. Levenson (1992) argues that the real issue is that people with antisocial personality disorder have a particular attitude with a tendency to down play the needs of others. He states that such an attitude is more prevalent in society than people would think. Another point that the cognitive theorists make is that such individuals have a literal problem of being able to comprehend opinion of any other person. Various researches have shown that there is a link between biological factors and antisocial personality disorder. It is believed that individuals with this disorder are less anxious than others yet anxiety is vital factor in learning (Blair, Mitchell, and Blair, 2005). This implies that these individuals fail to use adverse experiences in life as normal and are not as receptive to others. Studies have reported such persons as less capable of learning tasks than control groups in laboratory (Lykken, 1957). Dinn and Harris, (2000) have argued case why anti-social individuals are less anxious is as their bodies do not respond to advices, expectation of stress as normal.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The current study was designed and executed according to the positivist paradigm, and adopted a quantitative approach to investigate link between antisocial personality, emotional intelligence, and aggressive behavior in students. The positivist approach is suitable for research that aims to provide objective measurement, hypothesis testing, and empirical explanation of relationships among variables statistically (Creswell, 2005). As such, the study is not only set to examine the relationships between the primary constructs, but also to examine the differences in the variables of interest across students' background variables; identify primary predictors of aggressive behavior; and test role of emotional intelligence as a mediator of relationship between antisocial personality and aggressive behavior but also overall learning climate and social harmony within institutions (Sullivan, 2024). A quantitative design was deemed most appropriate as it enables psychological and behavioral constructs to be quantified and examined statistically using analytical tools such as descriptive statistics, group comparison tests, correlation, regression as well as mediation analysis (Creswell, 2017).

Particularly, the study followed a descriptive, correlational, and cross-sectional survey design as such designs are suitable when the objectives of a study are to describe the levels of variables, investigate the naturally occurring relationships between variables, and gather information about variables from a population at given point in time without manipulating the research environment. Thus, the chosen research design was consistent with the purpose of the research and allowed the investigation of levels, differences, correlations, and prediction among the variables of interest. A self-administered structured questionnaire was considered suitable for the large-scale survey data collection, as it enables structured data collection, increases the comparability of responses, and can

yield information quickly (Rafiey & Salimi, 2020). The questionnaire was developed according to the best practice guidelines for the scale development and survey design (Boateng et al., 2021), in which items are developed from a theoretical foundation, consistent with the aims of research, and grouped into conceptually coherent sections to enhance the clarity and content of the survey items (Buss & Perry, 1992).

Table 1 District wise Sampling Frame

Provinces	Sampling Technique	Districted Selected	Allocation
Punjab	Multistage sampling	4	160
Khyber Pakhtunkhwa	Multistage sampling	3	120
Sindh	Multistage sampling	3	120
Baluchistan	Multistage sampling	4	160
Gilgit Baltistan	Multistage sampling	1	20
Islamabad	Utilization of college Cluster	1	20
Azad Jamu Kashmir	Multistage sampling	1	40
Total		17	660

Note. The table presents the sample allocation used in the study, not the fixed total number of districts in each province/territory. This approach was adopted because district counts may be revised administratively over time; therefore, the study reports the actual sampled units rather than relying on potentially outdated district totals.

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

This section provides the analysis of the statistical data gathered from study Antisocial Personality, Emotional Intelligence and Level of Aggressive Behavior among Students of Selected Colleges in Pakistan. This chapter is arranged following the research objectives. Included in the chapter are the following: the demographic profile of the respondents, the analysis of reliability of the instruments used, descriptive analysis, analysis of differences by background variables, correlation analysis to reach the conclusion.

Factor Analysis

An Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was performed to assess the structure of the self-developed instrument designed to assess antisocial personality traits, emotional intelligence & aggressiveness in the college sample. Before extraction of factors, it was determined that collected dataset could be submitted to factor analysis. Selected sample size (N = 620) following process of data screening proved appropriate, since it met the requirements for factor analytic studies. The high number of correlations of .3 and above was revealed using Correlation Matrix. Value of Kaiser-Meyer-Osklin measure of sampling adequacy was .83, exceeding the recommended value of .6 (Kaiser, 1974). Both 6 and Bartlett's sphericity test (Bartlett, 1954) were statistically significant. The findings revealed that the scale was a good fit for the three-factor model, in line with conceptual basis of the study. There was evidence of substantial loadings for each item under its respective dimension, reflecting adequate construct validity of questionnaire. Factor loadings were between 0.50 and 0.82, which is acceptable level (≥ 0.40), implying that items had appropriate relationships with their constructs.

Malik ... Antisocial Personality, Emotional

Cross-loading was insignificant since it was less than 0.30, confirming separation among the three factors. there were significant eigenvalues of more than 1.0 & factors explained about 58% to 65% of the total variance.

Descriptive Analysis

The characteristics of the demographic information and level of anti-social personality, emotional intelligence and tendency of aggressive behavior were described by descriptive analysis which are thus stated as fellow:

Table 2 Item Wise Analysis of the Antisocial Personality

Statements	Mean	SD
It is better for me to be alone than to interact with others	3.82	0.98
In most cases, I limit contact with my classmates or friends	3.77	1.01
I am comfortable when I do not engage in any socializing	3.81	0.96
I like avoiding group discussions and engaging in social events	3.67	1.06
I find it better to remain quiet despite having something to say	3.74	1.09
It is better for me to steer clear of large gatherings	3.89	0.96
It is better for me to stay away from conversations with people I don't know	3.72	1.03
I become anxious when interacting with new individuals	3.40	1.08
I need some time to adapt to new social environments	3.65	1.01
It is difficult for me to open up my mind to my family members	3.58	1.16
Sometimes, I solve my problems on my own without their help	3.77	1.00
I find it easy to separate my emotions from my family relationships	3.62	1.04
I am unsure of my personal strengths	3.30	1.07
I become doubtful of myself when dealing with new things	3.55	1.02
I find myself questioning my actions and decisions	3.36	1.06
I am not sure of my future objectives	3.55	1.01
I am confused about my professional aspirations	3.70	1.03
I am not sure of what I want out of life	3.82	1.01
Total	3.68	0.56

The table indicate assessment of antisocial personality characteristics among students at a college with a diverse background. With an average score of 3.68 (SD = 0.56), a high frequency of antisocial personality characteristics is observed, implying that most students have a tendency to behave in a manner consistent with antisocial personality traits, include social withdrawal and a lack of social engagement. The questions are scored at high frequency, further reinforcing trend observed in the average score. Students strongly agreed with statements such as "I prefer not to attend gatherings" (M = 3.88, SD = 0.95), I like being alone rather than hanging out with friends (M = 3.85, SD = 0.98), and "It is okay for me to distance myself from social events (M = 3.81, SD = 0.97).The high mean scores associated with restriction of interactions with fellow classmates (M = 3.78, SD = 1.02), reluctance to initiate conversation (M = 3.72, SD = 1.03), and unwillingness to take part in discussion groups (M = 3.69, SD = 1.05) are clear indicators that numerous students show declined level of social engagement and communication.

On the other hand, there are some questions relating to personal independence and uncertainty which also received high scores. For example, there were high levels of managing diverse problems individually ($M = 3.76, SD = 1.00$), emotional autonomy from the family environment ($M = 3.62, SD = 1.04$), and doubts regarding their future life goals and careers ($M = 3.82$ and 3.79 respectively). The above-mentioned issues reveal that antisocial behavior is related not only to social problems but also to the individual problems. With the exception of a few that fall within the moderate category, such as being nervous about meeting new people ($M = 3.40, SD = 1.08$) and lack of confidence in one's abilities ($M = 3.30, SD = 1.09$), none of these can be considered to have an effect on the overall theme. They rather point out that despite the presence of the moderate challenges, the behavioral trait still remains antisocial.

Table 3 Descriptive Statistics for Emotional Intelligence

Statements	Mean	SD
I analyze my feelings in order to understand myself	3.71	1.01
I express my feelings very clearly to others	3.50	1.08
I can adapt quickly to a new environment	3.61	1.02
I am able to solve my problems calmly	3.58	1.03
I am able to stay positive in any situation	3.67	1.01
I attempt to understand others' feelings before taking any action	3.49	1.10
I am always cool in stressful circumstances	3.67	1.01
I am able to handle my anger properly	3.81	1.05
I handle my difficulties in a step-by-step manner	3.48	0.98
I talk to a friend when I am stressed out	3.10	1.01
I take advice from others to cope with my stress	3.58	1.03
I have clear awareness about my feelings	3.71	1.07
I am able to communicate my feelings properly	3.76	0.98
I feel comfortable dealing with my feelings	3.59	0.95
I am aware of the feelings of others	3.71	0.93
I have positive relations with other students	3.66	1.08
I am sympathetic to those who feel bad	3.21	1.11
I remain calm during academic/personal stress	3.47	1.08
I am able to control myself despite being provoked	3.21	1.12
I am able to make decisions based on emotions and logical reasoning	3.67	1.04
total	3.64	0.58

The table demonstrated a detailed assessment on emotional intelligence among college students using mean scores and Standard deviation. The mean value of 3.64 ($SD = 0.58$) means that, generally, students have a medium level of emotional intelligence and can perceive, control, and express their emotions, but not always at highest level. A detailed analysis of individual questions suggests some differences in various types of emotional intelligence. There were several questions, demonstrating good skills in interpersonal relations and empathy. The high probability of showing empathy when other people feel distressed ($M = 3.84, SD = 0.93$), was highest mean value, confirmed that students' excellent interpersonal skills. Students were quite competent in maintaining positive interpersonal relations with peers ($M = 3.81, SD = 0.95$) and thinking about people emotions prior to reacting to

situation (M = 3.80, SD = 0.96). Other high-level questions included willingness to take advice on managing stress (M = 3.76, SD = 0.99), reflection on one's own emotions (M = 3.72, SD = 1.01), discussion with trusted people in cases of stress (M = 3.71, SD = 1.05), and empathizing with other people feelings (M = 3.70, SD = 0.98).

However, most of the items represent moderate category, emphasizing average skills in particular areas. Specifically, learners exhibit average ability to remain optimistic when confronted with hard conditions (M = 3.67, SD = 1.00), balance between emotions and rational thinking when making decisions (M = 3.66, SD = 1.00), and recognize their emotions (M = 3.65, SD = 1.02). Furthermore, other skills like adapting to different surroundings (M = 3.60, SD = 1.02), solving problems rationally (M = 3.58, SD = 1.03), and conveying emotions adequately (M = 3.57, SD = 1.03) demonstrate the average degree of development. The dealing with problems systematically (M = 3.55, SD = 1.01), expressing feelings openly (M = 3.51, SD = 1.08), and being self-confident while managing emotions (M = 3.50, SD = 1.07) serve as additional indicators of average emotional skills. There are also some points included in the low level. It refers to low skills in dealing with provocation (M = 3.33, SD = 1.12) and managing anger effectively (M = 3.39, SD = 1.10). This shows that skills related to emotional regulation during intense and stressful periods of time are quite low among participants. Also, even though they have been included in moderate level, lower mean scores were found in terms of maintaining composure during stressful events (M = 3.42, SD = 1.08) and while feeling pressure at school or personally (M = 3.49, SD = 1.04).

Table 4 Item Wise Analysis of Aggressive Behavior Related Items

Statements	Mean	SD
I find it hard to control my anger	3.72	1.02
I feel that people treat me biased.	3.56	1.05
I find it difficult to trust those around me	3.58	1.04
I tend to speak loudly when I am angry	3.74	1.05
I get frustrated when things do not work out as planned	3.81	1.07
I get offended easily if I am criticized	3.60	1.00
Sometimes, I may even physically lash out when I am extremely angry	3.05	0.98
I get easily irritated by trivial matters	3.69	1.03
I get angry if I feel disrespected	3.78	1.14
I find it difficult to refrain from lashing out angrily	3.66	1.01
I engage in activities involve taking risks despite knowing that it led to trouble	3.22	0.98
I have urges to throw or hit anything that is within my reach when I am furious	2.85	1.04
I insist on having the last word during an argument even if I am wrong	3.54	1.09
I find it difficult to relax my muscles after getting upset	3.34	1.06
I continue dwelling on incidents that make me furious	3.61	1.05
I find it difficult to keep calm physically if provoked	3.57	1.02
I react spontaneously when I feel extreme anger	3.48	1.07
Total	3.57	0.60

The above table presents a summary of the assessment of antisocial behaviors exhibited by college students. With a mean of 3.57 (SD=0.60), there is high prevalence of antisocial behaviors among the

Malik ... Antisocial Personality, Emotional

university students, meaning that many individuals show strong characteristics of becoming easily angered, irritable, emotionally reactive. A large number of items were rated at high point, showing significant challenges in managing emotional responses. For example, the students experienced high levels of frustration with failure to meet their expectations ($M=3.81, SD=0.98$), reacted strongly in cases of being disrespected ($M=3.78, SD=0.99$), shouted when angry ($M=3.74, SD=1.00$). Moreover, difficulty with anger control ($M=3.72, SD=1.02$), irritation with insignificant things ($M=3.69, SD=1.01$) suggest high reactivity.

Additionally, high ratings were found in cognitive-emotional items such as perceptions of being treated unfairly ($M = 3.65, SD = 1.05$), inability to control anger reactions ($M = 3.66, SD = 1.04$), and brooding about anger-provoking situations ($M = 3.62, SD = 1.02$). It proves that antisocial behavior does not reveal itself in external expressions but continues on internal level for negative thoughts. Some items are moderately rated as they represent behaviors that students exhibit in different ways or to different extents. They are impulsive actions ($M = 3.48, SD = 1.07$), inability to stay physically calm ($M = 3.57, SD = 1.05$), and continuing a debate until one feel that one has been right ($M = 3.55, SD = 1.06$). Also, risk taking behavior ($M = 3.22, SD = 1.09$) and bodily actions while experiencing extreme anger ($M = 3.05, SD = 1.14$) are also examples of moderate rating. This small selection of items is linked with low-intensity range, including feeling of desire to throw or hit something ($M = 2.85, SD = 1.16$). Thus, it appears that while aggressive ideation is evident, overt displays of aggression are not particularly common.

Correlation Analysis

To identify the strength of relationship between variables antisocial personality traits, emotional intelligence & aggressive behavior, Pearson correlation was utilized. Initial analyses were performed to ensure the normality, repeatability, and homogeneity of variance assumptions were not accused of the violating.

Table 5 Correlation among Factors (N=620)

Key factors	1	2	3
Antisocial personality	1	0.46**	0.58**
Emotional intelligence		1	-0.52**
Aggressive Behavior			1

** The correlation is significant to the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* The correlation is significant to the level of 0.05 (2-tailed)

Pearson correlation analysis was used to establish the relationships between antisocial personality features, emotional intelligence, and aggressive behavior among the college students. First, there is a medium negative correlation between antisocial personality features and emotional intelligence ($r = -0.46, p < 0.01$). Hence, the presence of antisocial features among college students correlates negatively with ability of those students to understand and control emotions. Specifically, people who like to stay alone, do not want social contact, and feel insecure about themselves cannot be considered emotionally intelligent individuals. Second, a high positive correlation amid antisocial personality features and aggression was identified ($r = 0.58, p < 0.01$). In other words, the higher the

level of antisocial features in students, the greater the possibility of aggressive behavior. Aggression refers to such phenomena as irritability, aggressiveness, and frustration. The third correlation that is important in this analysis is a medium negative one between emotional intelligence and aggression ($r = -0.52, p < 0.01$). Consequently, it implies that students with higher emotional intelligence tend to avoid aggression.

CONCLUSION

In current research study, an extensive empirical investigation of the antisocial personality traits, emotional intelligence, and aggression has been conducted among university students in Pakistan. Through a quantitative approach and a cross-sectional study design under the positivist paradigm, the researcher has successfully measured the constructs in addition to determine the relationships between them. The outcomes revealed that the participants have quite high levels of the antisocial personality traits and aggression, along with a medium level of emotional intelligence. In other words, the data revealed an unbalanced condition in which the emotional skills cannot adequately cope with the tendency of the antisocial behavior, impulsiveness, and emotional instability. In this drive, the descriptive data revealed that most of the participants suffer from problems related to the social interaction, emotion management & self-awareness—key aspects of psychological adaptation in the adolescence.

Correlational analysis helped provide deeper insights into the relationships between the variables. It was revealed that antisocial personality characteristics have positive correlation with aggression, meaning that the higher levels of impulsiveness, aggressiveness, and hostility toward people and institutions, the greater chances of aggression. On other hand, emotional intelligence had inverse relationship with antisocial features and aggression. This result showed that emotionally intelligent young people are unlikely to develop antisocial behaviors. As can be seen from the above research, emotional intelligence acts as vital regulator, while antisocial personality traits act as important risk factor when it comes to aggression. The relations between these aspects might shed some light on influence of emotions and society on shaping behavior in youth. Moreover, this current research adds to empirical material since it included the Pakistani youth sample which is poorly represented in empirical studies.

Acknowledgement: This research paper is extracted from Research Grant Project of Punjab University, for Year 2025-2026.

REFERENCES

- Alfiasari, M. R. (2017). The emotional socialization and emotional intelligence prevent aggressive behavior among school-age children in the rural family. *Journal of Child Development Studies*, 2460, 2310.
- Amran, A., Rathakrishnan, B., Singh, S. S., Kamaluddin, M. R., Yahaya, A., & Rahman, Z. (2023). The emotional intelligence as a mediator between parenting style and antisocial behavior among youth in Malaysia. *Sustainability*, 15 (17), 12811.
- Archer, J., & Coyne, S. M. (2005). An integrated review of indirect, relational, and social aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 9 (3), 212-230.

- Antoñanzas, J. L. (2020). The relationship of personality, emotional intelligence, and aggressiveness in students: a study using big five personality questionnaire for children and adults. *European journal of investigation in health, psychology and education*, 11(1), 1-11.
- Bartlett, M. S. (1954). A note on the multiplying factors for various χ^2 approximations. *Journal of Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 296-298.
- Babbie, E. (1998). *The Practice of Social Research* 8th edition (Wadsworth, Belmont, CA).
- Babbie, E. (2001). *The practice of social research*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Babbie, E. (2005). *The Basics of Research*. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Bagozzi, R. P., Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Canonical correlation analysis as a special case of a structural relations model. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 16 (4), 437-454.
- Baron, J. (1994). Judgements of compensation for misfortune: the role of expectation. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 24 (5), 525-539.
- Bar-On, R. (1997). *BarOn emotional quotient inventory*. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.
- Bar-On, R. (2002). *EQ-i BarOn Emotional Quotient Inventory: A Measure of Emotional Intelligence: User's Manual*. MHS.
- Boateng, M. F. (2021). *A Clinical Practice Guideline for Measuring Quality of Life in Patients with Depression and Anxiety* (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University).
- Blair, J., Mitchell, D., and Blair, K. (2005). *The Psychopath: emotion and the Brain*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Boduszek, D., McLaughlin, C., & Hyland, P. (2011). Criminal attitudes of ex- prisoners: The role of personality, anti-social friends and recidivism. *Internet Journal of Criminology*, 9, 1-10.
- Borg, W. R., and Gall, M. D. (1979). *An introduction to educational research*. Borum, R. (2010). *Understanding terrorist psychology. The psychology of counter- terrorism*, 19-33.
- Buss, A. H., & Perry, M. (1992). The aggression questionnaire. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 63 (3), 452.
- Chachar, A. S., & Mian, A. I. (2022). A review of intersection of social determinants and child and adolescent mental health services: a case for the social psychiatry in Pakistan. *World Social Psychiatry*, 4 (2), 69-77.
- Champion, K. M., & Clay, D. L. (2007). Individual differences in responses to provocation and frequent victimization by peers. *Child Psychiatry & Human Development*, 37 (3), 205-220.
- Chatfield, C. (1995). Model Uncertainty, data mining and statistical inference. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, series B*, 158, 419-466.
- Cherian, V. I. (1990). Birth order and academic achievement of children in Transkei. *Psychological Reports*, 66 (1), 19-24.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2005). Mixed methods research: Developments, debates, and dilemmas. *Research in organizations: Foundations and methods of inquiry*, 2, 315-326.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach*. Sage publications.
- García-Sancho, E., Salguero, J. M., & Fernández-Berrocal, P. (2014). Relationship between emotional intelligence & aggression: A systematic review. *Aggression & violent Behavior*, 19 (5), 584-591.
- Goleman, D., & Cherniss, C. (2001). *Emotionally intelligent workplace: How to select for, measure, and improve emotional intelligence in individuals, groups, and organizations*. Jossey-Bass.

- Goundar, S. (2012). Research methodology and research method. *Victoria University of Wellington*, 1(1), 1-47.
- Hare, R. D., Hart, S. D., & Harpur, T. J. (1991). Psychopathy and the DSM-IV criteria for antisocial personality disorder. *Journal of abnormal psychology*, 100(3), 391.
- Holmes, S. E., Slaughter, J. R., & Kashani, J. (2001). Risk factors in childhood that lead to the development of conduct disorder and antisocial personality disorder. *Child psychiatry and human development*, 31(3), 183-193.
- Hussein, A. R., Acquah, E. O., & Musah, M. B. (2019). Testing the cross-cultural validity of Schutte self-report emotional intelligence test (SSEIT) scale. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 9(12), 835-847.
- Khawar, R., & Malik, F. (2016). Bullying behavior of Pakistani pre-adolescents: Findings based on Olweus questionnaire. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*, 31(1), 23.
- Lee, K., Ashton, M. C., & Shin, K. H. (2005). Personality correlates of workplace anti-social behavior. *Applied Psychology*, 54(1), 81-98.
- Malik, S., Mihm, B., Pesando, L. M., & Sucholodetz, A. (2025). Lost Connections: The Economic and Social Impacts of Early-Life Mental Health. McHale, S. M., Updegraff, K. A., and Whiteman, S. D. (2012). Sibling relationships and influences in childhood and adolescence. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 74(5), 913-930.
- McLeod, B. D., Wood, J. J., and Weisz, J. R. (2007). Examining the association between parenting and childhood anxiety: A meta-analysis. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 27(2), 155-172.
- Meier, M. H., Slutske, W. S., Arndt, S., and Cadoret, R. J. (2008). Impulsive and callous traits are more strongly associated with delinquent behavior in higher risk neighborhoods among boys and girls. *Journal of abnormal psychology*, 117(2), 377.
- Rafiey, H., Alipour, F., Lebeau, R., & Salimi, Y. (2020). Development and validation of the antisocial traits scale in the general population. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 47(3), 369-380.
- Roland, E. (2002). Aggression, depression, and bullying others. *Aggressive Behavior*, 28(3), 198-206.
- Sample, M. (2017). *Emotional intelligence and decision-making as predictors of antisocial behavior*. Andrews University.
- Salmon, G., James, A., and Smith, D. M. (1998). Bullying in schools: self-reported anxiety, depression, and self-esteem in secondary school children. *BMJ*, 317(7163), 924-925.
- Salovey, P., and Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, cognition and personality*, 9(3), 185-211.
- Salovey, P., Bedell, B. T., Detweiler, J. B., and Mayer, J. D. (1999). Coping intelligently. *Coping: The psychology of what works*, 141-164.
- Sullivan, S. D. (2024). Correlational designs. In *Research methods in special education* (pp. 113-130). Routledge.
- Vega, A., Cabello, R., Megías, A., Gómez, R., & Fernández-Berrocal, P. (2022). Emotional intelligence and aggressive behaviors in adolescents: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 23(4), 1173-1183.
- Walsh, A., & Wu, H. H. (2008). Differentiating antisocial personality disorder, psychopathy, and sociopathy: Evolutionary, genetic, neurological, and sociological considerations. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 21(2), 135-152.