1Journal Homepage: -www.journalijar.com

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH (IJAR)

Article DOI:10.21474/IJAR01/19798
DOI URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/19798

RESEARCH ARTICLE

PREDICTION OF CRIMINAL TENDENCIES BYSOCIAL MEDIA USAGE AND PERSONALITYCHARACTERISTICS

Aiswarya Satheesh[1], Alina Prem[1], Devananda K.P[1] and Dr. Mayuri Sahay[2]
[1]MSc Forensic Science Graduates, Department of Forensic Science, Garden City University, Bangalore, India.
[2]Assistant Professor,Department of Forensic Science, Garden City University, Bangalore, India.

Manuscript Info

Manuscript History
Received: 30 August 2024
Final Accepted: 30 September 2024
Published: October 2024

Key words:-
Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Regression Analysis, Criminal Tendencies

Abstract

Youth criminal activities and social media use have a convoluted relationship that is dependent on many factors. It is possible to predict that many people will continue to benefit from understanding the unique relationship between criminal tendencies and social media use. This study aims on hearing if social media use among the youth could be directly attributed to personality traits related with the Big Five model and general criminal behavior A questionnaire was administered to youngsters without any severe psychiatric diagnoses or criminal convictions, assessing their habits on social media and measuring their personality and criminal tendencies. Weak positive correlations were found between social media use and Extraversion, Agreeableness, Openness,and Emotional stability as personality traits. Conscientiousness showed an inverse relation with criminal tendencies, while emotional stability demonstrated a positive correlation: $r = 0.230$, $p = 0.018$. The criminal tendency was weakly correlated to the usage of social media, and the correlation was not statistically significant: $r = 0.081$, $p = 0.409$. Instead, regression analysis indicated that a model containing conscientiousness, openness, and emotional stability explained the maximum variance in criminal tendencies. These findings might indicate that the personality traits influence more on delinquent behaviors of adolescents compared to the influences of social media usage, although these relationships are still not clear. In addition, the current research also highlights a point that extraversion, agreeableness, neuroticism, and finally social media addiction are positively correlated. This study raises the need for further research toward an understanding of the complex relationship between personality, social media engagement, and criminal behavior in view of third variables that can have an intervening effect.

Introduction:-

The intersection of an individual's exposure on the internet and their propensity to commit crime has gradually become an important area of interest among researchers and policymakers in the digital information age. Social media has influenced radicalization, a variety of inappropriate behaviors, and a subset of deviant behaviors (Kierkegaard, 2008). College students addicted to social media are less likely to perform well academically and are

Corresponding Author:-Dr. Mayuri Sahay
Address:-Assistant Professor, Department of Forensic Science, Garden City University, Bangalore, India.

less satisfied with the quality of their relationships (Tsitsika, 2011; Luca Milani, 2009). As social media usage has become ubiquitous, diverse academicians have begun to examine how the virtual setting may impact and reflect personality and even deviant behavior (Azucar et al., 2018; Bowden-Green et al., 2021; Stachl et al., 2020). Over the years, the general public's overall interest in social media has enabled the development of massive reservoirs of user data, providing insights into human behavior that were previously unimaginable (Stachl et al., 2020). This data has been shown to be a robust predictor of personality traits, ranging from mere social media postings to the content shared on these platforms (Azucar et al., 2018).

General personality traits have also been highly investigated, indicating low agreeableness, high impulsivity, and weak self-control as having strong relations with proneness to offend. The Big Five personality features have already been shown to strongly correlate with social media user behavior (Azucar, 2018). For example, extroverted people have more activities in social media than introverted people and have more friends in it than introverted ones do. For example, extroverted people do have more activities in the social media in comparison to. High neuroticism is associated with revealing more personal details, using social media passively to get to know others, and using more negative language in posts (Seidman, 2013; Schwartz). Conversely, agreeable individuals are likely to post photographs that convey a positive attitude and express more positive content in their posts (Schwartz; Liu, 2016). People with higher conscientiousness are very cautious in maintaining their social media accounts, post fewer pictures, and participate in fewer group activities (Kosinski, 2014; Amichai-Hamburger, 2010). On the other hand, individuals who score high on openness have larger networks and are more likely to engage with social media content (Quercia, 2012; Bachrach, 2012).

In real life, the personality–criminal propensity relationship has been documented, and the social media setting opened new dimensions to this relationship. Other than this, it is also disclosed of researchers that information about psychological structure, even the one concerning the personalitystructure of a human being, can be drawn from a digital trace posted on. This suggests that the patterns of usage and content generation in social media could be a rich vein of research information related to an individual's propensity toward unlawful conduct.For example, a predisposition to criminal behavior is less likely in individuals who are rated highly for openness and extraversion dimensions (Bowden-Green et al., 2021).

More importantly, the digital traces may be able to prove the likelihood of criminal activity within a person. In accordance with studies, certain usage patterns in social media may point out increased risks for the development of antisocial behavior, meaning violent or antisocial feelings together with targeted actions(Stachl et al., 2020). In the understanding of personality and the relationship to social media usage, it is that scientists and other policymakers are better placed toward developing more effective models in predicting criminal tendencies. This understanding can have key implications for the development of targeted intervention strategies and prevention programs and hence a safer and more secure society.

The relationship between social media use, personality traits, and criminal tendencies is a very complex area of research. While the literature to date suggests the links between these constructs are important to understand for adequately predicting criminal behavior(Kim et al., 2013; Bowden-Green et al., 2021; Stachl et al., 2020), using the rich data embedded within social networking websites in conjunction with theories of personality and crime can themselves enable the development of powerful predictive models. Such models can be used in the process of policy decisions to improve public safety (Azucar et al., 2018; Kranenbarg et al., 2023). Theoretically, such models could flag people at higher risk of engaging in criminal behavior and provide the opportunity for more focused interventions. On the other hand, knowledge about the links between social media usage, personality dimensions, and criminal tendencies might enable insight into the contemporary societal complexities standing behind law-breaking. This would assist in the evolution of better methods to fight crime by integrated approaches and contribute to a safer society.

Methodology:-

Thisstudyexaminedtherelationshipsbetweensocialmediausage,criminaltendenciesandthe big five personality traits, to understand how personality traits influence an individual’s social media usage on criminal behavior.

Participants:

The study comprised of105 young adults in the age range of 18-30. There are 46 men, 19.6 per cent of them are under 21; 47.8 per cent are between 21–25 and 32.6 per cent are 25 and over. There are 49 women, 22.0 per cent are below

21, 47.5 per cent are between 21–25 while 30.5 per cent fall within the range of over 25 years. Both male and female groups total 100% within their respective categories. Participants self-reported their age, gender, educational qualification as well as the whole form. The questionnaire was distributed by google forms. Links posted across emails, social media platforms and educational forms. Before participation consent was obtained from all the participants.

Measures:
The key constructs were measured through, 1. Socialmediausepatternsandengagement levels,2. Personalitytrait and social media usage, 3. Criminaltendencies and social media usage.

Social media use patterns:
To assess the social media use patterns two questions were used in the whole questionnaire.

Personality traits and social media usage:
To assess the personality traits associated with social media use, twelve items were developed based on the Ten Item Personality Inventory. Extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, and openness are the five qualities that make up the Big Five-factor model. Each of these characteristics corresponds to two statements on the ten-item personality inventory scale (Samuel D. Gosling, 2003). Rate each item on a Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Criminal Tendencies and social media usage:
To assess the criminal tendencies association with social media usage, sixteen questions were used in the questionnaire. Rated each item on a Likert scale of 1 (Never) to 5 (Always).

Procedure:
Participants were informed about the data confidentiality and data protection on the initial page of the form. They were also informed about their right to withdraw from the study at any moment and the procedures involved. A consent form was also added on the initial page itself. For any questions, the researcher's contact information was also supplied. Additionally, background data on gender, age, and education was gathered from the second page of the online poll. The following page displayed the questionnaire with the three measures if the participant chooses to continue and finish the inventories. All of the collected data was exported to a Microsoft Excel document and then imported into an SPSS data file for examination.

Data analysis:
The obtained data will be analyzed in terms of looking for associations between personality traits, criminal tendencies and social media engagement levels. Correlational analyses will be conducted regarding these relationships.

InternalConsistency:
The research utilizedaquestionnairecomprising30items,designedtoassesspersonalitytraitsbasedonthe Ten-Item Personality Inventory, with questions also including criminal tendency and social mediaengagementlevels.ThereliabilityofthequestionnairewasconfirmedwithaCronbach's alphaof0.834, indicatingahighlevelofinternalconsistency.Thisrobustmeasureprovideda reliable foundation for examining the complex interactions between personality, social media use, and potential criminal behavior in this demographic.

Cronbach's Alpha	Noofitems
0.834	30

Results:-
Most participantswere within the age bracket of 21-25 years, 47.80 % males, and 47.50 % females(See table 1). As far as the educational stream is concerned, there are representations from the Science Stream, Engineering, Commerce, and Others. Science Stream forms the greatest percentage of participants at 43.50% for males and 50.80% for females. Other streams were Engineering, with a participation of 34.80% males and 32.20% females. The overall distribution is almost equally distributed between the genders and shows a flawless depiction of age and educational background, with an increased concentration in the science stream and among the age group of 21-25(See table 1).

The findings of the Chi-Square test show a strong relationship between various psychological variables and their clustering on a 'Low'/'High' continuum. These personality traits are significantly correlated with high social media usage with majority of individuals falling into this category. Chi-Square values for Social Media usage was 33.152 with the significance of 0, showing an important connection. Most of them, 78.1%, are in the high usage category. There is a significant relation in Extraversion with a Chi-Square value of 6.943 and a significance level of 0.008; 62.9% were found in the high Extraversion category. Agreeableness has a Chi-Square value of 45.343, and a significance level of 0, showing that there is a significant association; 82.9% fell into the high category **(See table 2)**. Furthermore, conscientiousness is strongly related to a Chi-Square value of 72.086 with a significance level of 0, wherein 91.4% are in the high category. Openness has a Chi-Square value of 85.952 with a significance level of 0, whereby 95.2% are in the high category. Emotional Stability has a Chi-Square value of 40.238 with a significance level of 0, whereby 81% are in the high category. On criminal tendencies, the Chi-Square value is 59.438, where the level of significance is 0, wherein 87.6% fall in the low category.

Table 1:- Demographic distribution of participants by age, gender, and educational stream.

Variable	Category	Gender	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Ages	<21	Male	9	19.60%
		Female	13	22.00%
	21-25	Male	22	47.80%
		Female	28	47.50%
	25+	Male	15	32.60%
		Female	18	30.50%
Educational Stream	Science	Male	20	43.50%
		Female	30	50.80%
	Engineering	Male	16	34.80%
		Female	19	32.20%
	Commerce	Male	7	15.20%
		Female	7	11.90%
	Others	Male	3	6.50%
		Female	3	5.10%
Total Count			105	100%

Table 2:- Analysis of chi-square test results for various psychological variables.

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Chi-Square	df	Asymp. Sig.
Social media	Low	23	21.9	33.152	1	0
	High	82	78.1			
	Total	105	100			
Extraversion	Low	39	37.1	6.943	1	0.008
	High	66	62.9			
	Total	105	100			
Agreeableness	Low	18	17.1	45.343	1	0
	High	87	82.9			
	Total	105	100			
Conscientiousness	Low	9	8.6	72.086	1	0
	High	96	91.4			
	Total	105	100			
Openness	Low	5	4.8	85.952	1	0
	High	100	95.2			
	Total	105	100			
Emotional Stability	Low	20	19	40.238	1	0
	High	85	81			
	Total	105	100			
Criminal Tendencies	Low	92	87.6	59.438	1	0
	High	13	12.4			
	Total	105	100			

Table 3:- Correlation analysis between personality variables, social media usage, and criminal tendencies.

Variable	Correlation with Social media	Sig. (Social media)	Correlation with Criminal Tendencies	Sig. (Criminal Tendencies)
Extraversion (P1)	0.296	0.002	-0.158	0.108
Agreeableness (P2)	0.323	0.001	-0.242	0.013
Conscientiousness (P3)	0.045	0.652	-0.53	0
Openness (P4)	0.209	0.032	-0.478	0
Emotional Stability (P5)	0.211	0.03	0.23	0.018
Social media	1		0.081	0.409
Criminal Tendencies	0.081	0.409	1	

Comparison of social media usage and personality traits across three age groups: under 21, 21-25, and over 25 with the variables are social media usage, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, openness, emotional stability, and, lastly, criminal tendencies reveals social media usage is highest in the 21-25 age category, at 7.06, followed by under 21, at 6.77, and lowest in the 25+ group, at 6.18, but these differences are not significant ($F = 2.221$, Sig. = 0.114). All extraversion scores are very similar across the age groups and, as such, there are no significant differences ($F = 0.071$, Sig. = 0.931). Moreover, agreeableness, conscientiousness, openness, and emotional stability were not distributed based on the age factor: $F = 0.033$, Sig. = 0.968; $F = 1.212$, Sig. = 0.302; $F = 2.28$, Sig. = 0.107; $F = 0.376$, Sig. = 0.688, respectively(See table 5). It means that criminal tendencies are higher in the age group of 21-25 years category with a value of 25.48 compared to that in under 21 years of 5.18 and over 25 years of 11.76, but again, the difference is not significant ($F = 1.664$, Sig. = 0.195). Therefore, on the whole, one can say that the trend for social media usage and personality traits is more or less uniform.

Table 4:- Gender differences in personality variables, social media usage, and criminal tendencies.

Variable	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
Social Media	Male	46	6.6304	1.88984	0.27864	-0.447	103	0.656	-0.16618
	Female	59	6.7966	1.89172	0.24628				
Extraversion (P1)	Male	46	5.7174	1.96257	0.28937	-0.901	103	0.37	-0.35041
	Female	59	6.0678	1.99019	0.2591				
Agreeableness (P2)	Male	46	6.6522	1.95752	0.28862	-0.54	103	0.59	-0.19528
	Female	59	6.8475	1.74013	0.22655				
Conscientiousness (P3)	Male	46	7.6522	2.11048	0.31117	-0.114	103	0.91	-0.04274
	Female	59	7.6949	1.74449	0.22711				
Openness (P4)	Male	46	8.9348	1.74359	0.25708	-1.796	103	0.076	-0.5059
	Female	59	9.4407	1.13367	0.14759				
Emotional Stability (P5)	Male	46	7.5217	2.2185	0.3271	-0.008	103	0.993	-0.00368
	Female	59	7.5254	2.20779	0.28743				
Criminal Tendencies	Male	46	24.7174	12.57628	1.85427	0.503	103	0.616	1.10722
	Female	59	23.6102	9.99486	1.30122				

Correlation coefficients for different personality variables in the relation to social media usage and criminal tendencies shows that extraversion has a positive significant correlation with social media usage, $r = 0.296$, $p = 0.002$, and a negative correlation with criminal tendencies, $r = -0.158$, $p = 0.108$.Notice that agreeableness is strongly positively correlated with social media use ($r = 0.323$, $p = 0.001$) and negatively correlated with criminal tendencies ($r = –0.242$, $p = 0.013$). On the other side, conscientiousness (P3) does not correlate significantly with social media use but does so negatively with criminal tendencies(See table 3). There is a positive significant

correlation between openness (P4) and social media usage (r = 0.209, p = 0.032) and a negative significant correlation with criminal tendencies (r = -0.479, p = 0). Emotional Stability (P5) demonstrated a positive significant correlation with social media usage, r = 0.211, p = 0.03, and a positive correlation with criminal tendencies, r = 0.23, p = 0.018. Social Media usage is related non-significantly positively to criminal tendencies: r = 0.081, p = 0.409.

Table 5:- Analysis of personality traits and social media use by age group.

Variable	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Sum of Squares (Between Groups)	Mean Square (Between Groups)	F	Sig.
Social media	<21	22	6.7727	2.26635	0.48319	15.398	7.699	2.221	0.114
	21-25	50	7.06	1.54405	0.21836				
	25+	33	6.1818	2.00709	0.34939				
	Total	105	6.7238	1.88361	0.18382				
Extraversion (P1)	<21	22	5.7727	2.20242	0.46956	0.566	0.283	0.071	0.931
	21-25	50	5.96	1.9162	0.27099				
	25+	33	5.9394	1.96754	0.3425				
	Total	105	5.9143	1.97637	0.19287				
Agreeableness (P2)	<21	22	6.8182	2.12998	0.45411	0.225	0.113	0.033	0.968
	21-25	50	6.78	1.75301	0.24791				
	25+	33	6.697	1.79382	0.31226				
	Total	105	6.7619	1.832	0.17878				
Conscientiousness (P3)	<21	22	7.2727	2.29247	0.48876	8.748	4.374	1.212	0.302
	21-25	50	7.6	1.86263	0.26342				
	25+	33	8.0606	1.65717	0.28848				
	Total	105	7.6762	1.90392	0.1858				
Openness (P4)	<21	22	8.6818	1.83579	0.39139	9.327	4.663	2.28	0.107
	21-25	50	9.26	1.56244	0.22096				
	25+	33	9.5152	0.75503	0.13143				
	Total	105	9.219	1.44768	0.14128				
Emotional Stability (P5)	<21	22	7.3636	2.49848	0.53268	3.686	1.843	0.376	0.688
	21-25	50	7.72	2.02071	0.28577				
	25+	33	7.3333	2.30036	0.40044				
	Total	105	7.5238	2.20181	0.21488				
Criminal Tendencies	<21	22	25.3182	11.44089	2.43921	408.886	204.443	1.664	0.195
	21-25	50	25.48	12.74113	1.80187				
	25+	33	21.1818	7.56412	1.31674				
	Total	105	24.0952	11.15582	1.0887				
df(between groups) =2									

Comparison of social media usage and personality traits among students in various educational streams: science, engineering, commerce, and other shows that the highest usage of social media is among Science students with a mean score of 6.98, while it is the lowest in Engineering with 6.15, though not significant with F = 0.706 and Sig. = 0.551. There are no significant differences in relation to Extraversion and Agreeableness scores on P1 and P2 among streams respectively(See table 6), with F = 0.331 and Sig. = 0.803, and F = 0.779 and Sig. = 0.508. While there was some variation in conscientiousness, P3 was only slightly higher in Science with 7.71 and Engineering with 7.45; differences here were not significant with F = 0.895, Sig. = 0.447. Openness, P4, and Emotional Stability, P5, were consistent across streams with no significant differences: F = 0.216, Sig. = 0.885; F = 0.988, Sig. = 0.402. Criminal tendencies are highest in the Other category, at 30.83, and lowest in Science, at 23.42, with no significant difference: F = 0.891, Sig. = 0.448. In general, no significant differences in social media usage and personality traits among students from different educational streams have been found.

Results of the regression analysis on the influence of personality traits on a given outcome variable across three models shows that there is a significant negative effect of Conscientiousness on the outcome variable (Model 1): B = –3.108, Beta = –0.530, t = –6.351, p < 0.001. This model explains 28.1% of the variance with R^2 = 0.281 and Adjusted R^2 = 0.274.Model 2 introduces Openness, which also exerts a negative influence on the outcome variable:

B = −2.169, Beta = −0.282, t = −3.016, p = 0.003. Conscientiousness still is a significant predictor: B = −2.271, Beta = −0.388, t = −4.153, p < 0.001(See table 7). This model explains 34.0% of the variance: $R^2 = 0.340$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.327$.Model 3 includes Emotional Stability, which remains positive: B = 1.128, Beta = 0.223, t = 2.797, p = 0.006. The rest of the significant predictors remain from before: Conscientiousness, B = –1.990, Beta = –0.340, t = –3.962, p < 0.001; Openness, B = –2.517, Beta = –0.327, t = –3.559, p = 0.001. The model explained 38.8% of variance, $R^2 = 0.388$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.369$.Finally, using the backward elimination method, it is shown that only conscientiousness and openness negatively predict the outcome, and emotional stability positively.

Table 6:- Personality traits and social media use analysis by educational stream.

Variable	Educational Stream	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Sum of Squares (Between Groups)	Mean Square (Between Groups)	F	Sig.
Social media	Science	50	6.98	1.74368	0.24659	7.577	2.526	0.706	0.551
	Engineering	35	6.5143	2.10561	0.35591				
	Commerce	14	6.2857	1.89852	0.5074				
	Others	6	6.8333	1.7224	0.70317				
	Total	105	6.7238	1.88361	0.18382				
Extraversion (P1)	Science	50	6.04	1.90552	0.26948	3.951	1.317	0.331	0.803
	Engineering	35	5.7143	2.13612	0.36107				
	Commerce	14	6.1429	1.46009	0.39023				
	Others	6	5.5	2.88097	1.17615				
	Total	105	5.9143	1.97637	0.19287				
Agreeableness (P2)	Science	50	6.84	1.82231	0.25771	7.894	2.631	0.779	0.508
	Engineering	35	6.7714	1.98651	0.33578				
	Commerce	14	6.9286	1.07161	0.2864				
	Others	6	5.6667	2.42212	0.98883				
	Total	105	6.7619	1.832	0.17878				
Conscientiousness (P3)	Science	50	7.7	1.68123	0.23776	9.757	3.252	0.895	0.447
	Engineering	35	7.4571	2.14672	0.36286				
	Commerce	14	8.3571	1.54955	0.41413				
	Others	6	7.1667	2.85774	1.16667				
	Total	105	7.6762	1.90392	0.1858				
Openness (P4)	Science	50	9.18	1.61232	0.22802	1.391	0.464	0.216	0.885
	Engineering	35	9.2857	0.95706	0.16177				
	Commerce	14	9.3571	1.15073	0.30755				
	Others	6	8.8333	2.85774	1.16667				
	Total	105	9.219	1.44768	0.14128				
Emotional Stability (P5)	Science	50	7.82	2.05724	0.29094	14.377	4.792	0.988	0.402
	Engineering	35	7.0857	2.4659	0.41681				
	Commerce	14	7.2857	2.09132	0.55893				
	Others	6	8.1667	1.94079	0.79232				
	Total	105	7.5238	2.20181	0.21488				
Criminal Tendencies	Science	50	23.42	9.73127	1.37621	333.863	111.288	0.891	0.448
	Engineering	35	24.5143	10.46667	1.76919				
	Commerce	14	22.5714	9.6613	2.58209				
	Others	6	30.8333	24.62045	10.05126				
	Total	105	24.0952	11.15582	1.0887				

df (between groups) = 3

Table 7:- Regression analysis of personality traits.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Sum of Squares (Regression)	Mean Square (Regression)	F	Variable	Unstandardized Coefficients (B)	Standardized Coefficients (Beta)	t	Sig.
1	0.53	0.281	0.274	9.50267	3642.07	3642.07	40.333	(Constant)	47.954	-	12.392	0
								Conscientiousness	-3.108	-0.53	-6.351	0
2	0.583	0.34	0.327	9.14978	4403.77	2201.89	26.301	(Constant)	61.529	-	10.531	0
								Conscientiousness	-2.271	-0.388	-4.153	0
								Openness	-2.169	-0.282	-3.016	0.003
3	0.623	0.388	0.369	8.85826	5017.7	1672.57	21.315	(Constant)	54.089	-	8.653	0
								Conscientiousness	-1.99	-0.34	-3.692	0
								Openness	-2.517	-0.327	-3.559	0.001
								Emotional Stability	1.128	0.223	2.797	0.006

Discussion:-

Personality traits andsocial media usage

Using Chi-Square tests, the results show that there are significant relationships between some of the personality variables and social media usage, where 78.1% of the subjects are in the high usage category. This therefore replicates other findings that social media usage is high for specified personality traits. Significant Chi-Square values appeared for Extraversion: $\chi^2 = 6.943$, $p = 0.008$; for Agreeableness: $\chi^2 = 45.343$, $p = 0$; for Conscientiousness: $\chi^2 = 72.086$, $p = 0$; for Openness: $\chi^2 = 85.952$, $p = 0$; and for Emotional Stability: $\chi^2 = 40.238$, $p = 0$. This result underlines the role these traits play in the prediction of social media behaviors, attesting to what Amichai-Hamburger and Vinitzky said back in 2010. The low scores for these traits had significantly high association with criminal tendencies: $\chi^2 = 59.438$, $p = 0$. Hence, personality traits may act like protective factors against criminal behavior(Eysenck, 1996).

Correlations with Social Media Usage and Criminal Tendencies

Extraversion came out to be positively correlated with the use of social media, $r = 0.296$, $p = 0.002$, and it was inversely correlated to criminal tendencies, with $r = –0.158$ and $p = 0.108$. The more extraverted an individual, the more engaged he would be in being online. Agreeableness correlated very positively with social media use, $r = 0.323$, and $p = 0.001$, and negatively with criminal tendencies. There was a negative relation of conscientiousness with criminal tendencies thereby indicating that the higher the conscientiousness, the lower the criminal behavior. Social media usage is positively related to openness and is negatively related to criminal tendencies. Emotional Stability showed a complex relation with social media usage and criminal tendencies.

The findings show that extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism are positively correlated with social media addiction, hence these personality traits are related to a high possibility of becoming an addict of the platforms. This finding is contrasted with that of Romero, 2018, who found that problematic internet use was predicted by lower levels of Agreeableness. In the same line, Alonso and Romero confirmed that lower levels of Openness and Conscientiousness predicted problematic internet use.

Previous research has identified extraversion as a predictor of social media use and addiction(Wilson et al., 2010). In this study, extraversion was a significant predictor of use and addiction, but it predicted addiction only at the third step. Extraverted people might have a higher chance of using social media since they thrive on social interactions, and excessive use may mean addiction. This may, on the contrary, be less of an issue for extraverts who do not back off from interpersonal interactions. Neuroticism was also pointed out as one of the predictors for use and addiction, thus supporting the previous findings by Tang et al. (2016) and Andreassen et al. (2013). Those high in neuroticism might feel anxiety about personal relationships and hence use social media to keep in touch.

Gender, Age, and Educational Stream Differences

No significant differences emerged about social media usage, personality traits, and criminal tendencies between the two genders, hence it is clear that these variables do not differ across genders. There were, however, gender differences in the interactions relating to personality traits and social media usage. While extraverted men and women were both likely to be frequent users of social media tools, only men with greater degrees of emotional instability were regular users. No significant relationship existed between women and emotional stability(Correa, 2010), which may point out the difference in styles of communication, as women tend to focus more on building connections and community(Tannen, 1990). Now, talking about age, it had no significant difference, thus pointing towards stability in personality traits and social media usage at the beginning of early adulthood. As for educational streams, no significant differences were found again, thus such psychological variables are unrelated to their educational background.

Linear Regression of Personality Dimensions on the Outcome Variable

In the regression analysis, it emerged that the predictions on the outcome variable by Conscientiousness and Openness were negative, whereas that for Emotional Stability was positive. Conscientiousness had a negative effect in all cases, which was significant, thus indicating that high conscientiousness means low levels of the outcome variable. This is also in agreement with the general literature on personality and behavior reported by Judge, Heller, and Mount, 2002.

The links and regression analyses observed support the idea that personality traits substantially impact the ways through which people make use of social media and affect their possible involvement in deviant activity. Further studies will have to be conducted to uncover these relationships on a deeper level and across several populations.

Conclusion:-

Strong correlations came up between personality, social media usage, and criminal tendencies. The findings offer some very important implications in terms of giving insights into an understanding of the psychological underpinnings of social media behavior and its links to criminal activity. Further studies should sample more diverse populations and other variables, which have potential influences on the relationships.

Acknowledgements:-

We would like to extend our heartfelt thanks to all the individuals who participated in the questionnaire and shared their valuable insights; without their contributions, this research would not have been possible.

Consent for participation:

Informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to the study as well as a formal consent within the Google Form, the form also included the study's purpose, procedures, and any potential risks

Disclosure statement:

The authors report there are no competing interests to declare.

Funding:

Not applicable.

Competing interests:

Not applicable.

References:-

1. Amichai-Hamburger, Y., &Vinitzky, G. (2010). Social network use and personality.Computers in Human Behavior, 26(6), 1289–1295.
2. Andreassen, C. S., Torsheim, T., Brunborg, G. S., & Pallesen, S. (2012). Development of a Facebook addiction scale 1, 2. Psychological Reports, 501–517.
3. Azucar, D., Marengo, D., & Settanni, M. (2018, April 1). Predicting the Big 5 personality traits from digital footprints on social media: A meta-analysis. Elsevier BV, 124, 150-159. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.12.018
4. Bachrach, Y., Kosinski, M., Graepel, T., Kohli, P., & Stillwell, D. (2012). Personality and patterns of Facebook usage. Proceedings of the 4th annual ACM web science conference (pp. 24–32). ACM.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2380718.2380722
5. Bandura, A., & Walters, R. H. (1977). Social learning theory (Vol. 1). Prentice Hall: Englewood cliffs
6. Bargh, J. A., & McKenna, K. Y. (2004). The Internet and social life. Annu. Rev. Psychol., 55, 573-590.
7. Blackwell, D., Leaman, C., Tramposch, R., Osborne, C., & Liss, M. (2017). Extraversion, neuroticism, attachment style and fear of missing out as predictors of social media use and addiction. Personality and Individual Differences, 116, 69-72.
8. Bowden-Green, T., Hinds, J., &Joinson, A. (2021, June 14). Personality and Motives for Social Media Use When Physically Distanced: A Uses and Gratifications Approach. Frontiers Media, 12. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.607948
9. C. Alonso and E. Romero, "Study of the domains and facets of the five factor model of personality in problematic internet use in adolescents," International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction, 2018.
10. Correa, T., Hinsley, A. W., & De Zuniga, H. G. (2010). Who interacts on the Web?: The intersection of users' personality and social media use. Computers in human behavior, 26(2), 247-253.
11. de Zu´n˜iga, H. G., & Valenzuela, S. (2011). The mediating path to a stronger citizenship: Online and offline networks, weak ties, and civic engagement. Communication Research, 38, 397–421.
12. Donath, J., & Boyd, D. (2004). Public displays of connection. BT Technology Journal, 22, 71–82
13. Gerbner, G., & Gross, L. (2003). Living with television: The violence profile. Television: Critical Concepts in Media and Cultural Studies, 2(2), 124.
14. Granovetter, M. (1973). The strength of weak ties. American Journal of Sociology, 78, l
15. Hamburger, Y. A., & Ben-Artzi, E. (2000). The relationship between extraversion and neuroticism and the different uses of the Internet. Computers in Human Behavior, 16, 441–449
16. Helfgott, J. B. (2015). Criminal behavior and the copycat effect: Literature review and theoretical framework for empirical investigation. Aggression and violent behavior, 22, 46- 64.
17. Hsieh, Y. C., & Shen, C. C. (2024, January). The Influence of Social Media Big Data on the Online Drama Series Communication. In ADDT 2023: Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Art Design and Digital Technology, ADDT 2023, September 15–17, 2023, Xi'an, China (p. 102). European Alliance for Innovation.
18. Huang, C. (2019). Social network site use and Big Five personality traits: A meta-analysis. Computers in Human Behavior, 97, 280-290.
19. Intravia, J. (2023). Crime, substance use, and offensive content: exploring the link between low self-control and social media posting behaviors among young adults. Deviant Behavior, 44(7), 975-988.
20. Kim, Y., Hsu, S., & Zúñiga, H G D. (2013, May 11). Influence of Social Media Use on Discussion Network Heterogeneity and Civic Engagement: The Moderating Role of Personality Traits. Oxford University Press, 63(3), 498-516. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12034
21. Kosinski, M., Bachrach, Y., Kohli, P., Stillwell, D., & Graepel, T. (2014). Manifestations of user personality in website choice and behaviour on online social networks. Machine Learning, 95(3), 357–380. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10994-013-5415-y.
22. Kranenbarg, M W., Gelder, J V., Barends, A J., & Vries, R E D. (2023, March 1). Is there a cybercriminal personality? Comparing cyber offenders and offline offenders on HEXACO personality domains and their underlying facets. Elsevier BV, 140, 107576-107576. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2022.107576
23. Kuss, D. J., & Griffiths, M. D. (2011). Online social networking and addiction—A review of the psychological literature. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 8(9), 3528–3552. http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/ijerph8093528.
24. Lampropoulos, G., Anastasiadis, T., Siakas, K., &Siakas, E. (2022). The Impact of Personality Traits on Social Media Use and Engagement: An Overview. International Journal on Social and Education Sciences, 4(1), 34-51.
25. Liu, L., Preotiuc-Pietro, D., Samani, Z. R., Moghaddam, M. E., & Ungar, L. H. (2016). Analyzing personality through social media profile picture choice. ICWSM (pp. 211–220).
26. Mahajan, R., &Mansotra, V. (2021). Correlating crime and social media: using semantic sentiment analysis. International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications, 12(3).
27. Matsueda, R., & Anderson, K. (1998). The dynamics of delinquent peers and delinquent behavior. Criminology, 36, 269–308
28. McCuddy, T., & Vogel, M. (2015). More than just friends: Online social networks and offending. Criminal Justice Review, 40(2), 169-189.
29. Milani, L., Osualdella, D., & Di Blasio, P. (2009). Quality of interpersonal relationships and problematic Internet use in adolescence. CyberPsychology& Behavior, 12(6), 681-684.

30. Moor, L., & Anderson, J. R. (2019). A systematic literature review of the relationship between dark personality traits and antisocial online behaviours. Personality and individual differences, 144, 40-55.
31. Muhammad, A. A., Shariff, I. A., Muhammed, Y. Z., &Apriantoro, M. S. (2024). Psychological effects of social media on Muslim youths in northern Nigeria. Ethica: International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Studies, 2(1), 1-12.
32. Nanaa, A., Akkus, Z., Lee, W. Y., Pantanowitz, L., & Salama, M. E. (2021). Machine learning and augmented human intelligence use in histomorphology for haematolymphoid disorders. Pathology, 53(3), 400-407.
33. Navarro, M. (2024). Current Youth Culture Effects on Juvenile Delinquency: Social Media Trends and Delinquency.
34. Özgüven, N., &Mucan, B. (2013). The relationship between personality traits and social media use. Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal, 41(3), 517-528.
35. Quercia, D., Lambiotte, R., Stillwell, D., Kosinski, M., & Crowcroft, J. (2012). The personality of popular Facebook users. Proceedings of the ACM 2012 conference on computer supported cooperative work (pp. 955–964). ACM. http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2145204.2145346.
36. Schmid, U. K., Kümpel, A. S., & Rieger, D. (2024). How social media users perceive different forms of online hate speech: A qualitative multi-method study. New media & society, 26(5), 2614-2632.
37. Schwartz, H. A., Eichstaedt, J. C., Kern, M. L., Dziurzynski, L., Ramones, S. M., Agrawal,M., ... Ungar, L. H. (2013). Personality, gender, and age in the language of social media: The open-vocabulary approach. PLoS One, 8(9), e73791. http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0073791.
38. Seidman, G. (2013). Self-presentation and belonging on Facebook: How personality influences social media use and motivations. Personality and Individual Differences,54(3), 402–407.
39. Siddiqui, S., & Singh, T. (2016). Social media its impact with positive and negative aspects. International journal of computer applications technology and research, 5(2), 71- 75.
40. Smit, D. M. (2015). Cyberbullying in South African and American schools: A legal comparative study. South African Journal of Education, 35(2), 1-11.
41. Stachl, C., Au, Q., Schoedel, R., Gosling, S D., Harari, G M., Buschek, D., Völkel, S T., Schuwerk, T., Oldemeier, M., Ullmann, T., Hußmann, H., Bischl, B., &Bühner, M. (2020, July 14). Predicting personality from patterns of behavior collected with smartphones. National Academy of Sciences, 117(30), 17680-17687. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1920484117
42. Sumaryanti, I. U., Azizah, S., Diantina, F. P., &Nawangsih, E. (2020, March). Personality and social media addiction among college students. In 2nd Social and Humaniora Research Symposium (SoRes 2019) (pp. 376-379). Atlantis Press.
43. Tang, J. H., Chen, M. C., Yang, C. Y., Chung, T. Y., & Lee, Y. A. (2016). Personality traits, interpersonal relationships, online social support, and Facebook addiction. Telematics and Informatics, 33(1), 102-108.
44. Tannen, D. (1990). You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation. New York, NY: Ballatine
45. Tsitsika, A., Critselis, E., Louizou, A., Janikian, M., Freskou, A., Marangou, E., ... &Kafetzis, D. A. (2011). Determinants of Internet addiction among adolescents: A case-control study. The Scientific World Journal, 11(1), 866-874.
46. Tundis, A., Böck, L., Stanilescu, V., &Mühlhäuser, M. (2019, August). Limits in the data for detecting criminals on social media. In Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Availability, Reliability and Security (pp. 1-8).
47. Twenge, J. M. (2013). Does online social media lead to social connection or social disconnection?. Journal of College and Character, 14(1), 11-20.
48. Wilson, K., Fornasier, S., & White, K. M. (2010). Psychological predictors of young adults' use of social networking sites. Cyberpsychology, Behavior and Social Networking, 173–177. http://dx.doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2009.0094.
49. Zhang, C. (2023). The Effect of social media on Individuals' Perception and Criminal Behavior. Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences, 22, 843-847.
50. Eysenck, H. J. (1996). Personality and crime. In J. W. W. W. C. H. McGuire (Ed.), The Psychology of Crime: A Social Science Perspective(pp. 1-18). Routledge.
51. Judge, T. A., Heller, D., & Mount, M. K. (2002). Five-factor model of personality and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87(3), 530-541. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.3.530
52. Romero, E. (2018). Personality traits and problematic internet use: A meta-analysis. Computers in Human Behavior, 83, 20-29. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2018.01.021

APPENDIX

SL.NO	QUESTIONS	OPTIONS
1	Email	--
2	Please choose from one of the alternatives below	• I have read the consent form and wish to participate in this study • I have read the consent form and do not wish to participate in this study
3	Name	--
4	Age	--
5	Gender	
6	Educational Qualification	
7	How often do you use social media platforms (e.g., Facebook, Instagram, Twitter)?	• Never • Rarely • Sometimes • Often • Always
8	On average, how many hours do you spend on social media per day?	• Lessthan1hour • 1-2hours • 2-4hours • 4-6hours • Morethan 6 hours
9	I enjoy exploring new topics and engaging in discussions on social media.	• Strongly Disagree • Disagree • Neutral • Agree

		• Strongly Agree
10	I am open to new perspectives and enjoy learning from others on social media.	• Strongly Disagree • Disagree • Neutral • Agree • Strongly Agree
11	I am careful about the information I share on social media to maintain my privacy.	• Strongly Disagree • Disagree • Neutral • Agree • Strongly Agree
12	I am responsible for managing my time on social media and balancing it with other activities.	• Strongly Disagree • Disagree • Neutral • Agree • Strongly Agree
13	I am out going and enjoy interacting with others on social media.	• Strongly Disagree • Disagree • Neutral • Agree • Strongly Agree
14	I am comfortable initiating conversations and making new	• Strongly Disagree

	connections on social media.	• Disagree • Neutral • Agree • Strongly Agree
15	I am assertive in expressing my opinions and beliefs on social media.	• Strongly Disagree • Disagree • Neutral • Agree • Strongly Agree
16	I am considerate of others feelings and opinions on social media.	• Strongly Disagree • Disagree • Neutral • Agree • Strongly Agree
17	I enjoy helping and supporting others through social media.	• Strongly Disagree • Disagree • Neutral • Agree • Strongly Agree
18	I am prone to feeling anxious or stressed when using social media.	• Strongly Disagree • Disagree • Neutral • Agree • Strongly Agree

19	I often compare myself to others on social media and feel insecure.	• Strongly Disagree • Disagree • Neutral • Agree • Strongly Agree
20	I am sensitive to negative comments or feedback on social media	• Strongly Disagree • Disagree • Neutral • Agree • Strongly Agree
21	How often have you engaged in cyberbullying(e.g., online harassment, trolling) in the past year?	• Never • Rarely • Sometimes • Often • Always
22	How often have you engaged in spreading false information or rumors on social media that may harm others?	• Never • Rarely • Sometimes • Often • Always
23	How often have you engaged in stealing or using someone else's social media account without their permission?	• Never

		• Rarely • Sometimes • Often • Always
24	How often have you engaged in threatening or intimidating others on social media?	• Never • Rarely • Sometimes • Often • Always
25	How often have you engaged in sharing explicit or inappropriate content on social media?	• Never • Rarely • Sometimes • Often • Always
26	How often have you engaged in hacking or gaining unauthorized access to someone's social media account?	• Never • Rarely • Sometimes • Often • Always
27	How often have you engaged in cyberstalking or repeatedly harassing someone on social media?	• Never • Rarely • Sometimes

		• Often • Always
28	How often have you engaged inspreading hate speech or inciting violence on social media?	• Never • Rarely • Sometimes • Often • Always
29	How often have you engaged in doing (publishing private information about someone online) onsocial media?	• Never • Rarely • Sometimes • Often • Always
30	How often have you engaged in creating or sharing fake profiles on social media to deceive others?	• Never • Rarely • Sometimes • Often • Always
31	How often have you engaged in posting or sharing illegal content (e.g., pirated software, copyrighted material) on social media?	• Never • Rarely

		• Sometimes • Often • Always
32	How often have you engaged in sending unsolicited or inappropriate messages to others on social media?	• Never • Rarely • Sometimes • Often • Always
33	How often have you engaged in sharing confidential or private information of others without their consent on social media?	• Never • Rarely • Sometimes • Often • Always
34	How often have you engaged in creating or sharing content that promotes hate speech or discrimination on social media?	• Never • Rarely • Sometimes

		• Often • Always
35	Do you feel that your personality traits influence your social media use?	• Strongly Disagree • Disagree • Neutral • Agree • Strongly Agree
36	Do you think your social media use influences your engagement in criminal behaviors?	• Strongly Disagree • Disagree • Neutral • Agree • Strongly Agree