

## INFLUENCE OF GROUP COHESIVENESS AND INDIVIDUATION ON CRIMINAL BEHAVIOUR TENDENCY AMONG EKITI STATE UNIVERSITY UNDERGRADUATES

**Damilola Ayodele OSEKITA<sup>1</sup>**

*Department of Psychology and Behavioural Studies  
 Ekiti State University, Ado Ekiti; Nigeria.  
[ayodele.osekita@eksu.edu.ng](mailto:ayodele.osekita@eksu.edu.ng)*

**Emmanuel Temitope BANKOLE<sup>2</sup>**

*Department of Psychology and Behavioural Studies  
 Ekiti State University, Nigeria  
[temiope.bankole@eksu.edu.ng](mailto:temiope.bankole@eksu.edu.ng)*

**Abiodun Azeez LASISI<sup>3</sup>**

*Department of Psychology and Behavioural Studies  
 Ekiti State University, Ado Ekiti; Nigeria.*

### ABSTRACT

*This study examined the influence of group cohesiveness and individuation on criminal tendency behaviour. The study employed an expo facto research design, which is a type of survey research. A total of 274 participants were selected from the Ekiti State University students. Data used for the study were collected using a well-structured questionnaire consisting of the Group Cohesion Scale, Individuation Scale and Criminal Attitude and Association Scale. Results showed that group cohesiveness ( $t=6.409, p < .05$ ) and individuation ( $t=2.033, p < .05$ ) are good predictors of criminal tendency behaviour among EKSU undergraduates. It was also revealed that there is no significant difference in criminal tendency behaviour between male and female genders ( $t=.055, p > .05$ ), and also no significant difference in criminal tendency behaviour was experienced among EKSU undergraduates across different ages ( $F(2, 271), p > .05$ ). The study recommends providing proper interventions, such as orientation programmes, to enhance students' sense of individuality and personal responsibility. Additionally, further research is needed to examine the factors influencing group cohesiveness and cultural factors influencing criminal tendencies*

**Keywords:** *criminal behaviour, group cohesion, individuation, criminal tendency behaviour*

### INTRODUCTION

Criminal behaviour amongst undergraduates has been a major issue in the school system in Nigerian universities. Literally, Paranjape (2011) defined criminal behaviour as a person's actions or inaction which tends to undermine the grand norms governing a given society such action may be tantamount to violation of the social contract and mutual consensus entered into by members of the society. Behaviour that does not conform to the cultural norms or laws of a given society at a particular time and is often times negatively sanctioned, is referred to as a criminal behaviour (Godziashvili, 1998). This implies that non-conformity to a given set of laws or norms that are accepted by a significant number of people in a community, society or group is a criminal act (Hoeve et al 2007). Society highly values conformity to socially accepted behaviour and expects it to be accepted and upheld by its members. Criminal behaviour in Nigeria tertiary institution is derogatory to the academic sector which has a negative effect on Nigerians undergraduates. (Peters, & Jackson, 2000). Examination misconduct as a criminal behaviour is mostly practiced by undergraduates in Nigeria universities. It refers to cheating in examination conditions to get unearned marks with the aim of passing an examination (Jackson, & Foshee, 2008)). Some of the ways or methods of exams misconduct includes; Use of bullets (small papers with answers on), impersonating, sorting, leakage of examination questions, swapping of exams sheets and to name a few (Jackson, & Foshee, 2008). Sexual harassment is another criminal

behaviour among undergraduates in Nigeria universities. It is regarded a criminal behaviour due to its negative impact on most undergraduates and the society at large based on the norms and the rules of the Nigerian Institution.

Over the years, researchers have attempted to find out different sets of people, who are likely to become criminals and what drives certain individuals to commit a particular type of crime in the first place. Psychologists have considered a range of different explanations in order to answer these difficult questions. Some have argued that there may be a genetic explanation which is at the centre of explaining criminal behaviour; others have suggested that it is the environment in which people live which can influence their chance of becoming criminal (Laird, & Pettit, 2005).

### **Criminal Tendency Behaviour**

According to Howitt, D. (2006), criminal tendency behaviour is defined as part of someone's character that makes them likely to behave in a certain way or become a criminal. An individual may not possess the characteristics of a criminal by birth itself but may develop such characteristics over the passage of time Howitt, D. (2006). According to Hentig (2009), humans learn through imitation, people learn from the social surroundings and the behaviour of others around them. Many sociological factors such as educational dropout, loss of parent and bad childhood etc., may cause the development of negative character in an individual (Hentig, 2009). These factors are termed as strains. Strains are contributory factors which forces an individual to have a myopic perspective and to make a hostile choice of acting in a certain manner which would fulfil his or her desire but through illegal means (Jackson, & Foshee, 2008). Clearly, there are some important factors to criminality that can be explained by situational and developmental factors, but there is also the psychological element to criminal activity that is relatively unique to that individual.

Temperament - is the feature of an individual which significantly determines the individual's behavioural model (Hart, 2008). Despite the great influence of environmental factors, it is generally considered that the peculiarity of temperament is determined by the genetics (Bank, & Patterson, 2007). Temperament includes the following components: character, sociality, activity level, reactivity and affectivity. Temperament plays a significant role in the relationship of a child and the environment; accordingly, the experience gained in childhood is well reflected in his/her environmental attitudes and the socialization process at his/her next age development stages (Bank, & Patterson, 2007).

Impulsiveness - is the feature of a subject to act in less consideration of the consequences of his/her action (Brownlie, & Beitchman, 2004). Impulsiveness prevents a person in exercising his/her purposeful behaviour. Behaviour of an impulsive individual in most cases is stipulated by the situation; therefore, a person can no longer afford to determine the results of the action committed by him/her (Brownlie, & Beitchman, 2004).

Locus of control - A factor related to impulsivity and another prominent feature that has been hypothesized as being related to personality and a tendency for criminal behaviour is the idea of locus of control (Rotter, 1989). Whereas impulsivity was concerned with the way in which offenders might not anticipate the consequences of their actions adequately, the idea of having a locus of control describes the way in which people accept there being different explanations for things that happen (Rotter, 1989).

Also, some personal qualities have been discovered to determine criminal tendency behaviour. Let's review these personal qualities separately:

Prevalence of negative emotional background - expresses the inclination of an individual to process the received situational cues by preliminary irritation and anger. Negative emotions background strongly correlates with delinquent behaviour. This regularity is valid in the case of different genders and cultures (Biglan, Flay, Embry, & Sandler, 2012).

Search risky sensations (low sensitivity threshold) - this feature is related to the adoption of active and risk perception, which leads to the individuals search for risky situations (Laird, & Pettit, 2005). The category of persons who are actively looking for strong feelings and at the same time are socialized, select the professions such as fire-fighters, police officers etc. or they go in for extreme sport (Blair, & Raver, 2012). The individuals who have low level of socialization but strong desire of searching for risky feelings with high probability, tend to self-realization in the way of carjacking, robbery etc (Laird, & Jordan, 2001).

Empathy - it is the individual's emotional and cognitive ability to understand, feel and share other people's feelings and spiritual condition (Young, Fox, & Zahn-Waxler, 1999). Emotional component of empathy enables an individual to feel the other person's pain while a cognitive component allows understanding the cause of the pain (Cohen & Strayer, 2006). There are people who suffer from/bear a whole world's pain, but there are the people who are unable to understand even the nearest person (Cohen, & Strayer, 2006). Lack of psychological sign of empathy is one of the predictors of criminal behaviour. The concept of cohesion has been around as long as people have been interested in collective processes and effectiveness.

### **Group Cohesiveness**

Cohesion refers to the concept of bonding or adhesion among members of a collective entity. Over 2,400 years ago Sun Tzu made multiple references to the concepts of collective harmony and morale in his treatise entitled *The Art of War* (Griffith, 2018). The most widely cited definition of cohesion is the "total yield of forces which act on members to remain in the group" (Festinger 2009). In their original formulation, cohesiveness was thought to arise from interpersonal attraction, liking, or commitment to the group task, and group prestige or pride (Wisdom, 2002). Despite the implied multidimensionality, early theorists tended to focus on cohesion as a unitary construct with a primary emphasis on the interpersonal and social aspects of member bonds to the group (Wisdom, 2002).

Group cohesiveness (also called group cohesion and social cohesion) arises when bonds link members of a social group to one another and to the group as a whole. Although cohesion is a multi-faceted process, it can be broken down into four main components: social relations, task relations, perceived unity, and emotions (Forsyth, 2010). Members of strongly cohesive groups are more inclined to participate readily and to stay with the group (Dyaram, Lata & Kamalanabhan 2005). Additionally, the original definition proved difficult to operationalized and created confusion in the interpretation of the construct. Recently, the concept of cohesion is central to understanding groups and group processes, and recent research has yielded substantial advances in understanding the nature, the sources, and the consequences of this key group-level process. (Forsyth, 2021). The most consistent theoretical and empirical support exists for the differentiation between task and social components of cohesion (Tziner, 2008; Zaccaro, 2015). Task cohesion is the degree to which members of a group work together to achieve common goals (Markowitz, Bellair, Liska, & Liu, 2001). Social cohesion is the degree of interpersonal attraction among members (Krivo, & Peterson, 2006).

Some other researchers, defined group cohesiveness as a dynamic process which is reflected in the tendency for a group to stick together and remain united in the pursuit of its instrumental objectives and/or for the satisfaction of member affective needs (Carron, Brawley, & Widmeyer, 2008). Here are some of the features of group cohesiveness: a cohesive group have fewer members, members of the cohesive teams are of similar interests or backgrounds, it has a high degree of status within organizations, members are accessible to each other to maintain easy communication, each cohesive team is physically remote from other groups in the organization, cooperative behaviour is rewarded regularly, cohesive groups have a history of past success.

The bonds between group members do not develop spontaneously. They develop from a number of components such as attraction, coordination, sense of belonging and shared emotions. The components can be known as antecedents of cohesion (Forsyth, 2009). Moreover, they also define the nature of cohesion. Each component is explained in-depth below.

**Attraction** - Festinger and his colleagues in 1950 highly focused on attraction as a force in comparison to any other forces (Hogg, & Hardie, 2002). In one study, they asked the group members to identify all their good friends and calculated the ratio of ingroup choices to outgroup choices. According to Dion in 2000, the greater the ratio, the greater the cohesiveness of the group (Dion, 2000). Hogg in 2002 noted personal attraction is not group cohesion even though members of cohesive groups like one another (Hogg, 2002). Group cohesion is similar to a type of group-level attraction which, according to Hogg, is known as social attraction (Hogg, 2002). Social attraction is a liking for other group members based on their status as typical group members. Attraction is a basic ingredient for most groups, however, when interpersonal relations between group members intensify, it can transform a conjoined group into a cohesive one (Myers, 2012).

**Sense of belonging** - In a cohesive group, individuals tend to fuse together to form a whole (Van Zelst, 2002). Non-members who would encounter a group will be convinced that it is a tightly bonded group. Group members would express their sense of belonging to the group by being loyal to the group, identifying with the group and classifying themselves as members. They would also describe their unity by using terms such as family, us, community, team, etc (Hare, 2006).

**Coordination** - It is believed that cohesion is more about the willingness to work together to accomplish a set of goals than the interpersonal relationships between group members (Hackman, 2006). Task-oriented groups such as flight crews and military squads share a drive to accomplish their goals (Forsyth, 2009).

**Shared emotions** - One of the most obvious features of a cohesive group is a shared positive emotion (Hardie, 2002). Emotional cohesion is a multilevel process as emotions can be collective. For example, a group member may experience emotion when he/she learns that the other group member has been mistreated (Casey-Campbell, Milly; Martens, Martin, 2009). An emotion is a collective emotion when all the members of a group experience the same emotional reaction. The intensity of such emotions is high when the members strongly identify with their group (Berkowitz, 2004).

The word 'individuation' refers to the process of becoming an individual (Arnett, 2000). As such it is derived from the Latin word 'individuus', which means 'undivided' or indivisible (Arnett, 2000). Jung (2018) used the term to describe the process of psychological development, which he defined as becoming a unified and also unique personality, i.e., a genuine individual in the sense of a separate, undivided and integrated person. Through individuation, understood as a

process of internal differentiation and integration of the unconscious into consciousness, the psyche transcends the one dimensionality of its ego and realizes the innermost and true self that it potentially already is (Komidar, Zupanc & Bjornsen, 2016). It can therefore be understood the process of self-realization, through which the psyche also finds meaning and purpose in life (Lanctot, & Poulin, 2018). Jung (2018) saw it as the process of self-realization, the discovery and experience of meaning and purpose in life; the means by which one finds oneself and becomes who one really is. It depends upon the interplay and synthesis of opposites e.g., conscious and unconscious, personal and collective, psyche and soma, divine and human, life and death (Jung, 2018). It not only fosters but accelerates individuation and creates conditions in the relationship between patient and analyst which offer the possibility for rarefied experiences and transformation of self which otherwise may not happen (Hendry, & Kloep, 2010). This is because the analytic situation allows both participants to join in a quest for the truth; to express and experience the self in ways which are often prohibited by the compromises made in the service of social acceptance in non-analytic relationships (Hendry & Kloep, 2010).

### **Individuation**

Jung (2018) stressed that individuation requires the integration of both collective and personal elements. The neurotic condition is one where the collective is denied, the psychotic where the personal is denied and archetypal inflation can overwhelm the ego Jung (2018). If someone is over concerned with his own personal affairs and status, he is in danger of becoming too identified with his persona e.g., the schoolteacher who is didactic at home, or the analyst who never stops analysing. Living such a blinkered life, focused on short-sighted and egocentric goals, denies the value of the collective (Mahler, 2003). This can lead to a neurotic narcissistic alienation from a deeper sense of oneself and one's place in society. In psychosis there is an absorption by the collective, where the fascination with the internal world and its processes can lead to a loss of interest in the external personal world of relationships and work (Sullivan, & Steckler, 2015). As Jung (2018) puts it: The aim of individuation is nothing less than to divest the self of the false wrappings of the persona on the one hand and the suggestive power of primordial images on the other.

Fordham (2015) described how individuation begins in infancy, but Jung (2018) saw it predominantly as a development in the second half of life. In the first half, one is concerned with expanding the ego and "adaptation to collective norms", such as building personal social status (Fordham, 2015). The second half of life is concerned with coming to terms with death, finding meaning in living and the unique part each one of us plays in the world (Jung, 2018). It is in the vicissitudes of negotiating the individuation process that Jung (2018) saw the major causes of neurosis. In the young, neurosis comes from a fear of engaging with life (Zupanci, & Kav, 2014); in the old, it comes from clinging to an outdated youthful attitude and shrinking back from death (Schwartz, Cot, & Arnett, 2005). Individuation is dependent upon relationships with others (Youniss, & Smollar, 2005). Jung (2018) went so far as to say: "The self is relatedness; the self only exists inasmuch as you appear. Not that you are, but that you do the self. The self appears in your deeds and deeds always mean relationship." (Jung, 2018). However, in his autobiography, Jung (2018) presents us with a conundrum when he also states that the goal of individuation is detachment from emotional relationships. Emotional relationships he defines as tethered because they are relationships of desire with expectations of others (Schnyders, & Lane, 2018). It is recommended that in order to attain objectivity and selfhood, one needs to withdraw the projections inherent in emotional ties to others (Salvatore, 2018). In this light, analysis could be seen as the playing out of emotional relationships between analyst and patient with a view to facilitating the retrojection of projections in the resolution of the transference/counter transference (Zorotovich, & Johnson, 2019). Jung (2018) implies this when he describes the transference



phenomenon as, without doubt, one of the most important syndromes in the process of individuation.

## Hypotheses

1. Group cohesiveness will significantly influence the extent of criminal tendency behaviour among undergraduates of EKSU
2. Individuation will significantly influence the extent of criminal tendency behaviour among undergraduates of EKSU.
3. Gender difference will significantly influence criminal tendency behaviour among EKSU undergraduates
4. There will be significant age difference on criminal tendency behaviour among Eksu undergraduates

## METHOD

### Participants

Participants for this study included 274 students of Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti. The mean for age is 26, while the age ranges from 17-22, 23-27, 27-35.

### Research Design:

The design used in this study is expo facto research design. Survey research method was adopted where copies of questionnaire were distributed to research participants in order to measure their responses.

### Measures:

#### The Group Cohesion Scale

The group cohesion scale was developed by Gawlick and Morein (1996) was used to measure group cohesion. The scale is used to assess cohesion among group members in terms of diverse interaction, communication, memory retention, decision making and vulnerability among group members. The scale is a 25 items questionnaire, scored on a four-point Likert format scale which includes strongly disagree, disagree, agree, strongly agree. The scale possesses internal consistency of with Cronbach alpha coefficient of .84, and also a validity coefficient of .46.

#### Individuation Scale

Individuation scale developed by Maslach (1974) was used to measure individuation. The individuation scale was developed for the purpose of assessing individual differences, in peoples reported willingness to engage in behaviours that would publicly differentiate themselves from others. As such, it is a measure of behavioural intentions. The scale is a 12-item scale which is rated on 5-point scale whereby 1= not at all willing to do this, 2= not very willing, 3= slightly willing,

4= fairly willing and 5 = very much willing to do this. The total score can thus range from a low of 12 to a high of 60.

Internal consistency of the individuation scale was estimated by Cronbach coefficient alpha, which yielded reliability coefficients of .87 and .84. The test interval was 1 to 3 weeks, and the Pearson correlation coefficient was .91. A number of different sets of data were collected to establish the validity of individuation. The validity was assessed by testing its relation to certain behaviours. High and low individuals (median split;  $n = 177$ ) were compared in terms of the self-reported frequency of actions that either called attention to themselves or avoided attention.

### Measures of Criminal Attitude and Association

The scale developed by Jeremy, Daryl and Adelle (2002) was used to measure criminal attitude and association. The scale is used to measure an individual attitude toward crime. It's a 46-item scale, scored on a 9-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = ashamed to 9 = proud. The scale possesses 4 subscales which includes; Violence (12 items), Entitlement (12 items), Antisocial Intent (12 items), and Associates (10 items). The internal reliability as measured by the alpha coefficient was .75 for the full scale. The scale as test re-test reliability for each subscale: MCAA Total = .81, Violence = .73, Entitlement = .74, Antisocial Intent = .79, and Associates = .65. Also, the scale as validity of Cronbach alpha of .40.

### Procedure

The sampling technique used for this research was purposive sampling technique due to the availability of the participants. Copies of the questionnaires was distributed to 300 students across Faculties in Ekiti State University and only 274 were found usable among the recovered questionnaires. The researcher approached prospective respondents and introduced himself to them explaining his mission and assuring them of confidentiality of the information provided by their responses. After their consent had been gotten, the researcher administered the questionnaire to the participants. Copies of the questionnaire was personally retrieved by the researcher.

### Statistical Analysis

The first and second hypotheses were tested using regression analyses, hypothesis three were tested with t-test, while hypothesis four was tested with the One-way Anova.

## RESULTS

**Table 1: Socio-Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents**

| Variable              | Items        | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----------------------|--------------|-----------|------------|
| Gender                | Male         | 134       | 48.9       |
|                       | Female       | 140       | 51.1       |
| Age                   | 17-22        | 97        | 35.4       |
|                       | 23-27        | 156       | 56.9       |
|                       | 27-35        | 21        | 7.7        |
| Religion              | Christianity | 178       | 64.9       |
|                       | Islamic      | 96        | 35.1       |
|                       | Others       | 0         | 0.0        |
| Socio-Economic Status | High Class   | 37        | 13.5       |
|                       | Middle Class | 150       | 54.7       |
|                       | Low Class    | 87        | 31.8       |

Result in Table 1 on the socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents revealed that 51.1% of the respondents were male while 48.9% were female. 35.4% were between 17-22 years of age, 56.9% between 23-27 years while 7.7% were between 27-35 years of age. Additionally, it

was revealed that the majority of the undergraduate students were Christians (64.9%), while 35.1% were Muslims and on the socio-economic status, it was revealed that 13.5% were from a high-class socioeconomic status, 54.7% from middle class while 31.8% were from low class socio-economic status. The student's socio-demographic distribution shows that they have diverse backgrounds.

### Hypothesis 1

Group cohesiveness will be significant influence criminal tendency behaviour among EKSU undergraduates.

**Table 2: Regression Summary table on the influence of group cohesiveness on criminal tendency behaviour among EKSU undergraduate**

| Model |                | $\beta$ | Std. Error | R <sup>2</sup> | T     | Sig. |
|-------|----------------|---------|------------|----------------|-------|------|
| 1     | Constant       | 121.322 | 18.930     |                |       |      |
|       | Group Cohesion | 1.112   | .274       | .057           | 6.409 | .000 |
|       | Total          |         |            |                |       |      |

Regression test result on the influence of group cohesiveness on criminal tendency behaviour among EKSU undergraduate students as shown in Table 2 revealed that group cohesiveness significantly influences criminal tendency behaviour among EKSU undergraduates ( $t = 6.409$ ,  $p < .05$ ). The  $\beta$  coefficients explain a 1.112-unit change in criminal tendency behaviour for a 1-unit change in group cohesion. In addition, coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) = 0.057 which implies that approximately 5.7% of the variance in criminal tendency behaviour can be explained by group cohesiveness.

### Hypothesis 2

Individuation will be significant influence criminal tendency behaviour among undergraduates of EKSU.

**Table 3: Regression Summary table on the influence of individuation on criminal tendency behaviour among EKSU undergraduate**

| Model |                | $\beta$ | Std. Error | R <sup>2</sup> | T     | Sig. |
|-------|----------------|---------|------------|----------------|-------|------|
| 1     | Constant       | 179.143 | 9.366      |                |       |      |
|       | Group Cohesion | .482    | .237       | .015           | 2.033 | .043 |
|       | Total          |         |            |                |       |      |

Table 3 on the influence of individuation on criminal tendency behaviour among EKSU undergraduate students revealed that individuation significantly influence criminal tendency behaviour among EKSU undergraduates ( $t = 2.033$ ,  $p < .05$ ). The  $\beta$  coefficients explain 0.482 unit change in criminal tendency behaviour for a 1 unit change in individuation. Furthermore, coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) = 0.057 which implies that approximately 5.7% of the variance in criminal tendency behaviour can be explained by individuation.

### Hypothesis 3

Gender differences will significantly influence criminal tendency behaviour among undergraduates of EKSU.



**Table 4: t-test summary table on gender difference on criminal tendency behaviour among EKSU undergraduates**

|                   |        | N   | Mean   | SD     | t    | Sig. |
|-------------------|--------|-----|--------|--------|------|------|
| Criminal tendency | Male   | 134 | 197.30 | 42.460 | .055 | .836 |
|                   | Female | 140 | 197.59 | 43.929 |      |      |

T-test result on the gender difference on criminal tendency behaviour as presented in Table 4 revealed that there is no significant difference in criminal tendency behaviour between both genders ( $t=.055$ ,  $p > .05$ ). There is obviously a negligible difference in the mean score (Male = 197.30; Female = 197.59). In other words, the tendency to exhibit criminal behaviour is the same for both genders.

#### Hypothesis 4

Age differences will significantly influence criminal tendency behaviour among undergraduates of EKSU

**Table 5.: ANOVA Summary result showing the age difference on criminal tendency behaviour among EKSU undergraduates**

|                | Sum of Squares | Df  | Mean Square | F    | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|------|------|
| Between Groups | 1304.469       | 2   | 652.235     | .349 | .706 |
| Within Groups  | 506713.210     | 271 | 1869.790    |      |      |
| Total          | 508017.679     | 273 |             |      |      |

ANOVA test result for hypothesis 4 as shown in Table 5, revealed that there is no significant difference in criminal tendency behaviour among EKSU undergraduates across different ages ( $F(2, 271)$ ,  $p > .05$ ). Therefore, the criminal tendency behaviour of the students does not differ by age.

## DISCUSSION

In hypothesis 1, result obtained revealed that group cohesiveness is a statistically significant predictor of criminal tendency behaviour among EKSU undergraduates. This suggests that changes in group cohesiveness are associated with changes in criminal behaviour within the student population. In other words, when the level of unity and bonding within a group changes, it can affect how likely students are to engage in criminal activities. This supports the findings of Cartwright (2008) who found that when there is a strong sense of cohesion in a group, there seem to be an improved level of communication between the group and a greater level of participation in the goal of the group. In essence, a group whose goal tends towards criminality will also influence the tendency of the group members towards exhibiting criminal behaviour. In similar finding Shaw (2010) discovered that there exists a positive relationship between group cohesion and performance. This is true because members of a group tend to work harder to achieve the objectives of the group. On the contrary, Terborg et al., (2006) noted that group cohesion has exhibit both negative and positive association with performance of individuals claiming it does not necessarily explain tendency of criminal behaviour as other factors could mediate this effect.

Hypothesis two was also accepted showing that individuation significantly influences criminal tendency behaviour among EKSU undergraduates. This implies that variations in



individuation levels are associated with differences in criminal behaviour among the students. This contradicts the findings of Delaney (2016) who discovered that there is significant relationship between individuation and criminal tendency behaviour. She further revealed that although age of individuals seems to be a mediating factor, this does not however explain the influence of individuation on criminal tendency behaviour. In a similar finding, Lee and Bell (2003) also discovered that it is often difficult to find an association between individuation and criminal behaviour tendency because of attachment to parents.

In hypothesis 3, the result revealed that there is no statistically significant difference in criminal tendency behaviour between male and female undergraduate students at EKSU. This indicates that, on average, both genders exhibit a similar tendency toward criminal behaviour within the studied population. Steffensmeier and Allan (2003) who identified in their study that gender do not significantly influence criminal tendency behaviour among students. It was also revealed by Adeyemo et al (2023) that there is no significant difference among males and females on the tendency of criminality and the types of crime committed. This contradicts the arrays of findings that have believed that the male gender naturally violent and exhibiting more criminal tendency behaviour compared to the female gender (James and Hernstein, 1985). However, Chukuezi (2009) study provided insights that female gender has the same tendency to commit crime just like the male gender and that they are becoming more involved in crimes and in different patterns.

Lastly, in hypothesis, the result revealed that age does not appear to be a significant factor in explaining differences in criminal tendency behaviour among EKSU undergraduates. This suggests that criminal behaviour levels are relatively consistent across different age groups within the student population. This finding is not in line with that of Albert and Steinberg (2013) whose study found that there is a relationship between age and crime early adulthood which could be attributed to developmental changes.

## Conclusion

From the findings obtained, the study concludes that both group cohesiveness and individuation are good predictors of criminal tendency behaviour, and that this condition exists for both male and female gender and across the students' age group.

## REFERENCES

- Adeyemo S, Olukolade O, & Aroyewun A. (2023). A validation of adult suicidal ideation questionnaire among Nigerian University students. *African Health Science*, 23(1):542-52. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4314/ahs.v23i1.57>
- Albert, D., Chein, J., & Steinberg, L. (2013). The teenage brain: Peer influences on adolescent decision making. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 22(2), 114–120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721412471347>
- Arnett, J.J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist*, 55(5), 469 – 480
- Bank, L., Patterson, G. R., & Reid, J. B. (2007). Delinquency Prevention through training parents in family management. *The Behaviour Analyst*, 10(1), 75–82
- Berkowitz, L. (2004). Group standards, cohesiveness, and productivity. *Human Relations*, 7 (4), 509–519.
- Biglan, A., Flay, B. R., Embry, D. D., & Sandler, I. N. (2012). The critical role of nurturing environments for promoting human well-being. *American Psychologist*, 67(4), 257–271. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026796>
- Blair, C., & Raver, C.C. (2012). Child development in the context of adversity: Experiential canalization of brain and behaviour. *American Psychologist*, 67(4), 309-318
- Brownlie, J H. & Beitchman, M.E (2004). Leslie A. early language impairment and young adult delinquent and aggressive behaviour. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 32, 453–467.
- Carron, A.V., Brawley, L.R., & Widmeyer, W.N. (2008). The measurement of cohesiveness in sport groups. In J. L. Duda (Ed.), *Advances in sport and exercise psychology measurement* (pp. 213-226). Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology
- Cartwright, D. (2008). The nature of group cohesiveness. In Cartwright, D. and Zander, A. (eds), *Group Dynamics: Research and Theory*, 3rd edn. New York: Harper & Row, pp. 91–109
- Casey-Campbell, Milly; Martens, Martin,(2009). Sticking it all together: A critical assessment of the group cohesion-performance literature. *International journal of Management Review*. 10.1111/j.1468-2370.2008.00239.x
- Chukuezi, Comfort Onyemaechi. 2009. "Gender and Renewable Energy in Rural Nigeria." *International NGO Journal* 4 (7): 333–36.
- Cohen, D., & Strayer, J. (2006). Empathy in conduct-disordered and comparison youth. *Developmental Psychology*, 32, 988–998.
- Delaney, M.E. (2016). Across the transition to adolescence: Qualities of parent/adolescent relationships and adjustment. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 16, 274–300.
- Dion, K. L. (2000). Group cohesion: From "field of forces" to multidimensional construct. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 4(1), 7–26. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2699.4.1.7>
- Dyaram & T.J. KamalanabhanLata, (2005). Relationship between human resource practices and employee turnover intention in hospitality industry. *Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal. Global Journals Inc. (USA)*.
- Festinger, P. (2009). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioural sciences* (2nd Ed.), Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ.
- Fordham, H. K., (2015). Identity development and political self-regulation in emerging adult political attitudes and behaviour. *Emerging Adulthood*, 4(3), 153–160. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F2167696815585052>
- Forsyth, D. R. (2021). Recent advances in the study of group cohesion. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 25(3), 213–228. <https://doi.org/10.1037/gdn0000163>
- Forsyth, D.R. (2009). *Group dynamics* (5 ed.). New York: Wadsworth. pp. 119–122. ISBN 978-0495599524

- Forsyth, D.R. (2010). *Components of cohesion. Group Dynamics*, 5th Edition. Wadsworth: Cengage Learning. pp. 118–122.
- Godziashvili, I. (1998). *Criminology*. Tbilisi. POLIGRAPHIST.
- Griffith, C. (2018). Personality and antisocial behaviour in children and adolescents: An enquiry into Eysenck's and Gray's theories. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 23, 767–781.
- Hackman, J.R. (2006). Group influences on individuals in organizations. In M.D. Dunnett & L.M. Hough (eds.). *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. Vol. 3 (2nd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press. pp. 199–26
- Hardie, (2002). *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid Philip Hardie Ovid's Poetics of Illusion* Philip Hardie. The American Journal of Philology Vol. 124, No. 3, pp. 485-489
- Hare, A.P. (2006). *Handbook of small group research* (2nd ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Hart, C.H., Nelson, D.A., Robinson, C.C., Olsen, S.F., & Mcneilly-Choque, M.K. (2008). Overt and relational aggression in Russian nursery-school-age children: Parenting style and marital linkages. *Developmental Psychology*, 34(4), 687–697.
- Hendry, L.B., & Kloep, M. (2010). How universal is emerging adulthood? An empirical example. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 13(2), 169–179.
- Hentig, H. V. (2009). *The criminal & his victim*. New Yourk: Yale University Press.
- Hoeve, M., Smeenk, W., Loeber, R., Stouthamer-Loeber, M., Laan, P. H. V. D., Gerris, J. R. M., & Dubas, J. S. (2007). Long-Term Effects of Parenting and Family Characteristics on delinquency of male young adults. *European Journal of Criminology*, 4(2), 161–194. doi: 10.1177/1477370807074854
- Hogg, M.A. (2002). *The social psychology of group cohesiveness*. New York: New York University Press. ISBN 978-0745010625
- Howitt, D. (2006) *Introduction to Forensic and Criminal Psychology* (2nd edition). Harlow: Pearson.
- Jackson, C., & Foshee, V.A. (2008). Violence-related behaviors of adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 13(3), 343–359. doi: 10.1177/0743554898133006
- James Q. Wilson and Richard J. Herrnstein (1985). *Crime and Human Nature*. Wiley Online library. Vol. 23. 2 pg193-388. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.1985.tb00342.x>
- [Jeremy F. Mills](#), [Daryl G. Kroner](#), and [Adelle E. Forth](#) (2002) Measures of Criminal Attitudes and Associates (MCAA): Development, Factor Structure, Reliability, and Validity. *Sage Journals*. Vol 9. 3. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191102009003003>
- Jung, M. (2018). Psychosocial identity development and perception of free time among college attending emerging adults. *Leisure Sciences*, 1–19(1), 77–95.
- Komidar, L., Zupanci c, M., PuklekLevpu, M., & Bjornsen, C. A. (2016). Development of the short version of the individuation test for emerging adults (ITEA–S) and its measurement invariance across Slovene and U.S. Emerging adults. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 98(6), 626–639.
- Krivo, L. J., & Peterson, R. D. (2006). Extremely disadvantaged neighbourhoods and urban crime. *Social Forces*, 75(2), 619–648
- Laird, R. D., Jordan, K. Y., Dodge, K. A., Pettit, G. S., & Bates, J. E. (2001). Peer rejection in childhood, involvement with antisocial peers in early adolescence, and the development of externalizing behaviour problems. *Development and Psychopathology*, 13(2), 337–354. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579401002085>

- Laird, R.D., Pettit, G.S., Dodge, K.A., & Bates, J.E. (2005). Peer relationship antecedents of delinquent behaviour in late adolescence: Is there evidence of demographic group differences in developmental processes? *Development and Psychopathology*, 17(01). doi: 10.1017/s0954579405050078
- Lanctot, J., & Poulin, F. (2018). Emerging adulthood features and adjustment: A person-centered approach. *Emerging Adulthood*, 6(2), 91–103. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2167696817706024>
- Lee, J.-M., & Bell, N. (2003). Individual differences in attachment–autonomy configurations: Linkages with substance use and youth competencies. *Journal of Adolescence*, 26, 347–361.
- Mahler, M. S. (2003). Thoughts about development and individuation (reprinted 1979). In M. S. Mahler (Ed.), *Selected papers. Separation and individuation* (Vol. 2). Aronson
- Markowitz, F. E., Bellair, P. E., Liska, A. E., & Liu, J. (2001). Extending social disorganization theory: Modeling the relationships between cohesion, disorder, and fear. *Criminology*, 39(2), 293–319.
- Maslach, C. (1974). Social and personal bases of individuation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 29(3), 411–425. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0036031>
- Myers, A.E. (2012). "Team competition, success, and the adjustment of group members". *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*. 65 (5): 325–332. doi:10.1037/h0046513
- Paranjape J. (2011). *Criminology and victimology with penology*. Central Law Publications, 107 Darbhanga Castle, Allahabad.
- Peters, & Jackson. (2000). Community action a force for social change? Some conceptual observations. Resolve Working Paper Series, 01-08, University of Surrey. Retrieved from. <http://epubs.surrey.ac.uk/807439/>.
- Rotter, J.B (1989). Internal versus external control of reinforcement: A case history of variable. *American Psychologist*, 45, 489-493.
- Schnyders, C. M., & Lane, J. A. (2018). Gender, parent and peer relationships, and identification with emerging adulthood among college students. *Journal of College Counselling*, 21(3), 239–251. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jocc.12106>
- Schwartz, S. J., Cotter, J. E., & Arnett, J. J. (2005). Identity and agency in emerging adulthood: Two developmental routes in the individualization process. *Youth & Society*, 37(2), 201–229. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X05275965>
- Shaw, M.E. (2001). *Group Dynamics: The psychology of small group behaviour*, 3rd edn. Montreal, Quebec: McGraw-Hill.
- Steffensmeier Darrell and Allan Emilie (2003) Gender and crime: Toward a gendered theory of female offending. *Annual Review of Sociology*; 1996; 22, ABI/INFORM Global pg. 459
- Sullivan, K.A., Berger, M.B., Quinlivan, E.B., Parnell, H.E., Sampson, L.A., Clymore, J.M., & Wilkin, A.M. (2015). Perspectives from the field: HIV testing and linkage to care in North Carolina. *Journal of the International Association of Providers of AIDS Care*, 15(6):477–485. doi: 10.1177/2325957415617830.
- Terborg, J.R., Castore, C. & DeNinno, J.A. (2010). A longitudinal field investigation of the impact of group composition on group performance and cohesion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34, 782–790
- Tziner, A., Waismal-Manor, R., Vardi, N., & Brodman, A. (2008). The personality dispositional approach to job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Psychological Reports*, 103(2), 435-442.
- Van Zelst, R.H. (2002). Sociometrically selected work teams increase production". *Personnel Psychology*, 5 (3), 175–185
- Wisdom, J.E. (2002). Social identity and the pursuit of possible selves: Implications for the psychological well-being of university students, *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 179- 189.



- Young, S.K., Fox, N.A., & Zahn-Waxler, C. (2009). The relations between temperament and empathy in 2- year-olds. *Developmental Psychology*, 35(5), 1189–1197.
- Youniss, J., & Smollar, J. (2005). Adolescent relations with mothers, fathers, and friends. University Press
- Zorotovich J, Johnson EI, Linn R. Subjective social status and positive indicators of well-being among emerging adult college students. *College Student Journal*, 50(4), 624–635.
- Zupanci, C.M., & Kav C.T. (2014). Student personality traits predicting individuation in relation to mothers and fathers. *Journal of Adolescence*, 37(5), 715–726.