Indian Research Journal of Pharmacy and Science; A. Maher et. al.

June'17 (Suppl)

ORIGINAL RESEARCH

IRJPS

GIVING LIFE TO YOUR WORK

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERSONALITY TYPES MPTI AND RISK FACTORS TO VIOLENCE AMONG PEACEKEEPING OFFICERS IN LIBERIA

Alasasleh Maher*[1], Eman Alali[2], Sae'd Shunnaq[1]

[1]Royal Medical Services, Jordan
[2]Help association, Jordan

ABSTRACT:

Introduction: violence has become an increasing phenomenon threating the world, which requires it being studied from various dimensions among which are the personality and its related factors.

Study objectives: this study aimed to investigate the personality types and risk factors of violence of peacekeeping force in Liberia, and to investigate the relationship between the personality types and risk factors for violence.

Methods and subjects: a cross sectional study design was conducted to collect data from study participants. The study included 156 male officers. Data were collected based on tools that were designed to measure the personality types, Myers–Briggs Type Indicator (MPTI), and to measure risk factors for violence. Statistical analysis styles included descriptive measures such as frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations. The relationships between study variables were examined using correlation coefficients Pearson. Significance was considered if $p \leq 0.05$.

Results: the most prevalent type of personality among officers was Introverted Sensing Thinking Judging (ISTJ), the degree of prevalent risk factors was medium and the existence of a significant relationship between the two studied variables (personality types and risk factors to violence).

Conclusions: the results of the present study showed the types of personality disorders from which the most prevalent type of personality among officers was (ISTJ).

KEYWORDS: Personality types, Risk Factors to violence, Peacekeeping officers.

Corresponding Author:Alasasleh Maher
E-mail: dralasasleh@yahoo.com

Indian Research Journal of Pharmacy and Science; A. Maher et. al.

June'17
(Suppl)

INTRODUCTION:

Personality Types MPTI:

The theory of psychological types described by Carl Jung explains that predictable differences in individuals are caused by differences in the way people prefer to use their minds to take in information, to organize that information and reach conclusions. Jung's theory of psychological type assumes that each personality may be divided into one of various personality types in terms of two preferences or constructs, namely attitudes and functions[1].

The attitudes consist two orientations: introversion (I) and extraversion (E), which relate to the focus of attention and flow or psychic energy of an individual. The extravert is being described as an outgoing, candid and accommodating nature that adapts easily to a given situation, quickly forms attachments, and, setting aside any possible misgivings, often ventures forth into an unknown situation, while the introvert is a hesitant, reflective, retiring nature that keeps itself to itself, shrinks from objects, is always slightly on the defensive, and prefers to hide mistrustful scrutiny[1].

The functions or processes consist: firstly, two perception processes that used in perceiving the world: sensation (S) or intuition (N). Sensation-dominant people prefer precise, specific data that is typically derived from their senses. In contrast, intuition-dominant people seek holistic information that reflects possibilities; the pattern of data is more important than the specific data points. Secondly, two judgment processes that used in order to reach decisions and take action: (thinking (T) and feeling (F)) Thinking-dominant people stress logic in their reasoning; they generalize and abstract. Feeling–dominant people stress value judgments in their reasoning; they think of things in human terms and emphasize how others may respond. By combining an individual's dominant attitude and function, the basic personality type may be determined. The personality types are thus patterns in the way people prefer to perceive and make judgments[1]

There are two additional orientations that used in perceiving the outer world: judging (J) and perceiving (P). The judge is being described as being related to the evaluation of external stimuli and orientation to cope with these via structure and control. The Perceiver is being described as receptivity to stimuli and seeking to understand and adapt to life on these stimuli[2].

MPTI is personality instrument, employed in vocational, educational, and psychotherapy situations to assist the individuals better understand psychological personality types and how they apply to their behavior. The purpose of the MBTI personality indicator is to make the theory of psychological types described by Jung[1] (1921/1971) understandable and useful in people's lives[3]. Briggs and Myers theorized that people naturally prefer certain aspects or differences over others concerning most everything in life[4].

Risk factors of violence

The violence defined as aggression with the goal of extreme physical harm, such as injury or death[5]. Violent behavior is often preceded by the presence of risk factors and the absence of protective factors. The risk factors for violence are divided into three categories: Historical, Clinical, and Contextual[6].

Historical risk factors:

The Historical Factors include the following:

History of violence and delinquency: Prior violent behavior is perhaps the best single predictor of future violence so risk for future violence increases incrementally according to the number of prior episodes[7]. Some data suggested that the relationship between past violence and future violence is greatest in the years immediately following the most recent violent episode and that risk decreases with time[6].

Early initiation of violence: risk level for future violence increases with earlier onset of juvenile offending and with greater aggregate frequency of juvenile offending. Early initiation may not predict a higher frequency or rate of violent offending per year. Early initiation of violence/delinquency (particularly prior to age 14) is associated with increased risk for violent recidivism and predicts more chronic and serious violence[7].

School problems: the school problems related to violence including: low levels of educational achievement, low interest in education, dropout (prior to age 15), truancy, and poor school quality[8].

Victim of maltreatment/abuse: the abuse or maltreatment is associated with increased risk for violence[9]. Being a victim of abuse induces predisposing experiences including: (a) those that model violence and (b) those that reinforce or reward violence[10]. Widom's[11] work suggests that victims of sexual abuse were slightly less likely than those with no abuse history to commit a violent offence. Those

Indian Research Journal of Pharmacy and Science; A. Maher et. al.

June'17
(Suppl)

who were physically abused were slightly more likely and those who were neglected showed the greatest increase in risk. Abuse/neglect increased the chances of later delinquency and criminality by 40%.

Home/family maladjustment: the factors related to parental problem behavior and maladjustment within the family system have been linked to violent behavior including: (1) Parental Criminality, (2) Family Bonding and (3) Family Conflict: Discord, conflict, and violent relationships[6].

Clinical risk Factors:

The clinical risk factors include the following:

Substance use problems: Substance-use problems refer to the use of alcohol, licit or illicit drugs, or inhalants that is sufficiently severe to cause problems in physical health or in one or more major areas of life functioning. Alcohol may be as much of a risk factor as drug use[12].

Mental or behavioral disorder: the major mental disorder (schizophrenia, bipolar, major depression) is a risk factor for violent behavior so risk may be particularly associated with delusions involving perceived threat of harm by others and overriding of internal controls[13].

Risk Taking/Impulsivity:impulsivity, as characterized by behavioral and affective instability, and marked fluctuations in mood or general demeanor, has been linked to violence[14].

Negative Attitudes/Cognitions:certain attitudes (particularly antisocial ones) or social cognitive deficiencies can increase risk for violent behavior[15]. There are two core difficulties that may lead to increased aggression: (1) an inability to generate nonaggressive solutions to interpersonal conflicts and (2) a tendency to frequently perceive hostile or aggressive intent by others, even whennone was intended. Concerning cognitive predispositions, appraisals of provocation or intentionality (hostile attribution bias), violent fantasies, aggressive self-statements (or "self-talk"), expectations about success or instrumentality of violence may increase risk.

Anger Control Problems:anger can be a "potent activator of aggression" [16]. Anger also tends to be associated with antisocial attitudes, and both are related to aggression[17]. Difficulty managing anger, particularly an explosive temper, is often associated with higher risk[18]. Anger may increase arousal and consequently risk for aggression; however, traitanger has also been linked to prospective risk for aggression[19]. Conversely, empathy, guilt, anxiety, or fear may inhibit risk. Aggression associated with high levels of anger-related arousal has been referred to as "affective aggression"[20].

Contextual Factors

Negative Peer Relationships:the nature of peer relationships can be an important factor in understanding and assessing an individual's risk for aggressive behavior. The people who are rejected are at increased risk for perpetration aggressive acts. Often, they are also the victims of overt and relational aggression and other negative outcomes [21].

Poor Parental/Family Management:poor management refers to a constellation of parenting practices relating to ineffective supervision and discipline. Poor child-rearing practices, parental conflict about child rearing and poor parental supervision have all been associated with increased risk for violence[22]. Additionally, low levels of parent-child communication and involvement in mid-adolescence tends to increase risk for violent behavior, although this link appears stronger for males than for females[23].

Stress and Loss:stressful life events have been associated with violence, so this link may be particularly salient for persons who have been victims of violence [24]. Significant losses may also be precipitants of violent behavior, so it is important to inquire about possible losses that may be material (treasured object), relational (death or separation of close relationship), or loss of status (narcissistic injury).

Lack of Personal/Social Support: The absence of supportive relationships can reduce the effectiveness of risk reduction efforts and increase the risk of exposure to risky conditions. Hostile or conflictual relationships also may increase the risk for violence[25]

Study questions:

1- What are Personality types of the most common among peacekeeping officers in Liberia?

2- What is the degree of prevalent risk factors of violence among peacekeeping officers in Liberia?

3- Is there significant statistical relationship between personality types and risk factors of violence among peacekeeping officers in Liberia?

Indian Research Journal of Pharmacy and Science; A. Maher et. al.

June'17
(Suppl)

STUDY OBJECTIVES:

This study aims to identify the most prevalent personality types among peacekeeping officers in Liberia, to identify the degree of prevalent risk factors of violence among peacekeeping officers in Liberia, and to determine relationship between personality types and risk factors of violence among peacekeeping officers in Liberia.

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES:

The descriptive - correlative approach was used for this study using the questionnaire as an instrument to gather information for its appropriateness of this approach to the nature of the study and its objectives.

Study population:

The study population consisted of (876) peacekeeping officers enrolled in United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL) specifically the year (2012- 2013).

Sample of the study:

The sample of the study selected randomly and consisted of (156) peacekeeping officers after receiving the forms are incomplete and incorrect.

Measuring instruments:

Two toolswere used to collect the required data to achieve the objectives of the study:

Personality types scale MPTI:

A nominal and a self- reporting measure have been built based on the classification of Myers-Briggs personality types[26, 27]. It consists of four dimensions: Extraversion/Introversion (EI); Sensing/Intuition (SN); Thinking/Feeling (TF); and Judging/Perceiving (JP). Every dimension consists (7) items that measure individuals' preferences relating to the basic functions of perception and judgment that enter into almost every behavior. Every item is consisted of two options: the first one represents set of traits while the second one represents set of opposite traits. The personality type classified based on the highest total of traits for each dimension.

Risk factors for violence scale

Numerical, and a self- reporting scale to measure risk factors for violence, it has been built based on the SAVRY (Structured Assessment of Violence Risk in Youth)[28], composed of 24 items in three risk dimensions (Historical Risk Factors, Social/Contextual Risk Factors, and Individual/Clinical Factors). Responses to the items of the scales during the three-estimation scale (high is three degrees, medium is two degrees, and low is one degree) on the basis of these grades means were adopted to estimate the risk factor of violence for officers.

3-2.34 Mean indicates a high degree of risk factors of violence.

2.33-1.67 Mean indicates a medium degree of risk factors of violence.

1.66-and less Mean indicates a low degree of risk factors of violence.

Statistical analysis:

The researchers used the following statistical analysis:

- Frequencies, percentages and means to determine what personality types of the most common and the degree of prevalent risk factors to violence among peacekeeping officers.

- Pearson correlation coefficient to reveal the nature of the relationship between personality types and risk factors for violence.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:

Firstly: Results related to the first question which is: what Personality types of the most common among peacekeeping officers.

To answer this question, we use the frequencies of officers numbers and percentages depending on their responses on the (MPTI) in table (1).

Table (1) frequencies and percentages of the personality types according to MPTI

Personality type	Abbreviation	Frequencies	Percentage
Introversion-Sensing-Thinking-Judgement	ISTJ	68	43.6%
Introversion- Sensing- Feeling- Judgement	ISFJ	8	5.1%
Introversion- Intuition- Feeling- Judgement	INFJ	2	1.3%

Indian Research Journal of Pharmacy and Science; A. Maher et. al.

June'17
(Suppl)

Introversion- Intuition- Thinking- Judgement	INTJ	5	3.2%
Introversion- Sensing- Thinking- Perception	ISTP	2	1.3%
Introversion- Sensing- Feeling- Perception	ISFP	1	.6%
Introversion- Intuition- Feeling- Perception	INFP	2	1.3%
Introversion- Intuition- Thinking- Perception	INTP	5	3.2%
Extraversion-Sensing-Thinking-Perception	ESTP	2	1.3%
Extraversion-Sensing- Feeling- Perception	ESFP	2	1.3%
Extraversion-Intuition-Feeling- Perception	ENFP	0	0%
Extraversion- Intuition- Thinking- Perception	ENTP	5	3.2%
Extraversion-Sensing- Thinking- Judgement	ESTJ	23	14.7%
Extraversion- Sensing- Feeling- Judgement	ESFJ	22	14.1%
Extraversion- Intuition- Feeling- Judgement	ENFJ	2	1.3%
Extraversion- Intuition- Thinking- Judgement	ENTJ	7	4.5%
Total		156	100.0%

Table (1) indicates that the most common personality types among officers is (**ISTJ**), where the number of officers is (68) and their percentage is (43.6%), followed by (**ESTJ**), where the number of officers is (23) and their percentage is (14.7%). The lowest common personality type was (**ENFP**), where the number of officers is (0) and their percentage is (0%), and (**ISFP**)where the number of officers is (1) and their percentage is (0.6%). According to this context, the ISTJ type stands out among military officers, and it is consistent with other studies reported in literature29-31. Also this result is interpreted in the light of MPTI's literature, where The ISTJ is often calm and cool in stressful situations and has a clear mind to make important decisions. However, ISTJs tend to be impatient and believe that a bad decision on time is better than no decision at all; doing something is better than doing nothing. ISTJ view the order or task as more important than the team/group's spirit, morale or interpersonal issues.This result may be beneficial to the military officers helping them self to identify internal preferences with their personality and understand how those preferences may affect their career satisfaction, and protect from risk factors of violence.

Secondly: Results related to the second question which is: What is the degree of prevalent risk factors of violence among peacekeeping officers in Liberia?

To answer this question, we usethe frequencies of officers' numbers, percentages and means depending on their responses on the risk factors to violence as shown in table (6).

Table (6): means and degrees of the risk factors to violence

Dimension	Mean	Degree
Historical	1.35	Low
Social/Contextual	1.78	Medium
Individual/Clinical	2.37	High
Total	1.83	Medium

Indian Research Journal of Pharmacy and Science; A. Maher et. al.

June'17
(Suppl)

Table (6) indicates that the degree of prevalent risk factors of violence was (1.83) degree which was medium, while the individual/ clinical risk factors are higher than historical and social/ contextual factors, where the degree of historical factors was low, and social/contextual factors was medium.

The result means that the officers are shown a violence when during their presence in peacekeeping missions, and they are more exposing to individual/clinical risk factors, which cause for example using a weapon illegally, psychological disorders like post trauma stress disorder which are perhaps more than historical and social risk factors as this is illustrated by studies conducted by Kewley et al[32], this result is interpreted in terms of the fact that clinical\individual factors were associated with violence are more than any other factors such as post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) symptoms, anxiety, and depression, younger age, being divorced, feeling homesick, lake of privacy, Boredom or monotony, Lack of time off Which leads to increase officers' risk for engaging in ''externalizing'' behaviors such as antisocial behavior, aggression, and illegal activities.

Thirdly: Results related to the third question which is: Is there significant statistical correlated relationship between personality types and risk factors of violence among peacekeeping officers in Liberia?

To answer this question, we use (Pearson correlation coefficients) to find out the relationship between personality types and risk factors among peacekeeping officers as this illustrated in table (3).

Table3:Correlation coefficients between personality types and risk factors

Personality types	Risk factors		
	Historical	**Social/contextual**	**Individual/clinical**
ISTJ	.172	-.147	.198
ISFJ	.017	.049	.003
INFJ	-.084	.094	.126
INTJ	.181	-.127	-.161
ISTP	.155	-.125	-.109
ISFP	-.202	-.004	-.041
INFP	-.039	-.036	-.040
INTP	.152	.040	.133
ESTP	-.064	-.270	-.020
ESFP	-.044	.302	-.097
ENFP	-.102	-.021	-.013
ENTP	.017	-.060	-.104
ESTJ	.206(*)	.302(**)	.433(**)
ESFJ	.101	-.049	.029
ENFJ	.000	.000	.000
ENTJ	.202	-.021	-.177

(*)Correlation is statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

(**) Correlation is statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

Indian Research Journal of Pharmacy and Science; A. Maher et. al.

June'17
(Suppl)

Table (3) shows that there is statistical significant correlation relationship between personality type of ESTJ and risk factors of violence, this result can be explained by reviewing the characteristics of ESTJ's, in which draws conclusions too quickly and is not always responsive to emotional needs of others. He or she does not always allow or listen to opposite points of view, and tends to disregard diversity and subordinate positions. ESTJ is sometimes seen as overbearing and insensitive. In making decisions, he or she believes it is more important to accomplish the mission in a timely fashion even at the expense of wasting valuable personal and organizational resources.

Due to the lack of studies which illustrates the relationship between personality types MPTI and risk factors of violence (according to researcher

knowledge) there is an urgent need for conducting further studies in this area.

Recommendations:

1- Developing and defining a psychological selection profile for peacekeeping officers based on these results.

2- Conductingstudies and research on other variables such as personality types and a tendency to commit suicide.

3- Conducting researches on the quality and quantity about personality and risk factors in different samples.

4- Holding training programs to lessen, reduce the impact of risk factors of violence.

REFERENCES:

1- Jung,C.G,1990. Psychological types. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

2- Myers, B., McCaulley, H., Quenk, L., Hammer, L, 1998. MBTI Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (3rd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

3- Myers, I. Briggs, M., McCaulley, H., Quenk, N. and Hammer, A, 2003. MBTI manual a guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs type indicator. Mountain View, CA: CPP. Inc.

4- Capraro, Roberto M., and M. M. Capraro, Myers-Briggs type indicator score reliability across: Studies a meta-analytic reliability generalization study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 2002,* 62 (4): 590-602.

5- Bushman, B. J., Huesmann, L. R, 2010, Aggression. In S. T. Fiske, D. T. Gilbert, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), Handbook of social psychology (5th ed., pp. 833–863). New York, NY: Wiley.

6- Borum, R, Assessing Violence Risk among Youth, Journal of clinical psychology, 2000, 56 (10): 1263–1288.

7- Farrington. D, 1991, Childhood aggression and adult violence: Early precursors and later life outcomes. In D. Pepler& K. Rubin (Eds.), the development and treatment of childhood aggression (pp. 5–29). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

8- Maguin, E., Loeber, R., 1996, Academic performance and delinquency. In M. Tonry (Ed.), Crime and justice: A review of research (Vol. 220, pp. 145–264). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

9- Smith, C., Thornberry, T, The relationship between childhood maltreatment and adolescent involvement in delinquency. Criminology, 1995, 33, 451– 481.

10- Klassen, D., and O'Connor, W.A,1994, Demographic and case history variables in risk assessment. In J. Monahan & H.J. Steadman (Eds.), Violence and mental disorder: Developments in risk assessment (pp. 229–258). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

11- Widom. C, The cycle of violence. Science, 1989, 244, 160–166.

Indian Research Journal of Pharmacy and Science; A. Maher et. al.

June'17
(Suppl)

12- Dukarm, C., Byrd, R., Auinger, P., Weitzman, M, Illicit substance use, gender, and the risk of violent behavior among adolescents. Archives of Pediatric Adolescent Medicine, 1996, 150, 797–801.

13- Swanson, J., Borum, R., Swartz, M., Monahan. J, 1996, Psychotic symptoms and disorders and the risk of violent behavior in the community. Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health, 6, 317–338.

14- Webster, C., Jackson, M, 1997, Impulsivity: Theory, Assessment, and Treatment. New York: Guilford.

15- Andrews, D.A., Bonta, J,1995,The psychology of criminal conduct. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing.

16- Novaco, R, 1994, Anger as a risk factor for violence among the mentally disordered. In Monahan, J., Steadman, H. (Eds.), Violence and mental disorder: Developments in risk assessment (pp.21– 60). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

17- Granic, I., Butler, S, The relation between anger and antisocial beliefs in young offenders. Personality & Individual Differences, 1998, 24, 759–765.

18- Furlong, M., Smith, D, 1994, Anger, hostility and aggression: Assessment, prevention, and intervention strategies for youth. Brandon, VT: Clinical Psychology Publishing.

19- Cornell, D., Peterson, C., Richards, H, Anger as a predictor of aggression among incarcerated adolescents. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1999, 67, 108–115.

20- Wells, D., Miller, M, Adolescent affective aggression: An intervention model. Adolescence, 1993, 28, 781–791.

21- Elliott D, Serious violent offenders: Onset, developmental course, and termination— The American Society of Criminology 1993 presidential address. Criminology, 1994, 32, 1–21.

22- Farrington, D, Early predictors of adolescent aggression and adult violence. Violence and Victims, 1989, 4, 79–100.

23- Williams, J, 1994, Understanding substance abuse, delinquency involvement, and juvenile justice system involvement among African-American and European-American adolescents. Unpublished dissertation. University of Washington, Seattle.

24- Felson, R.B, "Kick 'em when they're down".: Explanations of the relationship between stress and interpersonal aggression and violence. Sociological Quarterly, 1992, 33, 1–16.

25- Estroff, S.E., Zimmer, C, 1994, Social networks, social support, and violence among persons with severe, persistent mental illness. In: J. Monahan and H. Steadman (Eds.), Violence and Mental Disorder (pp.259–295). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

26- Myers, I.B., McCaulley, M.H, 1992, Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

27- Briggs, K.C., Myers, I.B, 1997, Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, Form G Booklet. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

28- Bartel, P., Borum, R., Forth, A, 2000, Structured Assessment for Violence Risk in Youth (SAVRY), Consultation Edition. Tampa: University of South Florida.

29- Moraski, J, 2001, Leadership: The Personality Factor, Unpublished Master's Thesis, *Marine Corps University.*

30- Garren, L, 2005, Correlation among the Army officer combat identifier, personality, and career satisfaction. Master's thesis, Army Command and

Indian Research Journal of Pharmacy and Science; A. Maher et. al.

**June'17
(Suppl)**

General Staff College, Ft Leavenworth, KS.

31- Lloyd, G,Dyk, G. and Kock, F, The psychological selection profile for civil-military coordination officers in peace-support operations: The results of field research in the Sudan. African journal on conflict resolution, 2009, 9 (3): 53-85.

32- Kewley, S. Larson,G. McRoy, R. Garland, C. and Gaskin, T. Factors Associated With Antisocial Behavior in Combat Veterans, Aggressive behavior, 2010, 36, 330–337.