

Introduction

- The family environment is critical in developing maladaptive behaviors (Marzilli et al., 2021; Schudlich & Calabrese, 2018).
- However, the impact of family processes on personality dysfunction remains unclear. This study aims to address this gap.
- The findings can potentially contribute to developing targeted interventions and enhancing therapeutic outcomes.



Research Questions

1. What is the relationship between family processes (e.g., strength and adaptability, overwhelmed difficulties, disrupted communication) and personality dysfunction?
2. What is the relative contribution of demographic variables (e.g., age, gender, education, socioeconomic status) and family processes to personality dysfunction?

Hypothesis

1. There is a significant relationship between family processes (e.g., strength and adaptability, overwhelmed difficulties, disrupted communication) and personality dysfunction.
2. Demographic variables (e.g., age, gender, education, socioeconomic status) and family processes significantly predict personality dysfunction.

Method

Participants

- Convenience sample of 262 participants aged 18 to 36 years (mean age = 23.36, SD = 3.91)
- 133 female participants (50.76%)
- Informed consent was taken

Measures

- Demographic information form
- Systemic Clinical Outcome and Routine Evaluation-15 (SCORE-15)
- Personality Inventory for DSM-5-Brief Form (PID-5-BF)

Procedure

- Individual data collection
- Printed questionnaires utilized
- Instructions provided for clarity

Data Processing and Statistical Analysis

- Parametric assumptions met
- Descriptive statistics, correlations, and hierarchical multiple regression calculated

Results

Table 1

Correlations for Study Variables

Variables	Personality Dysfunction				
	Antagonism	Detachment	Disinhibition	Negative Affect	Psychoticism
Demographic variables					
Age	.06	-.078	-.04	-.14*	-.08
Gender ^a	-.19**	.09	.17**	.31**	.06
Education span	-.03	.04	.01	-.04	-.08
Average vs. worse socioeconomic status	-.08	.01	.06	-.002	.11*
Better vs. worse socioeconomic status	.05	-.05	-.07	-.08	-.13*
Family processes					
Strength and adaptability	.08	.20**	.29**	.18**	.26**
Overwhelmed by difficulties	.20**	.23**	.32**	.34**	.30**
Disrupted communication	.18**	.18**	.27**	.23**	.19**

^a0 = male and 1 = female.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Findings: Significant Models and Predictors

Models Tested

Model 1: Demographic variables (e. g., age, gender, education span, average vs. worse socioeconomic status, better vs. worse socioeconomic status)

Model 2: Demographic variables and family processes (e.g., strength and adaptability, overwhelmed difficulties, disrupted communication)

Outcome variable: Antagonism

Significant models

1. Model 1: R square = .05, $p = .04$
2. Model 2: R square = .09, $p = .01$

Significant predictors

1. Gender: $B = -.996$, 95% CI for $B [-1.72, -.28]$, $SE B = .37$, $\beta = -.18$, $p = .01$
2. Overwhelmed by difficulties: $B = .12$, 95% CI for $B [.001, .24]$, $SE B = .06$, $\beta = .18$, $p = .05$

Outcome variable: Detachment

Significant model

1. Model 2: R square = .09, $p = .002$

Significant predictors: None

Outcome variable: Disinhibition

Significant model

1. Model 2: R square = .17, $p = .001$

Significant predictors

1. Gender: $B = 1.22$, 95% CI for B [.40, 2.05], $SE B = .42$, $\beta = .19$, $p = .004$
2. Strengths and adaptability: $B = .18$, 95% CI for B [.05, .30], $SE B = .06$, $\beta = .18$, $p = .006$
3. Overwhelmed by difficulties: $B = .15$, 95% CI for B [.01, .29], $SE B = .07$, $\beta = .18$, $p = .05$

Outcome variable: Negative Affect

Significant models

1. Model 1: R square = .12, $p = .001$
2. Model 2: R square = .23, $p = .001$

Significant predictors

1. Gender: $B = 2.17$, 95% CI for B [1.34, 2.99], $SE B = .42$, $\beta = .32$, $p = .001$
2. Overwhelmed by difficulties: $B = .29$, 95% CI for B [.15, .42], $SE B = .07$, $\beta = .34$, $p = .001$

Outcome variable: Psychoticism

Significant models

1. Model 2: R square = .13, $p = .001$

Significant predictors

1. Strengths and adaptability: $B = .14$, 95% CI for B [.01, .26], $SE B = .06$, $\beta = .14$, $p = .05$
2. Overwhelmed by difficulties: $B = .21$, 95% CI for B [.07, .35], $SE B = .07$, $\beta = .26$, $p = .003$

Conclusion:

- Gender and family processes (overwhelmed difficulties, strengths & adaptability) significantly predicted personality dysfunction outcomes
- Demographic variables had less impact on detachment; family processes had a more substantial influence

Limitations and Future Directions:

- Convenience sample limits generalizability
- Future research should include larger, diverse samples

References

- Marzilli, E., Cerniglia, L., & Cimino, S. (2021). Antisocial Personality Problems in Emerging Adulthood: The Role of Family Functioning, Impulsivity, and Empathy. *Brain Sciences*, 11(6), 687.
- Du Rocher Schudlich, T. D., Youngstrom, E. A., Calabrese, J. R., & Findling, R. L. (2008). The role of family functioning in bipolar disorder in families. *Journal of abnormal child psychology*, 36, 849-863.