



Giving a Comment or Not? The Influence of Psychopathy Trait on Commenting on Social Media**Vonia Muna Artana ¹□, Siti Nuzulia**¹Department of Psychology, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Keywords*Psychopathy, willingness, comment, social media*

Abstract

Personality usually also influences the preferences or interests that a person has. This interest then triggers the desire in a person to behave well, both positive and negative behavior. Psychopathic psychology itself is described as selfish, lacking feelings of empathy and remorse, impulsive, manipulative, more selfish, and tends to be antisocial. Research related to psychopathy and commenting behavior on social media has not been carried out much. Therefore, this study aims to see the effect of psychopathic personality on behavior to give comments on social media. This research is a quantitative research using quasi-experimental methods and one group post-test design. Quota sampling is used as a sampling technique. The research managed to collect 380 respondents who were then divided into two different groups, namely the control group and the experimental group. Both groups will be given the same treatment according to the existing procedure. Data analysis was then performed using logistic regression analysis which was carried out twice. While the results of the study show a significance value of 0.049 between so that it reads that the hypothesis is accepted where secondary psychopathy has a negative effect on commenting behavior in the experimental group with posting negative content.

□ Correspondence address: harmful
E-mail: vivionnss12@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

The behavior is defined as an activity, action, or conduct carried out by an individual (Notoatmodjo, 2010). The behavior often exhibited by individuals is closely tied to their personality, as behavior is a manifestation of one's personality (Sullivan in Hall & Lindzey, 1993). Personality itself is described as a combination of unity that includes thoughts, feelings, and behaviors possessed by an individual (Alwisol, 2012). Therefore, the personality of an individual also influences the factors behind their decision-making in behavior.

Personality itself, when explaining behavior, is divided into various groups or dimensions, one of which is the dark triad personality. O'Boyle et al. (2012) explain the dark triad personality as a collection of three personalities with dark sides: Machiavellianism, narcissism, and psychopathy. These three personalities are interconnected and have varying degrees of malevolence that influence how an individual acts or behaves. Jonason et al. (2015) categorize the dark triad personality with undesirable traits, including (a) manipulative and deceitful tendencies symbolized by Machiavellianism, (b) antisocial behavior, thrill-seeking, impulsivity, and lack of empathy symbolized by psychopathy, and (c) flamboyant, arrogant, and egotistical behavior symbolized by narcissism. Individuals with dark triad traits often employ various means to achieve their social and interpersonal goals, regardless of their antisocial tendencies (Jonason & Webster, 2012).

Psychopathy, among the dark triad traits, refers to antisocial behavior, displaying cruelty, and having low regard for others, accompanied by reduced empathy, affection, guilt, and conscience (Diller et al., 2021; Santoso et al., 2017). Psychopathic behavior is also linked to direct aggression and cyber aggression among adolescents (Ciucci et al., 2014). In a longitudinal study on cyber aggression, Fanti et al. (2012) found that the lack of empathy, a component of psychopathy, is positively associated with cyber aggression. The evidence suggests that psychopathic behavior is often observed on social media, particularly in posts or comments where individuals tend to express themselves with harsh language, criticism, or aggressive statements.

Numerous studies have explored behavior, such as Kircaburun et al.'s (2018) research on the relationship between Problematic Social Media Use, Dark Triad Traits, and self-esteem. Asghar et al. (2021) delved into the classification of psychopathic personality traits from social media text using deep learning. Pabian et al. (2015) investigated the connection between dark triad personality and adolescent cyber aggression. Sumner et al. (2012) focused on predicting the dark triad personality from Twitter users and linguistically analyzing their tweets. In Indonesia, Rizal & Handayani (2021) have explored the overview of dark triad personality among social media users, but research specifically on commenting behavior is scarce. This study proposes a novel approach by emphasizing commenting behavior—whether positive or negative—on social media posts related to activities of a specific industry or organization. The choice of this setting is driven by the need to expand beyond previous research, which often focused on general dark triad manifestations without specific content focus.

The aim of this research is to investigate whether the psychopathic trait influences commenting behavior on Instagram. The study aspires to contribute insights and perspectives for other researchers interested in similar inquiries concerning the development of dark triad personality traits, particularly the psychopathy trait, and its impact on the social media behavior of the Indonesian population.

METHOD

The subjects for this study are individuals with the characteristic of having an active Instagram social media account, and the sample is selected using the quota sampling method. A total of 380 participants were successfully gathered and evenly divided into two groups: the experimental group and the control group. Among the 380 participants, 84.2% are female, and 83.2% are students. The research adopts a quasi-experimental method with a one-group post-test design. For collecting data

on the psychopathy variable, the researcher utilizes The Levenson Primary and Secondary Psychopathy Scale, also known as LPSP-I and LPSP-II, consisting of 26 items (Levenson et al., 1995). The Cronbach alpha for the primary psychopathy scale is 0.80, and for the secondary psychopathy scale is 0.71 (Ben-Yaacov & Glicksohn, 2018). The experimental procedure is divided into three stages: pre-experiment, experiment, and post-experiment.

Pra-eksperimental

This phase involves creating two content designs containing activities by a company. The first content features positive activities, which will be uploaded to the Instagram account for the control group, while the second content showcases negative activities, intended for the experimental group's Instagram account. Subsequently, both contents undergo judgment to observe and assess the quality differences. To streamline data collection, a Google Form link is generated, serving as a tool to collect participant data and containing the LPSP 1 & LPSP 2 instruments for each group.

Eksperiment

Participants are first provided with explanations and instructions regarding the experimental procedure. They are then directed to fill out the provided Google Form link, which includes the LPSP 1 & LPSP 2 scales. After completing the questionnaire, at the end of the Google Form, there is a link to the Instagram content prepared earlier. Participants are instructed to open the link to view the content and are encouraged to leave comments if they wish. The comments are voluntary, and there is no compulsion. Data collection takes place over a two-week period.

Pasca-eksperimental

After collecting all participant data, the next step involves tabulating and scoring the data for both experimental groups. Only after this process will data analysis be conducted to address the research questions. As previously explained, the research aims to examine the influence of the psychopathy trait on the behavior of commenting. Therefore, the independent variable in this study is psychopathy, while the dependent variable is the behavior of commenting, defined as an expression individuals use to engage in an action or behavior (in this case, commenting). Additionally, there are control variables, namely gender and employment status. The collected data will be analyzed using logistic regression analysis techniques.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Calculation related to discrimination power and internal consistency was conducted earlier to determine the Cronbach's Alpha scores and item-total correlation scores on the LPSP I and LPSP II scales. For LPSP I (primary psychopathy), Cronbach's Alpha score was found to be .699, with the lowest item-total correlation score at .084 and the highest score at .466. On the LPSP II scale (secondary psychopathy), Cronbach's Alpha score was .588, with the lowest item-total correlation score at -.240 and the highest score at .417. Descriptive analysis, using mean and standard deviation values, provided insights into each variable. The analysis revealed a positive correlation between primary psychopathy and secondary psychopathy with a Pearson correlation value of 0.398** ($p < 0.01$), indicating a significant relationship. Other correlations were found between gender and primary psychopathy (Pearson correlation = 0.111*, $p < 0.05$) and a negative correlation between secondary psychopathy and employment status (Pearson correlation = -0.115*, $p < 0.05$).

Table 1. Result of Descriptive Statistic and Intercorrelation Has

Variable	Eksperiment		control		1	2	3	4	5
	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)					
1. <i>Primary Psychopathy</i>	18.463	6.172	17.721	4.874					
2. <i>Secondary Psychopathy</i>	13.657	3.957	13.152	3.905	.398**				
3. <i>Willingness Komentar</i>	1.384	.487	1.568	.496	.017	-.069			
4. <i>Jenis Kelamin</i>	1.110	.314	1.205	.404	.111*	-.094	.006		
5. <i>Status</i>	2.236	.536	2.105	.423	-.021	-.115*	-.054	.011	

* $p < 0.05$ (sig.2-tailed)

** $p < 0.01$ (sig.2-tailed)

In addition, a significance test was conducted between the experimental group and the control group. Based on the test using an independent sample T-test, it was found that the Significance value (2-tailed) for the willingness to provide comments is .000 ($p < 0.05$), suggesting a significant difference in commenting behavior between the experimental and control group

Table 2. Independent Samples Test

		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
							Lower	Upper
<i>Willingness komentar</i>	Equal variances not assumed	-3.648	377.876	.000	-.1842	.0505	-.2835	-.0849

The logistic regression analysis was conducted twice to address the second hypothesis. The first test aimed to assess the influence of LPSP 1 and 2 variables on willingness. The second logistic regression test included additional control variables such as gender and occupation. The results of both logistic regression analyses, whether involving control variables or not, indicate that secondary psychopathy can predict the occurrence of commenting behavior in the experimental group. However, primary psychopathy cannot predict commenting behavior in either the control or experimental group. Furthermore, the analysis suggests that the control variables do not have a significant impact on predicting commenting behavior in both research groups.

Table 3. Result of Analysis Regression Logistic Without Variable Control

Group	Predictor	b	(SE)	Wald χ^2	p	OR	CI 95%	
							LB	UP
Eksperiment	Primary	.013	.026	.267	.606	1.014	.963	1.067
	Psychopathy							
Controll	Secondary	-.082	.042	3.869	.049	.921	.849	1.000
	Psychopathy							
Controll	Primary	.040	.034	1.407	.235	1.041	.974	1.113
	Psychopathy							
Controll	Secondary	-.010	.042	.059	.807	.990	.911	1.075
	Psychopathy							

Eksperimen = R = .021 (Cox & Snell), .028 (Nagelkerke), X (8, N = 190) = 9.583, p (.296) > .05(Hosmer & Lemeshow)

Kontrol = R = .008 (Cox & Snell), .011 (Nagelkerke), X (8, N = 190) = 8.364, p (.399) > .05(Hosmer & Lemeshow)

OR = odds ratio

CI = confidence interval

Table 4. Result of Analysis Regression Logistic With Variable Control

Group	Predictor	b	(SE)	Wal d χ^2	p	OR	CI 95%	
							LB	UP
Eksperimen	Primary	.016	.027	.347	.556	1.016	.964	1.070
	Psychopathy							
Eksperimen	Secondary	-.088	.043	4.216	.040	.916	.842	.996
	Psychopathy							
Eksperimen	Jenis Kelamin	-.209	.497	.177	.674	.811	.306	2.148
	Status	-.157	.288	297	.586	.855	.486	1.504
Kontrol	Primary	.046	.035	1.708	.191	1.047	.977	1.121
	Psychopathy							
Kontrol	Secondary	-.019	.043	.204	.652	.981	.901	1.067
	Psychopathy							
Kontrol	Jenis Kelamin	-.208	.373	.310	.578	.812	.390	1.690
	Status	-.399	.354	1.268	.260	.671	.335	1.344

Eksperimen = R = .023 (Cox & Snell), .032 (Nagelkerke), X (8, N = 190) = 5.382, p (.716) > .05(Hosmer & Lemeshow)

Kontrol = R = .017 (Cox & Snell), .023 (Nagelkerke), X (8, N = 190) = 6.228, p (.622) > .05(Hosmer & Lemeshow)

OR = odds ratio

CI = confidence interval

Based on the analysis of the conducted research, it was found that the behavior of providing comments was observed in the experimental group with negative posts but not in the control group

with positive posts. Additionally, higher levels of secondary psychopathy in participants in the experimental group were associated with a decreased willingness to comment on negative content.

The findings of this study align with previous research by Malesza & Kalinowski (2021), indicating that individuals with higher levels of psychopathy tend to exhibit greater social discounting. This suggests a tendency toward increased selfishness and a reduced willingness to share with others. Other studies have also found that individuals with high levels of psychopathy generally feel less inclined to engage or cooperate in various activities (Newman, 1987; Book et al., 2006).

Previous studies examining similar variables have found contrasting results, where psychopathy positively predicts willingness or readiness in certain contexts. For instance, research by Hyde & Grieve (2014) indicated that primary psychopathy (lack of empathy, deceptive) is a predictor for self-report ability and willingness to be emotionally manipulated, while secondary psychopathy significantly predicts willingness. In another study, psychopathy emerged as the strongest predictor for lying and explained why certain individuals are willing to engage in deception (Modic et al., 2018). This is further supported by Morosoli et al.'s (2022) research, stating that high personality traits and social media usage intensity can increase the willingness to spread misinformation online. It's evident that findings in psychopathy research can vary based on the specific aspects studied and the context of the research.

While some of the earlier studies suggest a positive direction regarding the influence of psychopathy on an individual's willingness, it's important to emphasize that in this conducted research, only secondary psychopathy predicts willingness. The higher the level of secondary psychopathy, the lower the willingness to engage in activities. Secondary psychopathy, as described in the previous section, has distinct characteristics, tending to act impulsively, struggling with emotional control, and frequently getting involved in interpersonal issues (Levenson et al., 1995). Individuals with secondary psychopathy also exhibit tendencies such as boredom proneness, inconsistency, and a proclivity to lose interest in activities (Levenson et al., 1995). Secondary psychopathy is also associated with a lack of interest and attention (Del Gaizo & Falkenbach, 2008). Therefore, these factors may explain why individuals with high levels of secondary psychopathy have a low willingness to engage in specific behaviors.

The suspicion arises regarding why individuals with high levels of secondary psychopathy have a low willingness to engage in commenting, potentially due to the influence of antisocial characteristics. Individuals with antisocial traits tend to be individualistic, often feeling disconnected or disinterested in societal relationships. They may prefer solitude over social interactions and intentionally reject social connections because they perceive themselves as superior to others (Gustia, 2017; Setiadi & Kolip, 2011). Other research explains that psychopathy correlates positively with antisocial behavior, viewing antisocial behavior as a secondary symptom or consequence of psychopathic personality (Visser et al., 2010; Cooke et al., 2004). Specific psychopathic traits play a causal role in antisocial behavior, and characteristics associated with psychopathy seem to contribute to the development of antisocial behavior (Cooke et al., 2004; McDermott et al., 2000).

Furthermore, another speculation for the difference in findings compared to previous research could be attributed to the use of a different research object. In this study, the focus was not on controversial posts involving human subjects or posts threatening or offending individuals or human life itself. Previous research has highlighted that controversial and highly damaging content, such as news articles, influences an increase in willingness to post reactive comments, involving both cognitive and affective engagement (Ziegele et al., 2018). On the other hand, Hodas et al. (2016) conducted research showing that personality can influence behavior, preferences, and willingness in various forms of social media content. Hodas et al. (2016) also emphasized the need for a deeper understanding of the relationship between personality and content preferences to better comprehend and provide examples of social media behavior.

The conducted research is not exempt from limitations. The quasi-experimental design used introduces uncontrollable factors that may influence participants throughout the experiment.

Additionally, the open nature of the comment section, visible to anyone accessing the posts, may lead participants to not overtly express their true characteristics. Another possibility is that participants may refrain from commenting due to a lack of interest. The content of the posts is considered less provocative and does not attack the personal identity or group affiliation of participants, potentially diminishing the triggering of willingness to comment. Moreover, the lack of specific relevance between the content and the participants might contribute to a sense of disengagement or lack of threat, affecting participants' willingness to comment.

CONCLUSION

Based on the conducted research, it can be concluded that there are differences between the control group and the experimental group in terms of commenting on Instagram. The level of psychopathy trait in individual affect their willingness to comment of Instagram, as evidenced by the finding the secondary psychopathy negatively influences the willingness to comment in the experimental group. The higher the score of secondary psychopath, the lower willingness to comment on post with negative content and vice versa.

Suggestions for future research include conducting descriptive analyses to depict the characteristics of individuals with psychopathy traits and the types of comments they provide on social media posts. Additionally, exploring the relationship between the dark triad personality and content preferences could offer further insights into social media behavior. Experimenting with more negative and provocative content, possibly creating an impression of attacking personal identity or group affiliation, may stimulate aggression in participants. Further studies on the dark triad personality, especially the psychopathy trait, and its connection to willingness could add variety to research outcomes and contribute to supporting previous studies.

REFERENCES

- Alwisol. (2012). *Psikologi kepribadian*. UMM Press.
- Asghar, J., Akbar, S., Ashgar, M. Z., Ahmad, B., Al-Rakhami, M. S., & Gumaei, A. (2021). Detection and Classification of Psychopathic Personality Trait from Social Media Text Using Deep Learning Model. *Hindawi: Computational and Mathematical Methods in Medicine*, 1–10.
- Ben-Yaacov, T., & Glicksohn, J. (2018). Intelligence and Psychopathy: A study on Non-Incarcerated Females from the Normal Population. *Cogent Psychology*, 5(1).
- Book, A. S., Holden, R. R., Starzyk, K. B., Wasylkiw, L., & Edwards, M. J. (2006). Psychopathic traits and experimentally induced deception in self-report assessment. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 41, 601–608. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1016/j.paid.2006.02.011>
- Ciucci, E., Baroncelli, A., Franchi, M., Golmaryami, F. N., & Frick, P. J. (2014). The Association between Callous-Unemotional Traits and Behavioral and Academic Adjustment in Children: Further Validation of the Inventory of Callous-Unemotional Traits. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 36(2), 189–200.
- Cooke, D. J., Michie, C., Hart, S. D., & Clark, D. A. (2004). Reconstructing Psychopathy: Clarifying the Significance of Antisocial and Socially Deviant Behavior in the Diagnosis of Psychopathic Personality Disorder. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, 18(4), 337–357. <https://doi.org/10.1521/pedi.18.4.337.40347>
- Del Gaizo, A. L., & Falkenbach, D. M. (2008). Primary and secondary psychopathic- traits and their relationship to perception and experience of emotion. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 45, 206–212.
- Diller, S. J., Czibor, A., Szabó, Z. P., Restás, P., Jonas, E., & Frey, D. (2021). The positive connection between dark triad traits and leadership levels in self- and other-ratings. *Leadership, Education, Personality: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 3(2), 117–131. <https://doi.org/10.1365/s42681-021-00025-6>
- Fanti, K. A., Demetriou, A. G., & Hawa, V. V. (2012). A longitudinal study of cyberbullying: Examining risk and protective factors. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 9(2), 168–

181.

- Gustia, E. (2017). Tampilan Perilaku Anti Sosial Pada Siswa Sekolah Dasar. *JRTI (Jurnal Riset Tindakan Indonesia)*, 2(2), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.29210/3003211000>
- Hall, C. S., & Lindzey, G. (1993). *Psikologi Kepribadian I Teori-teori Psikodinamik (klinis)*. Kanisius. Hodas,
- N. O., Butner, R., & Corley, C. (2016). *How a User ' s Personality In fl uences Content Engagement in Social Media*. 1, 481–493. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-47880-7>
- Hyde, J., & Grieve, R. (2014). Able and willing: Refining the measurement of emotional manipulation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 64, 131–134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.02.036>
- Jonason, P. K., Duineveld, J. J., & Middleton, J. P. (2015). Pathology, pseudopathology, and the Dark Triad of personality. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 78, 43–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.01.028>
- Jonason, P. K., & Webster, G. D. (2012). A protean approach to social influence: Dark Triad personalities and social influence tactics. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 52(4), 521–526.
- Kircaburun, K., Demetrovics, Z., & Tosuntaş, Ş. B. (2018b). Analyzing the Links Between Problematic Social Media Use, Dark Triad Traits, and Self-esteem. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, 17(6), 1496–1507. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-018-9900-1>
- Levenson, M. R., Kiehl, K. A., & Fitzpatrick, C. M. (1995). Assessing Psychopathic Attributes in a Noninstitutionalized Population. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68(1), 151–158. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/0022-3514/95/53.00>
- Malesza, M., & Kalinowski, K. (2021). Willingness to share , impulsivity and the Dark Triad traits. *Current Psychology*, 40, 3888–3896. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-019-00351-5>
- McDermott, P. A., Alterman, A. I., Cacciola, J. S., Rutherford, M. J., Newman, J. P., & Mulholland, E. M. (2000). Generality of Psychopathy Checklist-Revised factors over prisoners and substance dependent patients. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 68, 181–186.
- Modic, D., Palomäki, J., Drosinou, M., & Laakasuo, M. (2018). The dark triad and willingness to commit insurance fraud. *Cogent Psychology*, 5(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311908.2018.1469579>
- Morosoli, S., Aelst, P. Van, Humprecht, E., Staender, A., & Esser, F. (2022). Identifying the Drivers Behind the Dissemination of Online Misinformation: A Study on Political Attitudes and Individual Characteristics in the Context of Engaging With Misinformation on Social Media. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 00(0), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00027642221118300>
- Newman, J. P. (1987). Reaction to punishment in extra_verts and psychopaths: Implications for the impulsive behavior of disinhibited individuals. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 21, 464–480. [https://doi.org/doi:10.1016/0092-6566\(87\)90033-x](https://doi.org/doi:10.1016/0092-6566(87)90033-x)
- Notoatmodjo, S. (2010). *Ilmu Perilaku Kesehatan*. Rineka Cipta.
- O'Boyle, E. H., Forsyth, D. R., Banks, G. C., & McDaniell, M. A. (2012). A meta-analysis of the Dark Triad and work behavior: A social exchange perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(3), 557–579. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025679>
- Pabian, S., De Backer, C. J. S., & Vandebosch, H. (2015). Dark Triad personality traits and adolescent cyber-aggression. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 75, 41–46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.11.015>
- Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). “The Dark Triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy,.” *Journal of Research in Personality*, 556–563.
- Rizal, I., & Handayani, B. (2021). Gambaran Kepribadian Gelap (Dark Triad Personality) Pada Pengguna Media Sosial. *Al-Hikmah: Jurnal Agama Dan Ilmu Pengetahuan*, 18(1), 44–53. [https://doi.org/10.25299/al-hikmah:jaip.2021.vol18\(1\).5564](https://doi.org/10.25299/al-hikmah:jaip.2021.vol18(1).5564)
- Santoso, M. B., Krisnani, H., & Deraputi, G. N. (2017). Gangguan Kepribadian Antisosial pada Narapidana. *Share: Social Work Journal*, 7(2), 18–27.
- Setiadi, E. M., & Kolip, U. (2011). *Pengantar Sosiologi Pemahaman Fakta dan Gejala Permasalahan Sosial: Teori, Aplikasi dan Pemecahannya*. Kencana.
- Sumner, C., Byers, A., Boochever, R., & Park, G. J. (2012). Predicting dark triad personality traits from twitter usage and a linguistic analysis of tweets. *Proceedings - 2012 11th International Conference on Machine Learning and Applications, ICMLA 2012*, 2, 386–393. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICMLA.2012.218>
- Visser, B. A., Bay, D., Cook, G. L., & Myburgh, J. (2010). Psychopathic and antisocial, but not

- emotionally intelligent. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 48(5), 644–648.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2010.01.003>
- Zagon, I. K., & Jackson, H. J. (1994). Construct validity of a psychopathy measure. *Journal of Personality and Individual Differences*, 17, 125–135.
- Ziegele, M., Weber, M., Quiring, O., & Breiner, T. (2018). The dynamics of online news discussions: effects of news articles and reader comments on users' involvement, willingness to participate, and the civility of their contributions. *Information Communication and Society*, 21(10), 1419–1435.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2017.1324505>