Nature vs. Nurture

The argument of nature vs. nurture is an argument that can be backed up on each side by sociological and scientific proof. The nativist account of this debate argues that what we as humans do in regards to personality and habit are influenced by the organism’s genes. This would make the process innate. An empiricist perspective argues that these traits are influenced by the environment of the organism and the behaviors are learned. I believe that I am about half and half when it comes to my personal traits.

Humans go through a certain cycle of gene making and gene pairing, like any other organism. Unlike sexual organisms however, we gain traits from two different counter parts, who therein obtained traits from a total of four counterparts, and this list continues to expand. As humans, we have an infinite possibility of gene pairs, and each pair can account for a different trait. As I excel at math and science, and my ability to learn foreign language is better off than others, I believe that these are traits I gained through my genes. For example, I was not taught how to do math at a young age, and I did not take interest in it until I actually tried to. I however have always been good at it. Whether or not I like it, math is one of the things that I am best at and it has always been that way.

Environmental factors have more of an impact on traits relating to character and personality. Characteristics such as loyalty, trustworthiness, and integrity are taught to children, often in schools. There are negative influences however that can impact the behavior of a person. For example, I grew up in a household where everyone was always working. Both of my parents were workaholics, so I was often left alone. For the time being that I wasn’t alone, my parents would often argue. By the age of ten, I developed mild depression, but I have since recovered. Characteristics like these are not innate in any way, and are influenced by the environment that we are in.