

Study of aggression in working and non-working adults

CHANDRA SHEKHAR^{1*} AND RIFFAT MALIK²

¹Sr. Assistant Professor and ²Ph.D. Scholar

P.G. Department of Psychology, University of Jammu, Jammu, Jammu-Tawi (J&K) India

ABSTRACT

Aggression is one of the important psychological variables that can influence each and every sphere of our life. In present study our interest was to see whether there is any statistically significant difference in the aggression level of working and non-working male and female. We collected a sample of 100 adults out of which 50 are working and 50 are non-working. Gender ratio is also maintained equal. Data is collected with the help of Aggression Scale (2004) by Mathur and Bhatnagar. With the help of t-test, we found significant differences in aggression level of working and non-working adults at 0.05 level of significance. In addition to it significant gender differences were also found.

Key Words : Aggression, Working and non-working, Adults and gender

INTRODUCTION

The concept of aggression is used in many different contexts. Importantly, it has been applied to animal behavior as well as human behavior. It is used to describe personality and attitudes, as well as to characterize behavior in both children and adults. When aggression is used in the medical field, it often linked to a mental disorder, such as epilepsy (Tebartz van Elst. 2002). Specially, physical aggression can result in violence and injury (Carlson *et al.*, 2004; Gates *et al.*, 2003). The aim of this analysis is to describe the different forms and manifestations of aggression, as well as to describe the causes and consequences in humans. A better understanding of aggression and the causal factors underlying it is essential for learning how to prevent negative aggression in the future (Walker and Avant, 1995). Historically, some investigators of human and animal behavior, such as Sigmund Freud and Konrad Lorenz, have argued that aggressive behavior is innate but, alternatively, others have proposed that it is a learnt behavior (Conger *et al.*, 2003; Huesmann *et al.*, 2003). In all likelihood, there are both genetic and environmental contributions towards aggressive behavior (Ghodsian-Carpey and Baker, 1987; Raine, 1993). Humans engage in aggression when they seek to cause harm or pain to another person. Aggression takes two forms depending on one's motives: hostile or instrumental. Hostile aggression is motivated by feelings of anger with intent to cause pain; a fight in a bar with a stranger is an example of hostile aggression. From the perspective of evolutionary psychology, human male aggression, like that in nonhuman primates, likely serves to display dominance over other males, both to protect a mate and to perpetuate the male's genes. Sexual jealousy is part of male aggression; males endeavor to make sure their mates are not copulating with other males, thus ensuring their own paternity of the female's offspring. Women

typically display instrumental form of aggression, with their aggression serving as a means to an end (Dodge and Schwartz, 1997).

Review of literature :

Underwood and Coie (2004) also highlight that under certain circumstances girls' and women's aggression may be adaptive as a form of self-defense, as a means to maintain group affiliation. Aggressive behavior may serve self-protective functions in addressing identity issues, and serve as attempts to self-regulate other emotions such as depression and anxiety. Assess for strengths and signs of resilience in girls who show evidence of aggressive behavior (e.g., abilities, interests, future orientation, possible positive female role models, and attachment history). Conduct disorder girls, who have a positive future orientation with potentially achievable goals, have been found to show evidence of more responsiveness to treatment and a more favorable prognosis (Chamberlain, 2004). Harris (1993) found that men perceived physical attack as more provoking than insensitive or condescending behaviors, whereas for women the relative magnitude of perceived provocation produced by each was reversed. In addition, Van Goozen *et al.* (1994) have shown that women are more likely to report that they would be angry as a result of impolite treatment, abuses, and frustrations than as a consequence of their own inability or incompetence. Feshbach (1969) observed first graders' responses to unfamiliar peers. She found that girls were significantly more likely than boys to respond to the unfamiliar peer with behaviors that, although referred to by the author as "indirect aggression," appear similar to those specifically defined here as relational aggression (e.g., rejection and social exclusion). Cairns *et al.* (1989) asked fourth through ninth graders to describe recent conflicts with peers. Content analysis of children's responses revealed that same-gender conflicts among girls were significantly more likely than boys' conflicts to involve themes of social alienation and manipulation of peer acceptance (*i.e.*, themes that are consistent with relational aggression). Some studies have found a direct relationship between higher levels of testosterone and higher levels of aggressiveness in humans as well, even within normal ranges (Gerra *et al.*, 1997). Male judo competitors, for example, displayed a direct relationship between levels of testosterone and the number of threats, fights, and attacks (Salvador *et al.*, 1999). In further studies with this same population, Salvador *et al.* (2003, 364) found that the group with higher testosterone also performed better in competition; the authors suggested that testosterone provides "an adaptive neurobiological response to competition." In some situations, chivalry norms may temper men's aggressiveness toward women, making them less aggressive toward female than male targets (Bjorkqvist and Niemela, 1992; Eagly and Steffen, 1986; Geen, 1990). In several studies that vary both gender of participant and level of provocation, women exhibit less aggression than men under relatively neutral conditions but behave slightly more aggressively than men when provoked (e.g., Anderson, 1993; Fischer *et al.*, 1969; Schuck *et al.*, 1971; Taylor and Epstein, 1967).

Objectives :

1. To assess the differences in aggression level of working and non-working adults.
2. To assess the gender differences in aggression level of working and non-working adults.

Hypotheses :

1. There will be no significant differences in aggression level of working and non-working adults.
2. There will be no significant gender differences in aggression level of working and non-

working adults.

METHODOLOGY

Sample :

A total no. of 100 adults participated in the study, out of which 50 were working (25 males and 25 females) and 50 were non-working (25 males and 25 females). The participants were taken from the Jammu region.

Tool :

Aggression scale (Mathur - Bhatnagar) established in the year 1985 is used to study the level of aggression in any age group (above 14 years). Aggression scale is finally prepared. Now it consists of 55 statements. Each statement describes different forms of individual's aggression in different situations. It is a Likert type 5 point scale. In this scale statements are in two forms *i.e.* positive and negative.

Reliability :

Reliability co-efficient of the Aggression Scale was calculated by 'Test-Retest Reliability' method. The Test-Retest Reliability of the scale is .88 in males and .81 in females.

Validity :

To obtain concurrent validity co-efficient of the aggression scale, the scale was compared with "statements in questionnaire of aggression" borrowed from Murray. Validity is .80 in males and .78 in females.

Scoring :

In this scale, statements are in two forms *i.e.* positive and negative. In positive forms of statements, scores will be given as 5, 4, 3, 2, 1, respectively and in negative form of statements, scores will be given as 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, respectively.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The present study has been conducted to study Aggression among working and non working people and across gender. Test of significance (t-test) was used to calculate the differences between two groups.

Variable	N	Mean	T-value	Significance
Working	50	185.7800	-2.065	Significant
Non-working	50	199.1800		

Our first objective was to assess the significant difference in aggression level between working and non-working adults. With the help of SPSS 20, we calculated t-test and found the significance value of .042 which shows that there is statistically significant differences in aggression level of working and non-working at 0.05. Thus our null hypothesis will be rejected at 0.05 level of significance.

Variable	N	Mean	T-value	Significance
Male	50	182.4800	-3.167	Significant
Female	50	202.4800		

Our second objective was to assess the gender differences in aggression level of working and non-working adults. This time we found the t-value of 3.17 and significance value of .002 which shows that there are significant gender differences in aggression level of working and non-working adults at 0.01 level of significance. Again our null hypothesis will be rejected at 0.01 level of significance.

Conclusion :

The results of this study have shown that females are aggressive than males which is contradictory to the results of maximum studies stated in review. Also this study shows significant differences in working and non-working adults.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, K.B. (1993). *The effects of provocation and uncomfortable temperatures on aggressive affect and behavior*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Missouri—Columbia.
- Bjorkqvist, K. and Niemela, P. (1992). New trends in the study of female aggression. In K. Bjorkqvist & P. Niemela (Eds.), *Of mice and women: Aspects of female aggression*, 3-16. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Cairns, R.B., Cairns, B.D., Neckerman, H.J., Ferguson, L.L. and Garipey, J. L. (1989). Growth and aggression: 1. Childhood to early adolescence. *Developmental Psychology*, **25** : 320- 330.
- Carlsson, G., Dahlberg, K., Lutzen, K. and Nystrom, M. (2004). Violent encounters in psychiatric care: A phenomenological study of embodied caring knowledge. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, **25**:191–217.
- Chamberlain, P. (2003). *Treating chronic juvenile offenders*. Washington, DD: American Psychological Association.
- Conger, R.D., Neppel, T., Kim, K.J. and Scaramella, L. (2003). Angry and aggressive behavior across three generations: A prospective, longitudinal study of parents and children. *J. Abnormal Child Psychology*, **31**:143–160.
- Dodge, K.A. and Schwartz, D. (1997). Social information processing mechanisms in aggressive behavior. In: Breiling JE, et al., editors. *Handbook of antisocial behavior*. John Wiley; New York: 171–180.
- Eagly, A.H. and Steffen, V. (1986). Gender and aggressive behavior: A meta-analytic review of the social psychological literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, **100** : 309-330.
- Feshbach, N.D. (1969). Sex differences in children's modes of aggressive responses toward outsiders. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, **15** : 249-258.
- Fischer, D.G., Kelm, H. and Rose, A. (1969). Knives as aggressioneliciting stimuli. *Psychological Reports*, **24** : 755-760.
- Gates, D., Fitzwater, E. and Succop, P. (2003). Relationships of stressors, strain, and anger to caregiver

- assaults. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, **24** : 775–793.
- Geen, R.G. (1990). *Human aggression*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/ Cole.
- Gerra, G., Zaimovic, A., Avanzini, P., Chittolini, B., Givcastro, G., Caccovari, R., Palladino, M., Maestri, D., Monica, C., Designore, R. and Brambilla, F. (1997). Neurotransmitter-neuroendocrine responses to experimentally induced aggression in humans: Influence of personality variable. *Psychiatry Res.*, **66** : 33-43.
- Ghodsian-Carpey, J. and Baker, L, A. (1987). Genetic and environmental influences on aggression in 4- to 7-year-old twins. *Aggressive Behavior*, **13**:173–186.
- Harris, M.B. (1993). How provoking! What makes men and women angry. *Aggressive Behavior*, **19** : 199-213.
- Huesmann, L.R., Moise-Titus, J., Podolski, C.L. and Eron, L.D. (2003). Longitudinal relations between children's exposure to TV violence and their aggressive and violent behavior in young adulthood. *Developmental Psychology, Special Issue: Violent children*, **39**:201–221.
- Raine A. (1993). *The psychopathology of crime: Criminal behavior as a clinical disorder*. Academic; San Diego.
- Salvador, A., Suay, F., Gonzalez-Bono, E. and Serrano, M. (2003). Anticipatory cortisol, testosterone, and psychological responses to judo competition in young men. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, **28**:364-75.
- Salvadora, A., Suay, F., Martinez-Sanchis, S., Simon, V.M. and Brain, P.F. (1999). Correlating testosterone and fighting in male participants in judo contests. *Physiology & Behavior*, **68** : 205-9.
- Schuck, S.Z., Schuck, A., Hallam, E., Mancini, F. and Wells, R. (1971). Sex differences in aggressive behavior subsequent to listening to a radio broadcast of violence. *Psychological Reports*, **28** :931-936.
- Taylor, S.P. and Epstein, S. (1967). Aggression as a function of the interaction of the sex of the aggressor and the sex of the victim. *J. Personality*, **35** : 474-486.
- Tebartz van Elst L. (2002). Aggression and epilepsy. In: Trimble ME, Schmitz BE, editors. *The neuropsychiatry of epilepsy*. Cambridge University Press; New York, 81–106.
- Underwood, M.K. and Coie, J.D. (2004). Future directions and priorities for prevention and intervention. In M. Putallaz and K.L. Bierman (Eds.), *Aggression, antisocial behavior and violence among girls*, 289-311. New York: Guilford Press.
- Van Goozen, S.H.M., Frijda, N.H., Kindt, M. and Poll, N. E. van de. (1994). Anger proneness in women: Development and validation of the anger situation questionnaire. *Aggressive Behavior*, **20** : 79-100.
- Walker, L.O. and Avant, K.C. (1995). *Strategies for theory construction in nursing*. Appleton-Century-Crofts; Norwalk, C.T.
