

Periodic Research

Aggression in Students

Abstract

In psychology, the term aggression refers to a range of behaviors that can result in both physical and psychological harm to oneself, other or objects in the environment. This type of social interaction centers on harming another person, either physically or mentally. The main purpose of this study was to find out the difference in aggression in students. The total sample consisted 320 students as a variation belong to sex, level of study and residential area. The research tool used for data assessed Aggression questionnaire developed by Buss & Paerry (1992). Here Gujarati version was used made by Siddharaj rana and Y. A. Jogsan. To check the significance effect of variable F-test (ANOVA) was applied. Result show that Sex and level of study variables were significant difference at 0.05 level in aggression of students and residential area variable were not significant difference in aggression of students. Results also revealed that high male students aggressive compared with females students and shows that U.G. students were more aggressive compared to the P.G. students.

Keywords: Aggression.

Introduction

Aggression is a word that we use every day to characterize the behavior of others and perhaps even of ourselves. We say that people are aggressive if they yell at or hit each other, if they cut off other cars in traffic, or even when they smash their fists on the table in frustration. But other harmful acts, such as the injuries that sports players receive during a rough game or the killing of enemy soldiers in a war might not be viewed by everyone as aggression. Because aggression is so difficult to define, social psychologists, judges, and politicians (as well as many other people, including lawyers), have spent a great deal of time trying to determine what should and should not be considered aggression. Doing so forces us to make use of the processes of causal attribution to help us determine the reasons for the behavior of others.

Review of Literature

Social psychologists define aggression as *behavior that is intended to harm another individual who does not wish to be harmed* (Baron & Richardson, 1994). Because it involves the perception of intent, what looks like aggression from one point of view may not look that way from another, and the same harmful behavior may or may not be considered aggressive depending on its intent. Intentional harm is, however, perceived as worse than unintentional harm, even when the harms are identical (Ames & Fiske, 2013).

You can see that this definition rules out some behaviors that we might normally think are aggressive. For instance, a rugby player who accidentally breaks the arm of another player or a driver who accidentally hits a pedestrian would not by our definition be displaying aggression because although harm was done, there was no intent to harm. A salesperson who attempts to make a sale through repeated phone calls is not aggressive because he is not intending any harm (we might say this behavior is "assertive" rather than aggressive). And not all intentional behaviors that hurt others are aggressive behaviors. A dentist might intentionally give a patient a painful injection of a painkiller, but the goal is to prevent further pain during the procedure.

Because our definition requires us to determine the intent of the perpetrator, there is going to be some interpretation of these intents and there may well be disagreement among the parties involved. The U.S. government perceives the development of a nuclear weapon by Iran as aggressive because the government believes that the weapon is intended to harm others, but Iranians may see the program as a matter of national pride. Although the player whose arm is broken in a rugby match may attribute hostile intent, the other player may claim that the injury was not



Jayesh B. Sarvaiya

Research Scholar,
Deptt. of Psychology,
Saurashtra University,
Rajkot, Gujarat

E: ISSN No. 2349-9435

intended. Within the legal system, juries and judges are frequently asked to determine whether harm was done intentionally. Psychologists also distinguish between two different types of aggression:

Impulsive Aggression

Impulsive aggression, also known as affective aggression, is characterized by strong emotions, usually anger. This form of aggression is not planned and often takes place in the heat of the moment. When another car cuts you off in traffic and you begin yelling and berating the other driver, you are experiencing impulsive aggression.

Instrumental Aggression

Instrumental aggression, also known as predatory aggression, is marked by behaviors that are intended to achieve a larger goal. Instrumental aggression is often carefully planned and usually exists as a means to an end. Hurting another person in a robbery or car-jacking is an example of this type of aggression. The aggressors goal is to obtain money or a vehicle, and harming another individual is the means to achieve that aim.

Factors than Can Influence Aggression

Researchers have suggested that individual who engage in affective aggression, defined as aggression that is unplanned and uncontrolled, tend to have lower IQs than people who display predatory aggression. Predatory aggression is defined as aggression that is controlled, planned and goal-oriented. A number of different factors can influence the expression of aggression. Biological factors can play a role. Men are more likely than women to engage in physical aggression. While researchers have found that women are less likely to engage in physical aggression, they also suggest that women do use non-physical forms such as verbal aggression, relational aggression, and social rejection. Environmental factors also play a role, including how people were raised. People who grow up witnessing more forms of aggression are more likely to believe that such violence and hostility are socially acceptable. Bandura's famous Bobo doll experiment demonstrated that observation can also play a role in how aggression is learned. Children who watched a video clip where an adult model behaved aggressively toward a Bobo doll were more likely to imitate those actions when given the opportunity.

Jordanian universities contribute to instill values and habits which will affect the behavior of their students, but the spread of aggressive behavior among students is noted in the form of beatings, insults, destruction of the university properties, teachers and students personal properties as well. They also attack teachers and staff by writing insulting expressions on walls, and sexual harassment towards the other gender. Such conducts have a negative impact on the productivity of young people, and they enhance students disagreement with their environment. Accordingly, the researcher is much encouraged to identify the level and type of aggression practiced by the students. Many studies have been conducted in the same area.

Md Shahinoor Rahman, Lailun Nahar (2013). Aggression in Boys and Girls as Related to Their

Periodic Research

Academic Achievement and Residential Background In addition, result indicates that study revealed it was found that regardless of gender, boys expressed more aggression than girls.

Lama Majed Qaisy (2013). Aggressive Behavior among the University Student. In addition, result indicated a high male aggressive compared with females, and shows that 3rd and 4th year students were more aggressive compared to the 1st and 2nd year students.

Alorani, O. I. & Alradaydeh, M. F. (2017). Depression, Aggression and Spirituality Well-being Among The University Students In Jordan. In addition, result indicates that study revealed negative correlation between spiritual and aggression among university student.

Objectives of the Study

The main objectives of study were as under:

1. To measure the effect between mean of aggression the context of sex variable in students.
2. To measure the effect between mean of aggression the context of level of study variable in students.
3. To measure the effect between mean of aggression the context of residential area variable in students.
4. To measure the internal effect between mean of aggression the context sex and level of study variables in the students.
5. To measure the internal effect between mean of aggression the context sex and residential area variables in the students.
6. To measure the internal effect between mean of aggression the context level of study and residential area variables in the students.
7. To measure the internal effect between mean of aggression the context sex, level of study and residential area variables in the students.

Hypothesis

To related objectives of this study hypothesis were as under:

1. There will be main significant effect between mean of aggression the context of sex variable among students.
2. There will be main significant effect between mean of aggression the context of level of study variable among students.
3. There will be main significant effect between mean of aggression the context of residential area variable among students.
4. There will be internal significant effect between mean of aggression the context of sex and level of study variables among students.
5. There will be internal significant effect between mean of aggression the context of sex and residential area variable among students.
6. There will be internal significant effect between mean of aggression the context of level of study and residential area variable among students.
7. There will be internal significant effect between mean of aggression the context of sex, level of study and residential area variable among students.

Method

Sample

First of all 400 students were selected out of them 320 were selected. In 320 there were 160 males and 160 females were taken as sample. In which 80 U.G. students and 80 P.G. students, besides, 40 were Hosteller and 40 Non-hosteller were taken as sample in different area of Rajkot City (Gujarat).

Instrument

For this purpose, the following test tool was considered with their reliability, validity and objectivity mention in their respective manuals.

Aggression Questionnaire

To check the student's aggression, aggression questionnaire was developed by Buss & Paerry (1992). This scale Gujarati translated by Siddhraj rana and Yogesh A. Jogsan (2008) were used. This scale has total 30 sentences which measured students aggression. This scale has 5 point scale. Every sentence has five possible answers in this scale. In this scale 30 sentences full disagree, disagree, neutral, agree and full agree score was used 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1. This scale reliability and validity is higher.

Procedure

The testing was done on a group of students. The procedure of filling the questionnaire was explained to them fully and clearly. The instruction given on the inventory was explained to them. It was also made clear to them that their scores would be kept secret. It was checked that none of the subjects left any questions and answered or that no subject encircled both the answers given against a question

Table-1. The ANOVA Table of Aggression Variables of Sex, Level of Study and Residential Area

Variables	Sum of Square	Df	Mean of Square	F-ratio
A _{ss} (sex)	1353.02	1	1353.02	6.55*
B _{ss} (level of study)	884.45	1	884.45	4.28*
C _{ss} (residential area)	6.62	1	6.62	0.03 NS
AB _{ss} (sex and level of study)	2646.97	1	2646.97	12.82**
AC _{ss} (level of study and residential area)	1720.87	1	1720.87	8.33**
BC _{ss} (level of study and residential area)	1703.87	1	1703.87	8.25**
ABC _{ss} (sex, level of study and residential area)	4547.67	1	4547.67	22.02**
W _{ss}	64442.48	312	206.55	-
T _{ss}	77305.95	319	-	-

* P < 0.05, ** P < 0.01, N. S. = Not Significant

Table-2. Showing the Mean and 'F' Value of Sex Variable (Aggression)

Variables	N	Mean	F-ratio
A ₁ (male)	160	77.32	6.55*
A ₂ (female)	160	73.21	

* P < 0.05, ** P < 0.01, N. S. = Not Significant

According to ANOVA table of aggression (Table-1) we said that 'f' value of sex variable was 6.55. The mean of A₁ (males) received 77.32 and A₂ (females) received 73.21 (Table-2) the 'f' value of sex variable was significant difference (Table 1 and 2). So we can say that the first hypothesis was accepted because significant difference can be seen. Possible reason competitively male is strictly heart and female are very sensitively heart. Therefore highly aggression in male. Evidence of research is line with the finding of Md Shahinoor Rahman, Lailun Nahar (2013). That

Research Design

The aim of present research was to measured the aggression in students for these total 320 students were taken as a sample. To check the main and internal effect of three independent variables 2 x 2 x 2 factorial design was used which as under:

Table-A Factorial Design (2 x 2 x 2) (N =320)

	A ₁ (Males)		A ₂ (Females)		Total
	B ₁	B ₂	B ₁	B ₂	
C ₁	40	40	40	40	160
C ₂	40	40	40	40	160
Total	80	80	80	80	320

A= Sex

A₁ = Males

A₂ = Females

B = Level of Study

B₁ = U.G.

B₂ = P.G.

C = Residential Area

C₁ = Hosteller

C₂ = Non-hosteller

Data's collected were analyzed by appropriate statically technique. To study the influences of dependent variables under investigation in aggression, ANOVA has been used.

Result and Discussion

The main object of present study was to measure the aggression in students. In it statistical F-test method was used.

Result discussion of Present study is as under:

study revealed it was found that regardless of gender, boys expressed more aggression than girls. Lama Majed Qaisy (2013) research's result also supported.

Table-3

Showing the Mean and 'F' Value of Level of Study Variable (Aggression)

Variables	N	Mean	F-ratio
B ₁ (U.G.)	160	76.93	4.28*
B ₂ (P.G.)	160	73.60	

* P < 0.05, ** P < 0.01, N. S. = Not Significant

Periodic Research

The 'f' value of level of study was 4.28. The mean of B₁ (U.G. students) received 76.93 and B₂ (P.G. students) received 73.60 (Table-3). The 'f' value of level of study was significant difference (Table 1 and 3). So we can say that the second hypotheses were accepted because significant difference can be seen. According by mean (Table-3) the U.G. students that more aggression as compare P.G. students. Possible reason will be U.G. student more than 18-20 year old. They are less mature compare to P.G. students. Evidence of research are line with the finding of Lama Majed Qaisy (2013). Result indicated shows that 3rd and 4th year students were more aggressive compared to the 1st and 2nd year students.

Table-4
Showing the Mean and 'F' Value of Residential area Variable (Aggression)

Variables	N	Mean	F-ratio
C ₁ (Hosteller)	160	75.41	0.03 NS
C ₂ (Non-hosteller)	160	75.12	

* P < 0.05, ** P < 0.01, N. S. = Not Significant

The 'f' value of Residential Area was 0.03 the mean of C₁ (Hosteller) 75.41 and C₂ (Non-hosteller) received 75.12. The 'f' value of residential area was not significant (Table 1 and 4). So we say that the third hypotheses were rejected because no significant difference can be seen. Hosteller students more aggression as compare Non-hosteller students possible reason will be hosteller student more freedom lifestyle as compare Non-hosteller students. (Table-4)

Table-5
Showing the Mean and 'F' Value of Sex and Level of Study Variable (Aggression)

Variable	Mean		F-ratio
	A ₁	A ₂	
B ₁	80.11	73.74	12.82**
B ₂	75.53	72.68	

* P < 0.05, ** P < 0.01, N. S. = Not Significant

Table-6
Showing the Mean and 'F' Value of Sex and Residential Area Variable (Aggression)

Variable	Mean		F-ratio
	A ₁	A ₂	
C ₁	78.53	72.29	8.33**
C ₂	76.11	74.13	

* P < 0.05, ** P < 0.01, N. S. = Not Significant

Table-7
Showing the Mean and 'F' Value of Level of Study and Residential Area Variable (Aggression)

Variable	Mean		F-ratio
	B ₁	B ₂	
C ₁	75.48	75.34	8.25**
C ₂	78.38	71.86	

* P < 0.05, ** P < 0.01, N. S. = Not Significant

In aggression ANOVA table we can see that the internal effect of variables. The internal effect of A x B (sex and level of study) 'f' value was 12.82 Significant difference at 0.01 level, A x C (sex and residential area) 'f' value was 8.33 and B x C (level of study and residential area) 'f' value 8.25 significant difference.

Table-8. Showing the Mean and 'F' Value of Sex, Level of Study and Residential Area Variable (Aggression)

Variables	Mean				F-ratio
	A ₁		A ₂		
	B ₁	B ₂	B ₁	B ₂	
C ₁	81.23	75.83	69.73	74.85	22.02**
C ₂	79.00	73.23	77.75	70.50	

* P < 0.05, ** P < 0.01, N. S. = Not Significant

The 'f' value of A x B x C (sex, level of study and residential area) was 22.02, both are significant at 0.01 level the mean of A₁B₁C₁ was 81.23, A₁B₁C₂ was 79.00, A₁B₂C₁ was 75.83, A₁B₂C₂ was 69.73, A₂B₁C₁ was 74.85, A₂B₁C₂ was 77.75, A₂B₂C₁ was 74.85, A₂B₂C₂ was 70.50 (Table 1 and 8). It means seventh hypotheses accepted because significant difference can be seen.

Conclusion

We can conclude by data analysis as follows.

There was significant effect of Sex and Level of Study variable on Student's Aggression and there was no significant effect of Residential Area variable on Aggression in students.

Limitation of the Research

This study had several limitations that can be addressed by future research. Firsts, the participants consist only students of different area of Rajkot City. So it is not representative of all other city. Hence, a more representative participant might yield different result; for example a participant from different city of Gujarat might show significant interaction effects of different city.

Suggestions

Endeavour can be executed to analyze more them 320 data of sample with efficacy to attain better results. For the accumulation of information, variegated methods except questionnaires can be adopted. Selection of sample can be accomplished with the intake of different city women, different state to ascertain in their Aggression. To crown the research work, other method of selecting sample can be appropriated.

Reference

- Alorani, O.I. & Alradaydeh, M. F. (2017). *Depression, Aggression and Spirituality Well-Being Among The University Student In Jordan. European Scientific Journal edition vol.13, No.2 ISSN:1857-7881 pp.269-280*
- Ames, D. L., & Fiske, S. T. (2013). *Intentional harms are worse, even when they're not. Psychological Science, 24(9), 1755-1762.*
- Archer, J., & Coyne, S. M. (2005). *An integrated review of indirect, relational, and social aggression. Personality and Social Psychology Review, 9(3), 212-230.*
- Behar, D.; Hunt, J.; Ricciuti, A.; Stoff, D.; Vitiello, B. (1990). *Subtyping Aggression in Children and Adolescents. The Journal of Neuropsychiatry and Clinical Neurosciences 2 (2): 189-192.*
- Berko, A., & Erez, E. (2007). *Gender, Palestinian women, and terrorism: Women's liberation or oppression? Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, 30(6), 493-519.*

Periodic Research

6. Berkowitz, L. (1993). *Aggression: Its causes, consequences, and control*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
7. Blumenfeld, W. J., & Cooper, R. M. (2010). *LGBT and allied youth responses to cyberbullying: Policy implications*. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, 3(1), 114–133.
8. Bushman, B. J., & Anderson, C. A. (2001). *Is it time to pull the plug on hostile versus instrumental aggression dichotomy?* *Psychological Review*, 108(1), 273–279.
9. Buss & pearry (1992). *Aggression Questionnaire*, Prasad Psycho corporation of india.
10. Craig, W. M. (1998). *The relationship among bullying, victimization, depression, anxiety, and aggression in elementary school children*. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 24(1), 123–130.
11. Crick, N. R., & Grotpeter, J. K. (1995). *Relational aggression, gender, and social-psychological adjustment*. *Child Development*, 66(3), 710–722.
12. Hinduja S., & Patchin, J. W. (2009). *Bullying beyond the schoolyard: Preventing and responding to cyberbullying*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
13. Horgan, J. (2005). *The psychology of terrorism*. New York, NY: Routledge
14. Kruglanski, A. W., & Fishman, S. (2006). *Terrorism between “syndrome” and “tool.”* *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 15(1), 45–48.
15. Lama Majed Qaisy (2013) *Aggressive Behavior among the university students*, *British Journal of*

Education, Society & behavioral Science, Vol. 4, Issue:9.

16. McCauley, C. (Ed.). (2004). *Psychological issues in understanding terrorism and the response to terrorism*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers/Greenwood Publishing Group.
17. Md shahinoor, Rahman, Lailun Nahar (2013) *Aggression on Boy and Girls as Related to their Academic Achivement and Residential Background*, Vol. 4, No. 5.
18. *National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism (2011). Background report: 9/11, ten years later*. Retrieved from
19. Olafsen, R. N., & Viemero, V. (2000). *Bully/victim problems and coping with stress in school among 10- to 12-year-old pupils in Aland, Finland*. *Aggressive Behavior*, 26(1), 57–65.
20. Paquette, J. A., & Underwood, M. K. (1999). *Gender differences in young adolescents’ experiences of peer victimization: Social and physical aggression*. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 45(2), 242–266.
21. Potok M. (2010). *Gays remain minority most targeted by hate crimes*. *Intelligence Report*, 140.
22. Sharp, S. (1995). *How much does bullying hurt? The effects of bullying on the personal well-being and educational progress of secondary aged students*. *Educational and Child Psychology*, 12(2), 81–88.
23. http://www.start.umd.edu/sites/default/files/files/announcements/BackgroundReport_10YearsSince_9_11.pdf

Figure. 1 Mean of Aggression the context of Sex, Level of Study and Residential Area

