

University of Rajshahi

Rajshahi-6205

Bangladesh.

RUCL Institutional Repository

<http://rulrepository.ru.ac.bd>

Department of Psychology

MPhil Thesis

2003

Psycho-Social Factors in Aggressive Behaviour in Males and Females in Bangladesh

Rahman, A.K.M. Rezanur

University of Rajshahi

<http://rulrepository.ru.ac.bd/handle/123456789/587>

Copyright to the University of Rajshahi. All rights reserved. Downloaded from RUCL Institutional Repository.

**PSYCHO-SOCIAL FACTORS IN AGGRESSIVE
BEHAVIOUR IN MALES AND FEMALES
IN BANGLADESH**

A Thesis submitted for the degree of
M. Phil.
In Psychology

By
A.K.M. REZANUR RAHMAN

Under the Supervision of
DR. M. MOZAMMEL HUQ
Professor of Psychology



DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF RAJSHAHI
RAJSHAHI, BANGLADESH.

DECEMBER, 2003

DECLARATION

It is my humble declaration that this dissertation for M. Phil. degree entitled “Psycho-social Factors in Aggressive Behavior in Males and Females in Bangladesh” is a completely new and original work of mine. This dissertation has not been submitted to any other University or Institute for any degree or diploma.

A. K. M. Rezanur Rahman

A. K. M. REZANUR RAHMAN

Research Fellow

Department of Psychology


University of Rajshahi

Rajshahi, Bangladesh.

Certificate

This dissertation entitled "Psycho-Social Factors in Aggressive Behavior in Males and Females in Bangladesh" has been conducted by A.K.M. Rezanur Rahman for the degree of M. Phil in Psychology. He has completed this research under my supervision and it constitutes his own work. I feel proud to recommend the thesis for evaluation.

SUPERVISOR



30.12.03

(Dr. M. Mozammel Huq)

Professor

Department of Psychology
University of Rajshahi
Rajshahi, Bangladesh.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I convey my thanks to the members of the Academic Committee of the Department of Psychology, Rajshahi University, for allowing me to undertake M.Phil. course. I am personally grateful to my supervisor Dr. M. Mozammel Huq, Professor, Department of Psychology, for giving his consent to guide my research in the area of aggressive behavior. I am also indebted to the learned Professors of Psychology of Rajshahi University for helping me in various stages for the construction of the Measure of Aggressive Behavior. I humbly acknowledge and extend my sincere thanks to them. I remember the boys and girls of different educational institutions who were enthusiastic to become the subjects of my study. I thank them sincerely. Many distinguished Professors of the department of Psychology helped me with their scholarly knowledge, wisdom and scientific interpretations of facts and figures for the preparation of this thesis. I feel proud to thank them all. Dr. M. Habibur Rahman, Assistant Professor of the Department of Chemistry kindly helped me in preparation of this thesis. Lastly I would like to acknowledge my wife Mrs. Ismat Ara Khanum for her great sacrifice and patience through out the work.

December, 2003



A.K.M. Rezanur Rahman

Research Fellow
Department of Psychology
University of Rajshahi
Rajshahi, Bangladesh.

ABSTRACT

The present study was conducted to explore the psycho-social factors of aggression in males and females in the social context of Bangladesh. The study has conceptualized aggression in its different forms. The theoretical constructed of aggression differs in its emphasis in terms of biological, motivational and social factors. Its underlying theme assumes that human aggression is caused by the combined results of biological factors and experience. Biological factors include genetic inheritance and evolutionary process. Experience indicates learning through exposure to environmental factors.

The broad objective of the study was to conduct an investigation on psycho-social factors in aggressive behavior in males and females in Bangladesh. Several predictions were made. These were as follows.

- (i) Female respondents would express more aggression as compared to male respondents.
- (ii) Respondents with high socio-economic status would express more aggression followed by the respondents with middle socio-economic status and least by the respondents with low socio-economic status.
- (iii) Respondents with rural residential background would express more aggression as compared to the respondents with urban residential background.

A total of 240 respondents constituted the sample of the study. They were equally divided into males and females. Each group was again equally divided into high, middle and low socio-economic status. Each subgroup was again equally subdivided into urban and rural residential background. Thus the study used a 2 X 3 X 2 factorial design consisting of two levels of gender (Male / Female), three levels of socio-economic status (High / Middle / Low) and two levels of residential background (Urban / Rural).

The study used the Measure of Aggressive Behavior (MAB) for the collection of data. The Measure of Aggressive Behavior (MAB) was composed to five dimensions such as Physical Aggression (PA), Verbal Aggression (VA), Hostile Aggression (HA),

Anger Aggression (AA) and Indirect Aggression. The measure contained 25 items. Physical Aggression had 5 items, Verbal Aggression had 9 items, Hostile Aggression had 5 items, Anger Aggression had 3 items and Indirect Aggression had 3 items.

The results of the study were analyzed into two parts. In part-I, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was computed on the total scores of the Measure of Aggressive Behavior. It was found that regardless of socio-economic status and residential background, female respondents expressed more aggression than the male respondents. Similarly, regardless of gender and residential background, respondents with high socio-economic status expressed more aggression than the respondents with middle socio-economic status and low socio-economic status. Also respondents with middle socio-economic status expressed more aggression than the respondents with low socio-economic status.

In part-II, within-group comparisons were computed on the scores Physical Aggression (PA), Verbal Aggression (VA), Hostile Aggression (HA), Anger Aggression (AA) and Indirect Aggression (IA). In case of males with high socio-economic status, it was found that respondents with rural residential background expressed more physical aggression than the respondents with urban residential background. Again male respondents of low socio-economic status with rural residential background expressed more physical aggression than the male respondents of high socio-economic status with urban residential background.

Results also showed that in case of males with high socio-economic status, it was found that respondents with rural residential background expressed more verbal aggression than the respondents with urban residential background. In case of females, it was found that, respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background expressed more verbal aggression than the male respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background. It was also found that male respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background expressed least hostile aggression than other comparison groups.

In case of males, it was found that respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background expressed least anger aggression as compared to other comparison groups. In case of females, it was found that respondents of high socio-economic status with urban residential background expressed more anger aggression than other comparison groups. In case of high socio-economic status with rural residential

background, it was found that male respondents expressed more indirect aggression than the female respondents. However, in case of low socio-economic status with urban residential background, female respondents expressed more indirect aggression than the male respondents.

The findings of the study provided full support to the first hypothesis that female respondents would express more aggression as compared to male respondents. The second hypothesis that the respondents with high socio-economic status would express more aggression followed by the respondents with middle socio-economic status and least by the respondents with low socio-economic status was also supported by the findings of the study. However, the third hypothesis that the respondents with rural residential background would express more aggression as compared to the respondents with urban residential background was not supported by the findings.

In conclusion, it can be said that the results of the present study demonstrate that the relationships among different dimensions of aggression such as Physical Aggression (PA), Verbal Aggression (VA), Hostile Aggression (HA), Anger Aggression (AA) and Indirect Aggression (IA) are complex. Thus relationships among these dimensions may be regarded as positively correlate and may be used as predictive of aggression. In the light of these arguments, it can be said that the dynamic, functional and domain-specific nature of aggression will be highlighted through future research in the social context of Bangladesh.

INDEX OF TABLES

Table No.		Page No.
01	Showing a schematic diagram of sample distribution	48
02	Showing summary of ANOVA involving Gender, Socio-Economic status and Residential Background on the total scores of the Measure of Aggressive Behavior	59
03	Showing overall mean scores and significant mean differences between males and females on the total scores of the Measure of Aggressive Behavior.	60
04	Showing overall mean scores and significant mean differences between high, middle and low socio-economic status on the total scores of the Measure of Aggressive Behavior.	61
05	Showing overall mean scores and significant mean differences between gender and residential background on the total scores of the Measure of Aggressive Behavior.	62
06	Showing overall mean scores and significant mean differences between gender, socio-economic status and residential background on the total scores of the Measure of Aggressive Behavior.	64
07	Showing mean differences of male respondents between different comparison groups of socio-economic status and residential background on the scores of Physical Aggression (N=20 for each group).	67
08	Showing mean differences of female respondents between different comparison groups of socio-economic status and residential background on the scores of Physical Aggression (N=20 for each group).	68
09	Showing mean differences of male respondents between different comparison groups of socio-economic status and residential background on the scores of Verbal Aggression (N=20 for each group).	69
10	Showing mean differences of female respondents between different comparison groups of socio-economic status and residential background on the scores of Verbal Aggression (N=20 for each group).	70
11	Showing mean differences of male respondents between different comparison groups of socio-economic status and residential background on the scores of Hostile Aggression (N=20 for each group).	71

12	Showing mean differences of female respondents between different comparison groups of socio-economic status and residential background on the scores of Hostile Aggression (N=20 for each group).	72
13	Showing mean differences of male respondents between different comparison groups of socio-economic status and residential background on the scores of Anger Aggression (N=20 for each group).	73
14	Showing mean differences of female respondents between different comparison groups of socio-economic status and residential background on the scores of Anger Aggression (N=20 for each group).	74
15	Showing mean differences of male respondents between different comparison groups of socio-economic status and residential background on the scores of Indirect Aggression (N=20 for each group).	75
16	Showing mean differences of female respondents between different comparison groups of socio-economic status and residential background on the scores of Indirect Aggression (N=20 for each group).	76
17	Showing mean differences between MHU Vs FHU, MHR Vs FHR, MMU Vs FMU, MMR Vs FMR, MLU Vs FLU and MLR Vs FLR on the scores of Physical Aggression (N=20 for each group).	77
18	Showing mean differences between MHU Vs FHU, MHR Vs FHR, MMU Vs FMU, MMR Vs FMR, MLU Vs FLU and MLR Vs FLR on the scores of Verbal Aggression (N=20 for each group).	78
19	Showing mean differences between MHU Vs FHU, MHR Vs FHR, MMU Vs FMU, MMR Vs FMR, MLU Vs FLU and MLR Vs FLR on the scores of Hostile Aggression (N=20 for each group).	79
20	Showing mean differences between MHU Vs FHU, MHR Vs FHR, MMU Vs FMU, MMR Vs FMR, MLU Vs FLU and MLR Vs FLR on the scores of Anger Aggression (N=20 for each group).	80
21	Showing mean differences between MHU Vs FHU, MHR Vs FHR, MMU Vs FMU, MMR Vs FMR, MLU Vs FLU and MLR Vs FLR on the scores of Indirect Aggression (N=20 for each group).	81

INDEX OF FIGURES

Figure. No.		Page No.
01	Showing two-way interaction between gender and residential background on the total scores of the Measure of Aggressive Behavior.	63
02	Showing three-way interaction between gender, socio-economic status and residential background on the total scores of the Measure of Aggressive Behavior.	66

CONTENTS

	Page No.
DECLARATION	ii
CERTIFICATE	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iv
ABSTRACT	v
INDEX OF TABLES	viii
INDEX OF FIGURES	x
CHAPTER-I INTRODUCTION	1-46
Types of Aggressive Behavior	6
The childhood-onset type versus the adolescence-onset type	6
Instrumental and hostile aggression	8
Roots of Adolescent Aggressive Behavior	8
Biological Causes of aggression	9
Environmental Causes of aggression	10
Aggression as Intention	13
Aggression as Action	14
Aggression as Physical harm and Injury	14
Theories of Aggression	16
Instinct theory of aggression.	16
Biological theory of aggression.	18
Ethological theory of aggression.	20
Psychoanalytical theory of aggression.	21
Drive theory of aggression.	21
Social learning theory of aggression.	24
Cognitive theory of aggression	27
Difference-Aggression Theory	27
Overview of Theories of Aggression	29
The concept of psycho-social factors	29
Review of the Literature	31

Rationale of the Study	42
Objective of the Study	43
Hypothesis of the Study	43
CHAPTER-II METHOD AND PROCEDURE	47-56
Sample	47
Mode of Sample Selection	48
Characteristic of the Sample	49
Selection of Instrument	50
Measure of Aggressive Behavior (MAB)	51
Reliability of Measure of Aggressive Behavior	54
Validity of the Measure of Aggressive Behavior	55
Design of the Study	55
Procedure of Data Collection	55
CHAPTER-III RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION	57-86
PART-I	58
PART-II	67
Summary of the Results	82
CHAPTER- IV DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	87-95
Limitation and Implications	94
Conclusions	95
REFERENCES :	96-115
APPENDICES :	116-122

CHAPTER-I

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER-I

INTRODUCTION

Aggression is a form of social behavior. In everyday life, aggression occurs frequently. Aggression is found to exist in interpersonal relationships. In sometimes a husband behaves aggressively with his wife. The wife may also behave aggressively with her husband. Even parents may express aggression toward their children. The master-servant relationship is vitiated by aggression. Two world wars are clear examples of state aggression. Intolerance, self interest and feeling of dominance may lead an individual or a group to behave aggressively.

Aggression may be antisocial and pro-social. If an aggressive act results from intent to hurt other person, it is called antisocial aggression. But if an aggressive act is aimed at killing terrorist who has killed an innocent person, it is called pro-social aggression. The pro-social aggression is based on social norms of helping the oppressed persons. Unprovoked criminal acts such as assault and battery; murder, gang beatings and terrorism clearly violate social norms. Hence they are described as pro-social. Acts of law enforcement and appropriate parental discipline are examples of pro-social aggression.

Some aggressive acts fall between pro-social and antisocial. These are called sanctioned aggression. A teacher may punish his disobedient students. A person may hit another person for self-defense. These are the examples of sanctioned aggression. These acts of aggression do not violate moral standards and these are permitted by social norms.

A proper understanding of aggression needs to differentiate between aggressive behavior and aggressive feeling such as anger. Anger is our

internal feelings. We may be quite angry inside but we seldom make an effort to hurt another person. Thus our overt behavior does not always reflect our covert feelings. Society discourages and condemns most forms of aggressive behavior. We can exist only if people control their aggressive feelings most of the time. We can not allow one person to hit another person, breaking windows or acting violently whenever he feels to do it. Society places strong restraints on such expression. In reality most people who feel angry rarely act aggressively. Hence it is necessary to consider both the factors that increase anger and that restraints anger from being translated into aggressive action.

The present worldview experiences aggression repeatedly in individual life as well as in national and international spheres. U.S. Department of Justice (1994) reported that in the United States there were 6,621,140 crimes of violence in 1992. In the same year, there were 140,930 forcible rapes and 657,550 assaults that resulted in injury to the victim. U.S. Department of Justice also observed that there were more than one rape every 5 minutes and one assault every 28 seconds in the United States of America. Daro and McCurdy (1992) reported 1,400 cases of fatal child abuse in the United States each year. Peterson and Brown (1994) observed that tens of thousands of children are treated medically for what are termed “unintended injuries” and recent findings suggest that many of these injuries are actually the results of abuse by parents or other adults.

Straus and Gelles (1988) reported that more than 1.8 million wives are beaten by their husbands each year. Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) observe that many incidents involving abuse of husbands by their wives also occur. Butterfield (1992) reported that homicide is the leading cause of death among African American males ages 15-34 in the United States.

All these incidents reported above might appear that violence is an American monopoly. But this is not the case in other violences. In Bosnia, tens of thousands of civilians have been killed. This mass killed was done as

part of a conscious policy of “ethnic cleansing”. Struggles in Somalia between warlords during the 1990s resulted in the death of 500,000 persons consequently famine-ravaged the whole country. Thus new waves of wholesale violence occur.

All these facts make the “Homo Sapiens” uncomfortable to live on the earth. These figures of human sufferings due to violence are alarming for future generation for comfortable livings on this planet. They confirm a basic lesson of human history that aggression exists every where in our individual, social, national and international spheres. The present study was an empirical investigation aimed at exploring the psychosocial factors in aggressive behavior in males and females in Bangladesh.

According to Huesmann (1994) aggression refers to the intentional infliction of some form of harm on others. Baron and Richardson (1994) observed that aggression is alarming in frequency and it has devastating consequences on human beings in general.

Aggression as psychological phenomenon stems from deliberate intention of harming another person. It is an action, which is visible in overt behavior. It is, therefore, clear that aggression is constituted of three elements. These are intention, action tendency and actual harm committed to another person (Berkowitz, 1981).

It is, therefore, clear that aggression can generally be defined as behavior which results in personal harm or physical injury. This personal harm may be physical or emotional as the case in verbal abuse (Bandura, 1973). However, whether an act will be classified as aggressive depends on subjective judgements of intention and causality (Bandura, 1973) by observers. Furthermore, the same injurious act may be viewed differently depending upon the sex, age, attractiveness, status, background, etc. of the perpetrator (Bandura, 1983). Bandura reports that people are more disposed to judge harmful acts as unintentional if the perpetrator is favoured than if he or she were not favoured. This problem in part, has lead Buss (1961) to

propose that the concept of intent is awkward and unnecessary in the definition of aggression. Buss points out that the intent is a private event, which the individual may or may not be able to express verbally.

In conclusion, it may be said for the present purpose of research that aggression refers to any behavior the intent of which is to cause physical or psychological harm or damage to a person or property. Examples of such behaviour include wilful, malicious acts such as assault, which may be psychological or physical. It also includes both actual aggressive behaviour and aggressive-looking behaviour. This is Berkowitz's (1981) concept of instrumental aggression. Thus the primary goal of the individual's behaviour in this situation is not the injury of a victim, but some unknown factor (motive) beyond this. Thus a wide range of motives both conscious or unconscious have been postulated in aggression including release of emotional tension and bad temper.

According to Aronson, Wilson, and Akert (1997) an aggressive behavior or violence is an intentional action aimed at doing harm or causing pain. More specifically, aggression is a physical or verbal behavior aimed at causing either physical or psychological pain. For example, if an adolescent client throws a stone at some one but it misses to hurt the person, it is still an act of aggression. However, if the client unintentionally runs down a person while learning to ride a bicycle, that is not an act of aggression. Hence it is argued that deciding whether one's act is aggression or not depends on one's intention.

Types of Aggressive Behavior

There are many ways to differentiate between aggressive behaviors. These are discussed below.

The childhood–onset type versus the adolescence-onset type

Aggressive behavior can be characterized by age of onset. Age of onset is distinguished by childhood or adolescent-onset. If aggressive behavior begins prior to age ten, it is called the childhood-onset type. If the adolescent shows no symptoms before age ten, it is called the adolescent-onset type. This categorization helps predict the adolescent's future aggressiveness and provides insight into treatment implication. For instance, people of the childhood-onset type are usually male and physically more aggressive than those of adolescent-onset type. They tend to have few friends and are more likely to suffer from adult antisocial personality disorders. They are also more likely to be diagnosed with conduct disorder and consequently adult antisocial personality disorder. In particular, biological deficits may be associated with their persistent aggressive behavior.

Fraser (1996) viewed family environment as one of the most important risk factors in childhood-onset aggressive behavior. Children from families that use poor child management style (e.g., harsh punishment, negligence, abuse, acquiescence, etc.) learn poor problem-solving skills from their parents. For example, coercion is modeled (social learning) and acquiescence rewards a child's aggressive reactions (reinforcement). Aggressive behavior is also rewarded in families where parents employ coercion-acquiescence child management and children in such families are often isolated from prosocial peers because they are more likely to use aggressive behaviors to get what they want and to establish social dominance.

In contrast, people of adolescent-onset type are less aggressive than those of childhood-onset type aggression and generally have some friends. The numerous individuals whose aggressive behavior is limited to adolescence differ from the persistent types in many ways. Most significantly, their behavior is marked by discontinuity. Their behavior tends to begin abruptly and end just as quickly. The temporary aggressive behavior can be expressed only in situations where doing so seems rewarding to them. For example, joining as a gang member can be rewarding because the individual may be valued by other gang members (Alloy et al., 1996). Delinquent behavior or aggressive behavior can be a way to gain adult power and status. Through the behaviors, they can access roles that symbolize adult privilege or autonomy from parental control.

Fraser (1996) further stated that the adolescent-onset type aggressive behaviors are often more influenced by contextual and systematic factors outside the family, including school, neighborhood, and peer conditions such as hostile relations with teachers, peer pressure to engage in early sexual activity, and involvement with a gang. School climate in which violence and power are valued and poor teaching practices (e.g., coercive teaching or poorly trained staff) are strongly related to children and adolescents' aggressive behaviors. Gang-related violence, in particular, is more strongly associated with local economic, school, and peer factors than with biological and family factors, which are usually the primary risk factors in childhood-onset aggressive behavior.

However, according to Moffitt (1991), these two types of aggressive behavior may be indistinguishable during adolescence. Her study found that the two types did not differ in the variety of laws they broke, the frequency of delinquency, or the number of times they appeared in juvenile court. Therefore, a look at the preadolescent history of the offenders does offer a way to distinguish between the persistent and temporary types.

Instrumental and hostile aggression

Baron (1977) maintained that instrumental aggression is an attempt to injure someone while trying to satisfy some other non-aggressive purposes or desired goals (e.g., obeying the rules of one's gang to obtain their approval), whereas hostile aggression is primarily directed toward the injury of an intended victim. According to him, hostile aggression is usually a response to stimuli perceived as aversive, such as a real or imagined insult or a frustrating experience, and often lacks emotional control. In addition, those who show hostile aggression often have a tendency to erroneously infer hostile intentions to others. Coie and Dodge (1986) also differentiated between two types of aggressive adolescents using different terms, namely, the dominant aggressive adolescent (instrumental) and the reactive aggressive adolescent (hostile).

People with hostile aggression are described by psychologists as angry with an inability of controlling their aggression (Baron, 1977). Also, people with childhood-onset type aggression have much in common with people with hostile aggression in nature. By the same token, people with instrumental aggression are more likely to have much in common with people with adolescent-onset type aggression. Therefore, it may be assumed that people with hostile aggression will be more likely to show more persistent aggressive behavior from childhood through adulthood.

Roots of adolescent aggressive behavior

Researchers are not in complete agreement with one another about what causes aggression. Some researchers (Moyer, 1976; Sylwester, 1999) argue that aggression is an innate and instinctive phenomenon, whereas some claim that aggression must be learned. Although no one has found a single absolute cause for aggression, there is a general agreement that both nature and nurture are important causes of aggression, and that they interact with and influence each other.

Biological causes of aggression

Some causes of aggression are believed to result from biological causes. For example, the amygdala that is an area in the core of the brain plays a role of controlling aggression. If that area is stimulated, a docile organism becomes violent. If that area is blocked, a violent organism becomes docile (Moyer, 1976). The hypothalamus also plays a key role in activating our rapid reflexive and often assertive responses to an imminent danger or opportunity (Sylwester, 1999).

Testosterone, a male sex hormone that promotes bone growth and muscle mass can also be a possible cause of aggressive behaviors. Testosterone lowers the male voice and helps develop sexual characteristics. It also binds to brain areas that influence behavior. According to Moyer (1976) testosterone increases aggression in animals. Even though both males and females have testosterone, males have much more than females and are consistently more aggressive than females (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974).

Another possible cause of aggression may be chemical imbalances. Neurotransmitters such as serotonin, dopamine, and norepinephrine play important roles in regulating one's behavior. Low serotonin levels, for instance, are linked to aggressive behaviors such as fighting, arson, and suicide (Sylwester, 1999). The malfunctioning brain systems of people with mental problems, such as schizophrenia, attention deficit disorders, and autism, is another cause of social behavior problems (Sylwester). However, it should be noted that aggression may be an optional strategy that is determined by a situational context in which the individual finds himself or herself. For example, imagine that one man is in a threatening or irritating situation in which he is surrounded by violent and strong men. Even though his amygdala is stimulated, that person may try to escape instead of attacking those people. Simply speaking, biological causes are likely to create a predisposition of aggressive behavior. However, a biological cause itself may be incomplete in the explanation of aggressive behavior.

Environmental causes of aggression

There are many environmental causes of aggression that may escalate the biological tendency for aggression. Some of these are the (i) home environment, (ii) sociocultural factors, (iii) media violence, (iv) the values of school or society, (v) the availability of aggressive objects, and (vi) leisure boredom.

(i) Home environment: An aggressive adolescent tend to be raised in an environment in which the primary caregivers are either uninvolved with or actively hostile toward him or her. Through interviews with parents, Olweus (1980) identified three parental qualities that contribute to aggressiveness in boys. The first is the parents' negative attitude toward their sons (e.g., hostility, rejection, or indifference). Second, such parents are usually tolerant of aggressive behavior in their children and do not set clear boundaries as to what appropriate behavior is. The third quality is the parents' use of power-assertive methods of discipline. Thus, boys who are frequently subjected to physical punishment, threats, and violent outbursts of their parents are more likely to be aggressive.

Bowers et al. (1994) posited that parents who practiced inconsistent or highly aversive discipline techniques, coupled with physical punishment, were more likely to have a child who would be aggressive toward others. Poor parent discipline and monitoring practices may also lead to childhood aggressive behaviors. Olweus (1993) pointed out that family problems, including frequent conflicts between the parents, divorce, psychological illness, and alcohol problems, might also contribute to children's aggressive behaviors.

(ii) Sociocultural factors: Sociocultural factors such as changes in family roles, divorce, child abuse, unemployed parents, and community racial tension are often regarded as contributing factors to personal violence in the schools. In addition, urban society tends to be violent, and some aspects of this violence overflow into the schools (Nuttal & Kalesnik, 1987). Poverty may be another important factor in aggression. Poverty decreases the essential resources necessary for social development and increases the stressors that impede effective parenting and problem solving (Nuttal & Kalesnik).

In addition, aggressive behaviors in schools may be influenced by policies and staff attitudes that foster and reinforce violence through the values promoted by an institution reflects into the values of the dominant group in society. Byrne (1993) examined aggressiveness in boys, in single sex boys' schools. In general, boys' schools are more explicitly built on 'male' values. According to the study results, physicality was not only used as a means of intimidation among the boys, but also as a way of making social contact. Apart from physical aggression, a great deal of verbal abuse was heard. Some men teachers commented on the way in which they thought aggression among the boys reflected the authoritarian structures in the school, and referred to the contradictory situation of a teacher threatening a boy with physical punishment for bullying another boy.

Competitiveness was another major element of boys' schools. Physical strength and power were also seen as part of stereotypical male attributes, and aggressive behavior such as bullying was a major way in which boys were able to demonstrate their manliness (Byrne, 1993). Thus, excessive competition is another possible factor that explains the learning of aggressive behavior. Hoover, Oliver, & Hazler, (1992) concluded that the excessive competition fostered in American schools is to the detriment of interpersonal relationships. According to Hoover, et al. (1992),

competitiveness and regimentation have also been blamed in part for an increase in the rate of students' aggressive behavior in Japan.

(iii) Media violence: Numerous studies have been conducted to examine the relationship between media violence and aggressive behavior. Specifically, since 1955, about 1,000 studies, reports, and commentaries concerning the impact of television violence have been published. The cumulative research clearly demonstrates a correlation between viewing violence and aggressive behavior (Tepperman, 1997). In recent years, the effects of other types of media violence, such as video games, radio, music videos, books, and comics, have been investigated as they are related to children's development. Although some of the research is inconclusive and contradictory, the majority of the research has indicated a positive relationship between adolescent aggressive behaviors and media violence (Tepperman, 1997).

More recently, the Canadian Press (2001) reported that overexposure to even non-violent media can make kids more aggressive. That theory is plausible because children who watch lots of TV or video games may spend less time interacting with others and may thus have fewer social skills.

(iv) Availability of aggressive objects: The mere presence of aggressive stimuli can increase the probability of aggression. Berkowitz (1981) articulated that an angry person can pull the trigger of a gun, but the trigger can also pull the finger. Guns, bombs, and any other objects that can be used as weapons are examples of aggressive objects.

Archer and Gartner (1984) in their cross-national study of violence, found that the homicide rate in countries all over the world is highly correlated with the availability of handguns. Aronson et al. (1997) also proposed that lethal violence, especially involving guns, is a major part of American society and therefore plays a major role in the expectations and fantasies of American youngsters.

Alcohol may also be included in this category because it tends to lower inhibitions against committing aggressive behaviors (Desmond, 1987). Alcohol can be regarded as an available aggressive object, too. For example, about one-third of youth committing serious crimes consumed alcohol just before the offense (Aronson, et al., 1997).

(v) Leisure boredom: During the period of adolescence, leisure activities are particularly important because in addition to providing opportunities to socialize, they provide adolescents with good opportunities to explore and form their autonomy and identity (Iso-Ahola & Crowley, 1991). However, the lack of leisure repertoires or a perceived boredom in adolescents' leisure time may lead to involvement in deviant behaviors such as violence and crimes. Mukerjee and Dagger (1990) claimed that leisure boredom may be correlated with an increase in adolescent participation in crime.

Iso-Ahola and Crowley (1991) found that people with aggressive behavior may be engaged in harmful activities (i.e., drug abuse, smoking, alcoholism, and juvenile delinquency) to escape from boredom in their free time. Their finding was consistent with other previous studies having shown a positive relationship between boredom susceptibility and alcohol use, smoking and deviant behavior (Orcutt, 1984; Smith & Caldwell, 1989; Wasson, 1981).

Although there are still some arguments between nature and nurture, there is a general agreement that both elements are important causes of aggression. That is, it is generally accepted that nature and nurture influence each other and interact each other.

Aggression as intention

Intention is basic element of aggression. It refers to do harmful act to another person. A harmful act would be aggressive if it is done deliberately. If an act to inflict harm on a person were not intentional, it would not be considered as an act of aggression. Thus a surgical operation conducted by a

surgeon may inflict harm to the patient, but it would not be considered as an aggressive behavior. But an assassin who pulls the trigger of his gun and misses the victim is an aggressive act because there was intention for killing the person. Thus if the harm is caused by accident, it is not the result of aggression. But if there is an intention to do harm to another person and if he is escaped by chance, it would be regarded as an aggressive behavior (Tedeschi, Smith, & Brown, 1974).

Aggression as action

Thoughts and emotions of human beings may be violent. But these internal states of behavior are imaginative and do not qualify as aggression.

It is true that aggression is accompanied by internal states such as anger and passion. But these would not be accepted as aggressive behaviors until these are materialized in actual behavior. Thus aggression refers to overt behavior. Aggressive behavior may be direct or indirect. If a person kills another person, it is a direct aggressive behavior. If a leader orders his followers to commit a violent action leading to mob movements, it is an indirect aggression. Aggression may involve overtly harmful action or just the threat or such action. Thus a person may shoot another person and may cause physical harm. Again a person may threaten another person asking him to get out of the room or he may be killed. In all these cases aggression is a formal behavior. It is an action tendency, overt behavior and actual harm done to the person (Baron and Richardson, 1994; Berkowitz, 1994).

Aggression as physical harm and injury

Aggression and altruistic behavior are two extrem poles of a straight line while altruistic behavior is pro-social, aggressive behavior is antisocial. Altruistic behavior has positive consequences but aggressive behavior has harmful and aversive consequences for other persons. These aversive consequences include both physical harm as well as psychological injury. When someone is attacked, raped, or killed, it is physical harm. But the

effects of threats, insults and shunning may be regarded as the consequences of psychological injury. However, the reactions to such consequences of physical and psychological harms may vary. If an individual enjoys pain, it is an act of masochism and the person who satisfies these masochistic needs may not act aggressively.

Aggression involves a victim who is an unwilling participant in the interaction. He or she must avoid the consequences that the aggressor intends to inflict on him or her (Baron, 1977; Bjorkqvist, et.al. 1994).

There are a number of different theoretical approaches to the study of aggression. However, the term aggression reflects the diversity of approaches, which have been developed to investigate the concept. There are several theoretical approaches that can be considered in the explanations of the phenomenon of aggression. But none of these approaches can be considered complete. Each appears to reflect a different aspect depending on the need of the investigation (Barchas, 1981).

Brain (1981) observes that the concept of aggression as applied to man may refer to an extremely diverse assortment of written, verbal and physical phenomenon having an element of value judgement. Whether an action is aggressive or a reasonable action depends on the convictions of the observer. These reactions are considered to be products of complex interactions between biological, environmental and experiential factors. This section is not intended to provide an in-depth analysis of the various approaches to the study of aggression but will briefly consider a number of distinct approaches to the study of aggression.

The nature and origin of aggression will be clearer if we view aggression from different theoretical perspectives.

Theories of Aggression

There are eight theories of aggression. These are as follows:

- 1. Instinct theory of aggression.**
- 2. Biological theory of aggression.**
- 3. Ethological theory of aggression.**
- 4. Psychoanalytical theory of aggression.**
- 5. Drive theory of aggression.**
- 6. Social learning theory of aggression.**
- 7. Cognitive theory of aggression.**
- 8. Difference-aggression theory.**

1. Instinct theory of aggression

Instinct theory of aggression state that aggression originates from within the individual. It is impossible to find out an individual who has not acted aggressively in his / her life. Viewed from this perspective, aggression may be regarded as a popular behavior.

Thus aggression seems to be a universal behavior. It indicates that there is something inside people that predisposes them to act aggressively. In this sense people are born with aggression. Instinctive theories and many biological theories take the position that people are aggressive by nature.

The instinctive theory states that a behavior is inherited rather than learned. It means that the behavior pattern is common to all members of the species. This theory has been formulated by Sigmund Freud witnessed the death and destruction in World War I. This led him to state that humans are born with in instinct of aggression. According to Freud, life instinct and

death instinct are two systems in the individuals where death instinct represents the aggression.

Lorenz (1966) an ethnologist gives another theory of instinct based on the research of animal behavior. Lorenz points out that the instinct to aggression is a common behavior in animal species. But Lorenz and Freud differ about the basic nature of instinct leading to aggressive behavior. According to Lorenz aggressive behavior is triggered by external cues. But according to Freud, aggression is inborn and inherent instinct that originates within the individual. Thus Freud saw aggression as destructive and disruptive but Lorenz viewed interspecies aggression as adaptive and essential for the survival of animal species.

According to Lorenz, an animal protects its territory through aggression. Aggression helps the animal to secure its food supply. Aggression serves to spread out animal populations and to prevent over crowding. In addition, one animal fights another animal over mates and strongest animals win the mates and reproduce the species. Thus the fittest members of a species reproduce and the defective members are eliminated. The instinctive theories of aggression have been criticized on several grounds. Firstly some researchers argue that certain animals have built-in releasing mechanisms. Hence instinct to aggression can not be regarded as an agent outside the animals.

A second criticism of instinct theory of aggression is directed toward human aggression. If humans are instinctively aggressive then there would be a great deal of similarity in the style and amount of aggression displayed by people. Again some people use weapons while other use words to express their aggression. Some people show aggression directly and openly, while others engage in passive aggression.

Thus the conviction that the people have a natural tendency towards violence is not feasible. Human aggression has different styles and forms depending on situational factors. Hence, in order to explain the nature of

human aggression, it is necessary to explain the conditions and factors under which people behave aggressively.

2. Biological theory of aggression

Biological theories also locate the seat of aggression inside the individual. Moyer (1976) identify certain neural centers that give rise to violent behavior when stimulated. These neural centers are called the seats of aggression. This approach, however, does not identify the conditions that cause stimulation of these seats of aggression.

A second line of research of biological theories of aggression has focused on the relationship between aggression and hormones. Maccoby and Jacklin (1980) have suggested that male sex hormones may be responsible for aggressive behavior. Hence, they have argued that there are definite sex differences in aggressive behavior. These investigators found that males are more aggressive than females because of hormonal differences. Hence the differences between males and females in aggressive behavior is innate.

Eron (1980) and Tieger (1980) have formulated an opposite view. According to them, sex differences in aggressiveness are due to learning and social aggression rather than differences in hormones. Thus the proponents and opponents of the biological predisposition theory centers on whether or not sex differences in aggression can be found in young children. However if these sex differences are found only at a later age, learning must play role in aggressive behavior. But there are no conclusive answers on this issue at present.

Jacobs et al. (1965) and Court-Brown (1967) have provided a biological theory of aggression based on genetics. It is argued that the genetic composition of individuals may predispose them toward certain types of behaviors. This line of research has focused on the relationship between the sex-type gene and behavior.

There are 46 chromosomes in each cell of the normal individual. Two chromosomes determine the sex of individuals. A female sex possesses 2 X-chromosomes but a male has 1 X and 1 Y chromosome. Jacobs et al. (1965) and Court-Brown (1967) noticed an unusually high number of abnormalities in the sex-type genes of prison inmates. It was found that these prison men possessed an extra Y chromosome. These people with extra Y chromosome were larger in size than the average male and were prone to violent outbursts. Hook (1973) and Jarvik et al. (1973) reported that the XYY abnormalities occurred once in every 550 normal males but its incidence was 15 to 20 times high among prison inmates. These findings suggest that Y chromosome might be related to aggressive behavior. Hence individuals with two Y-chromosomes might be particularly predisposed to behave violently.

Hook (1973) and Jarvik (1973) were the main proponents of chromosome theory that accounted for aggressive behavior. This theory of aggression has been criticized by Bandura (1973) on methodological grounds. They questioned the methodology used to stabilize the genetic theory of aggression. It is argued that the chromosomal abnormality may lead to an increase in the individual size. Hence the social factors such as the societal expectation that the large man should be tough and strong may enhance the chances that the XYY individual will behave aggressively. Furthermore, only 2 to 3.6 percent of prison inmates are likely to possess the XYY abnormality. This means that nearly all crimes are committed by individuals who have normal sex-type genes. Thus, even if the chromosome theory was correct, it could account for only a small proportion of the incidents of aggression. Moreover, if we accept the view that biological mechanisms play a role in instigating violence, it is necessary to explain what triggers these mechanisms.

It is, therefore, clear that biological theories of aggression emphasize the innateness of the aggressive response (Edmunds and Kendrick, 1980). The

genetic material of a species is seen as the primary determinant of a range of possible behaviours including aggression (Barchas, 1981). This base may be modified by experience. This is not to imply that there are no differences in patterns of aggressive behavior between humans and animals particularly primates.

However, it is generally assumed that some similar principles of behavior may be seen in both groups. From an evolutionary perspective, emotions are one of the most important traits to have developed in humans. In this perspective, emotions are regarded as having evolved for specific functions (Plutchik and Kellerman, 1980). Emotions are seen as communicators from one animal to the next, providing information about the probability of occurrence of a given behavior. Emotions are viewed as being basically adaptive, helping to organize the animal's behavior in a way, which meets the demands of the environment.

It is, therefore, logical that in order to understand aggression, one must look outside the person. It is necessary to investigate the ways in which these external conditions affect people to behave aggressively.

3. Ethological theory of aggression

A major biological approach to the study of aggression is that of the classical ethologists (those concerned with detailed observation of behavior). Most classical ethologists claim that aggression is in part a consequence of an organism's biological inheritance, making it subject to evolutionary pressures. Aggression is regarded as fulfilling useful biological functions. However, some researchers make no claims regarding the innateness of aggressive behavior (Brain, 1981). Ethological views of aggression have been received pessimistically by some (Brain, 1981). Hinde (1978, cite in Brain, 1981) notes that there is no dispute that aggressive behavior has been selected as an adaptive characteristic in a larger number of the higher species other than humans.

Hinde has argued for the survival value of aggressive behavior. Lorenz (1966, cited in Brain, 1981) has emphasized "the utility of aggression to social organization in human society" (Brain, 1981, p.616). Eibl-Eibesfeldt (1971, cited in Brain, 1981) argues for the view that aggression may have cohesive force in a society when one common enemy has been identified. From the biological point of view, man can be seen as being "biologically predisposed to behave in a fashion that can be labeled as 'aggression' under defined circumstances of experience and in the presence of particular environmental factors" (Brain, 1981, p.619). The majority of ethologists agree that situational and experiential factors are important in the control of aggression. However, the degree to which aggression (in humans particularly) is determined by genetic, physiological or learning factors is open to debate. A debate, which according to Brain is "inherently sterile" (Brain, 1981, p.619).

4. Psychoanalytic theory of aggression

Another approach to the study of aggression is based on psychoanalytic theory. Freud viewed aggression as a basic instinct or a fundamental need or drive for aggressive behavior (Barchas, 1981). Aggressive behavior occurs when need for aggression has built to such a level that it can, no longer be contained. However, through socialization and resolution of developmental stages of growth, the aggressive drive can be attached to more constructive behaviors (Barchas, 1981).

5. Drive theory of aggression

The drive theory states that aggression stems mainly from an externally elicited drive to harm others. According to Berkowitz (1989) and Feshbach (1984) drive theories proposed that external conditions such as frustration lead to aggression. Frustration causes interference with goal directed behavior. This arouses a strong motive to harm others. This aggressive drive, in turn, leads to overt act of aggression. The most famous

of these theories is well-known frustration-aggression hypothesis developed by Dollard, Doob, Miller, Mower and Sears (1939).

Frustration-aggression hypothesis postulates that aggression is always a consequence of frustration and that frustration always leads to some form of aggression. According to this theory, the investigation to aggression should increase as the strength of frustration increases. Based on these seemingly simple premises, Dollard and his associates attempted to make precise predictions about when people aggress and against whom they direct their aggression. The theory also postulate that the greater the frustration, the greater will be the resulting aggression.

They defined frustration as an interference with the behavior sequence. These statements may be translated to say that frustration will occur when some one can not have what he wants. They defined aggression as a behavior whose goal is the injury of the person toward whom it is directed. This includes physical and verbal aggression.

Dollard et al. (1939) stated that although frustration instigates aggression, the actual act of aggression may be inhibited if punishment for aggression is expected. Consequently those who are frustrated should aggress directly against the frustrating agent. However, if the frustrating agent is unavailable or if the aggressor fears punishment for aggressing against the frustrating agent, an aggressor may displace aggression to some other target. This is called displaced aggression.

Miller (1948) hypothesized that the target of displaced aggression will have some similarities with the original frustrating agent. For example, if the frustrating agent is the father, aggression may be displaced to the mother, since both the mother and the father are parents.

Berkowitz and Knurek (1967) found that aggression may be displaced to a target with a name similar to that of the frustrator. In this study, subjects who were prevented from winning money attributed more unfavorable

characteristics to a bystander with the name as that of the frustrator than to a bystander with a different name.

Frustration-aggression theory also deals with the type of aggression that can be expected to follow frustration. Dollard et al. suggests that direct physical and verbal aggression will be the most preferred types. However, if the use of direct aggression is inhibited or blocked, an alternative type of aggression, such as spreading rumors about the frustrator or making him or her the butt of jokes, may be employed. Such displacements of aggression can occur in both the target and the type of aggression.

The general principles of the frustration-aggression hypothesis were developed from the psychoanalytic tradition and the work of Freud (Dollard, Doob, Miller, Mowrer and Sears, 1939). However, in contrast to Freud, Dollard et al (1939) proposed that the origin of aggressive behavior was to be found in external factors. Thus accumulated frustrating experiences may be identified as the source of aggression. But Freud had postulated an internal or instinctive base for aggressive behavior. Initially, in the original statement of the frustration-aggression hypothesis (Dollard et al, 1939), it was assumed that aggressive behavior was always the consequence of frustration. It was hypothesized that a one-to-one relationship existed between frustration and aggression. Aggression was defined as an act whose goal response is injury to an organism (Dollard et al, 1939, p. 11).

Frustration was defined as that condition which exists when a goal-response suffers interference" (Dollard et al, 1939, p. 11). The intensity with which the frustration was experienced was seen to depend upon three factors. These included the strength of the instigation to the frustrated response, the degree of interference with the frustrated response, and the number of previous goal-response sequences frustrated. Thus, the stronger the feelings of frustration, the stronger the aggressive response.

According to Kaufmann (1965), frustration produces instigation to aggression. The instigation may or may not be strong enough to provoke

aggressive behavior. However, when aggression has been elicited, the organism will be instigated to attack an opponent. Berkowitz (1962, 1981) subsequently argued that an organism has a tendency to continue an activity until its goal has been reached. Inability to achieve this goal causes frustration. Catharsis occurs when and because the aggressor achieves his or her aggressive goal.

Contrary to the arguments of Dollard et al (1939), Berkowitz (1981) argues that the occurrence of aggressive behavior (or the achievement of an aggressive goal) would decrease only when the aggressive instigation are the result of previous frustrations. Berkowitz (1981) notes that it is not possible to say that only one type of aggression exists or that there is only one sort of aggressive goal. He goes on to argue that it is worthwhile to differentiate between hostile and instrumental aggression. In hostile aggression the goal is to injure the object of the attack, whereas in instrumental aggression the primary goal of aggressive behavior is to reach a goal beyond causing injury to the victim of the attack, such as domination, access to resources and so on. It could be hypothesized that much of the aggression observed in societal context would correspond to this second type.

6. Social learning theory of aggression

A sharply contrasting perspective on aggression is known as social learning view. This approach emphasizes the idea that aggression is a complex form of social behavior. Bandura (1973, 1986) and Baron and Richardson (1994) were the major proponents of social learning theory. This theory states that human beings are not born with a large array of aggressive responses at their disposal. But they must acquire these in the same way that they acquire other complex forms of the social behavior.

According to Baron and Richardson (1994), social behaviors are learning. These are acquired through direct experience or by observing the actions of others. Thus depending on there past experience, people in different cultures learn to attack others in contrasting way. Through direct

and vicarious experience, individuals also learn, (i) which persons or groups are appropriate targets for aggression, (ii) what actions by others either satisfy or actually require aggressive retaliation and (iii) what situations or contexts are there in which aggression is appropriate or inappropriate.

Bandura and Walters (1963) have provided some specific predictions about the situation under which aggression will be exhibited. Thus children learn when to aggress, how to aggress and against whom to aggress. The bulk of this learning comes from observing parents. Additional learning of aggression comes from peer groups and from mass media portrayals of aggression and violence. In extreme forms, children may actually be schooled in the techniques of the aggression by parents or teachers. In short, the social learning perspective suggest whether a specific person will aggress in a given situation depends on a vast array of factors, including that person's past experience, the current reinforcements (rewards) associated with aggression, and many variables that shape the person's thoughts and perceptions concerning the appropriateness and potential effects of such behavior.

Social learning theorists argue that aggression is not due to instinct or drive, but is the result of the norms, rewards, punishment and models to which individuals have been exposed (Bandura, 1983). Aggression is therefore viewed as a learned response, through observation or imitation of socially relevant others (Barchas, 1981). The more often aggressive behavior is reinforced the more likely it is to occur again. For example values which indicate that 'to be a man, sometimes you have to stand and fight'. If parents punish children for aggressive behavior, such behavior may soon become inhibited in the presence of the parents, however, the imitative response will be strongly learned. Aggressive behavior would then be expected to occur in situations in which the parent is not present. Physically punishing children for aggressive behavior may effectively act as a model for aggressive behavior. Biological mechanisms set limits on the types of aggressive

behaviors that can develop and influence the rate of learning (Bandura, 1983).

In the social learning view, individuals are understood to be endowed with neurophysiological mechanisms which allow them to behave in an aggressive way. However, the elicitation of aggressive behavior depends on the occurrence of appropriate stimulation and is largely under cognitive control (Bandura, 1983). Thus, the actual form the aggressive behavior will take. The frequency of its occurrence and the circumstances in which it arises will depend on complex social learning factors (Bandura, 1983).

Aggressive behaviors may be learned through observation from aggressive models. Bandura (1983) proposes that aggressive behavior patterns can be obtained in Western society from three primary sources. Possibly the most fundamental of these is the role of family members in the modeling of aggressive behavior. However, the family is contained within a complex social system, which plays an important secondary role in the modeling of aggressive behavior patterns. Finally, the mass media is viewed as the third most important source of aggressive behavior modeling for individuals.

According to Bandura (1983) there is mounting evidence that television affects behavior and may act as a symbolic model for aggressive behavior. He goes on to say that television has been found to affect behavior in four ways; by teaching aggressive behavior styles, altering restraints over aggressive behavior, desensitizing and habituating viewers to aggressive behavior, and shaping viewers' images of reality, upon which they base much of their behavior. Direct experience in the social learning approach is also considered to influence aggressive behavior styles. The formulation of suitable behavior patterns is developed from observing the effects of ones own actions (Bandura, 1983). Such reinforcement appears to act as an informative and motivational mechanism rather than as a mechanical response shaper.

7. Cognitive theory of aggression

Berkowitz (1989) Huesmann (1988, 1994) and Anderson (1995) are the main proponents of cognitive theories of aggression. According to them, cognitive factors play a crucial role to determine the reactions of an individual in a given situation. One of these factors is called scripts or cognitive programs for the events that are supposed to happen in a given setting. Another cognitive factor influencing the behavior is the interpretation of the situation. Interpretation involves the appraisal of “Why” of others behavior. It includes others intention or purpose. Individual must assess whether the event is an accident or an intentional act to cause harm. According to Anderson (1995), the individual will very quickly decide whether it was an act of malice. This initial appraisal may then be followed by reappraisal. This reappraisal of the whole situation will lead the individual to retaliate through an act of aggression or to forgive and forget.

It is, therefore, clear that aggression in a given situation depends on many factors. Some factors come on the target of the aggression and some factors stem from the aggressor. While other factors depend on the situational variables. Lastly, all these factors involve cognition. Thus, the cognitive theory of aggression suggests that aggression stem from a complex interplay between cognitive factor, affecting states and additional variables. In fact, aggression is the results of many factors such as current modes and experiences, thought, memory as well as cognitive appraisals of the current situations.

8. Difference-aggression theory

Byrne, (1971) has shown that, in general, people like people like in-group members and dislike out-group members. Byrne explained this phenomenon from cultural and racial perspectives. According to him, groups and cultures tend to create in-groups and out-groups and each person is expected to conform to his or her group’s beliefs. Hitler’s hostility toward the Jews is an example of aggression caused by racial difference. In short,

in-groups are usually valued while out-groups are devalued, stereotyped, and scapegoat.

Bee (1998) has shown that school bullying behaviors and violence may be approached from this perspective. Especially in the period of adolescence, peers are a major force in shaping an adolescent's identity development. Adolescents tend to choose their friends who share their values, attitudes, and behaviors.

Brown, Mory, & Kinney (1994) coined a term, "identity prototype", which refers to an adolescent's reputation-based group, with which he or she is identified either by choice or peer designation. Some of prototypes are "jocks," "brains," "nerds," "dweebs," "punks," "druggies," "toughs," "normals," "populars," "preppies, "loners," etc. According to Brown et al., labeling others or labeling oneself as belonging to a particular group helps the adolescent create or reinforce his or her own identity and also helps the adolescent identify potential friends or foes. Thus, membership in one group guides each adolescent toward particular activities and particular relationships. For example, "druggies" and "toughs" seem to experience explicit pressure to engage in misconduct or lawbreaking (Berndt & Keefe, 1995).

In a study of school bullying, Lagerspetz, Bjorkqvist, Berts, and King (1982) presented data, which revealed that the victims of school bullying were physically weaker than well-adjusted childrens and also that obesity and handicaps were more common among them. Boulton and Smith (1994) also found that victims were often rated as being 'thin' and as 'appearing different from the rest of the class for example in dress and speech.' In addition, the victims were rated as having poor personal hygiene (Boulton & Smith, 1994). Therefore, the difference-aggression theory suggested by Byrne (1971) appears to have some plausibility.

Overview of Theories of Aggression

Various theories of aggression differ in the types of aggressive behavior. They also differ in their emphasis in terms of biological, motivational and social factors. However, the underlying theme of these theories assumes that human aggression is caused by the combined result of biological factors and experience. Biological factors include genetic inheritance and evolutionary process. Experience indicates learning through exposure to environmental factors.

Cofer and Appley (1964) have provided a comparative analysis of different theories of aggression. According to them, human motives are driven by innate forces or external conditions. Therefore, the motives of individuals for aggression may be conscious or unconscious, compelled by drives and instincts, or human aggression may be determined by incentives, goals and values. In other words motivating factors of aggression may be postulated as innate forces or cultural forces.

The Concept of Psycho-Social Factors

The concept of psycho-social factors indicates affective and cognitive aspects of everyday experience. These factors stem from the environmental situations in which the individuals are exposed in their day to day interactions. In the present study three psychosocial factors such as (i) Gender, (ii) Socio-Economic Status (SES) and (iii) Residential Background have been selected in the perspectives of aggressive behavior.

Gender issue

Gender issue is an important psychosocial factor in human aggression. In every society, male – female categorization leads to different type of social behavior. It is believed that males are supposed to protect country from the outside invaders and females are supposed to keep household affairs. This division leads the male counterparts to be involved in all types of aggressive behavior. A large number of studies (Fraser, 1996; Baron,

1997; Tepperman, 1997; Mukerjee and Dagger, 1990) and social observations have shown that physical aggression is the characteristic nature of males and verbal aggression is the characteristic nature of females. The present study has taken gender as an independent variable in the study of human aggression.

Socio-economic status

Socio-economic status of the individuals may be conceived in terms of economic upliftment, societal position, education and profession. In general, individual in the society have been categorized in to high, middle and low socio-economic status in consideration to their economic condition, education and profession. It is important to note that socio-economic status of an individual reflects his position in the society. It is the directives for the individual to his psychological functioning for attitudinal preference and values. It is, therefore, expected that aggressive behavior of an individual should be conditioned by his socio-economic status.

Residential background

Residence is another factor that may cause differences in human aggression. The basic nature of male is molded by his residence. In general, people living in urban and rural areas develop different social norms and value system. People living in rural areas in Bangladesh are mostly farmers by their profession. Agriculture is such a profession that engages people in work most of the time. The rural people are also less educated. Urban people, on the other hand, are engaged in various types of profession. Most of them are businessmen and service people. Business and job orientation provide a different type of social norms and value system. It is, therefore, argued that residential differences would lead to differential amount of aggressive behavior.

Review of the Literature

The present section provides a short review of current empirical findings on aggression.

Bach and Torbet (1983) conducted a study on violent behavior and found that an aggressor can not control his feelings (affective) and thinking (cognitive) aspects of his behavior. Aggression is expressed in an overt physical action (sensory motor) usually causing an imbalance in his rationality. On the basis of these experimental data, the investigators concluded that aggression is a person's intentional physical and verbal injury to another person.

Baron and Byrne (1982) reported that aggression is any form of behavior performed with the intention or goal of harming another living being who is motivated to avoid harm. Potkay and Allen (1986) gave emphasis on behavior and explained it as an action that involves musculature of the body. It includes the muscles used in speech as well as other actions such as thinking and feeling. They found intention an important factor of aggression. Intention is the conscious planning and execution of a behavior. Its purpose is to cause physical and mental damage or harm. The harm outweighs the benefits.

Berres and Long (1979) provided some empirical findings on passive-aggressive behavior. They reported that passive-aggressive behavior is characteristically related with passive-aggressive students. These students deal with their anger and frustration by eliciting these feeling in others. As a result they become victim of others rational behavior.

Beck (1985) found that passive-aggressive students are passive listeners. They move slowly and take more time to complete a task. They forget purposefully. They commit more accidental destruction. They are restless and frequently out of seat. They exhibit inappropriate behavior. They constantly complain without any reasonable cost.

Huesmann and Miller (1994) found entertainment media to play positive role to create depression in children and adult. In a study with violent video game, it was found that the subjects who were exposed to violent picture expressed more aggression immediately after the game was finished.

Elmer-Dewitt, (1993) reported similar findings and concluded that the people in the modern U.S. society are more aggressive than the people of 25 years ago. In this comparison, investigator reported that popular games are simple and harmless in the past. But modern games are characterized by cruelty, anger and violent behavior leading to the loss of human lives. As a result, the children and the adults learn aggression from violent games.

Huesmann (1986) conducted a study to explore the psychological process of aggression produced by media violence. The investigator conducted a study on university students and the total time they spent in the recent past on the video games it was found that video games have potential detrimental effects on grades. The data of this study on TV violence suggest that aggressive behavior engendered by media violence exposure is related to decrements in academic achievements.

Emes (1997) has provided a review of the effect of video games on children. It was found that violent video games decrease aggressiveness and reduce pent-up emotion. But this has not been supported by most of the studies conducted on TV exposure of aggression.

Dietz (1998) conducted a study on the implications for gender socialization and aggressive behavior. He examined 33 popular games and found that 80% of the games were violent in nature and 21% of these games portrayed violent towards woman.

Anderson, Anderson and Deuser (1996) examined the weapon and temperature effects on aggressive thought affect and attitude. They provided

an affective aggression framework and showed that exposure to violent pictures increase aggressive behavior.

In another study, Anderson, Deuser and DeNeve (1995) and showed that the short-term effects of video exposure of violence produce aggressive personality. These data integrates the existing theories of social learning processes of aggression developed by Bandura (1971) and cognitive theory of aggression developed by Berkowitz (1993). The investigators explained the general affective aggression model by noting that the enactment of aggression largely based on knowledge structures created by short-term effects of violence shown in video.

Anderson, Anderson, Dill and Deuser (1998) explained the basic principles of video aggression. It described a multistage process by which aggressive personality and situational factors such as provocation input variable learning to aggressive behavior. Thus the aggressive person influences several related internal states. This is a controlled and autonomic appraisal process of aggressive behavior.

Anderson (1997), Crick and Dodge (1994), and Dill, Anderson, Anderson and Deuser (1997) found that personological and situational factors can influence the internal state of the person's cognitive, affective and arousal variables leading to aggression. They reported that individuals with aggressive personality have social perception schemas that lead to hostile perception, expectation and attributional basis. These investigators explained aggression as an internal physiological mechanism.

Anderson (2000) conducted two studies on aggression –related variables. The first study used 227 Ss. Among them, 78 were males and 149 were females. A correlational design was used to examine the relationship between violent video games and several outcome variables such as aggressive behavior delinquency, academic achievement and worldview. The study also examined the potential interactive effects of individual differences in aggression. Data were collected using a questionnaire in a

group. The second study used 210 Ss. Among them 104 were females and 106 were males. In addition to the first study, the second study examined the interactive effects of gender and trait irritability on those variables. Design was 2 (violent / nonviolent game) x 2 (high / low irritability) x 2 (male / female) between-subjects factorial design. The results of both the studies showed that men had a more hostile view of the world than did the women. It also showed that exposure to violent games increased aggressive behavior in both the cases.

Werbach (1995) conducted a study to show the nutritional influences on aggressive behavior. He examined the effects of vitamins, minerals, iron, lithium, magnesium, and showed that aggressive symptoms may be attributed to organic factors. Furthermore, constitutional factors including genetic effects of disease and physical trauma were found to play a major role in determining proneness to over aggressive behavior. Thus the investigator explained the contribution of nutritional factors and concluded that the aggressive behavior is marked by restlessness, irritability, impulsivity, and a proneness to violence.

American Psychiatric Association (1987) reported that aggression may be attributed to organic factors as well as psychological factors. Hanes (1974) reported effects of nutritional medicine on aggressive symptoms. Tucker et al. (1990) found vitamins or minerals to produce aggressive effects on human beings and identify neuropsychological impairment. They conducted this symptom of aggression by EEG records.

Gelenberg (1988) reported that deficiencies of several vitamins are positively associated with irritability. Similar findings have been reported by Lonsdale et al. (1980). They reported that frequently over aggressive behavior are manifestations of marginal vitamin neutriture. Under laboratory conditions, they conducted experiments on 20 people eating "Junk food" diets. These people were found to have biological evidence of marginal thiamin deficiency. These people were found impulsive, highly irritable,

aggressive and sensitive to criticism. Following thiamin supplementation, their behaviors were improved. This laboratory evidence suggests that marginal thiamin deficiency may have contributed to their aggressive behavior syndrome.

Youdim et al. (1990) reported that iron deficiency is most common in industrialized societies. It was found that 10% of American males and 3% of American females are overtly iron deficient. Investigators found deficiency of iron to interfere with proper brain function. Thus iron deficiency may cause learning deficits leading to behavioral impairment in the form of aggressive behavior.

Webb and Oski (1974) conducted laboratory experiment on behavioral status of young adolescents with iron deficiency. On the basis of their findings, investigators conclude that iron deficiency may be an important contributor to aggressive behavioral syndromes. They reported that among adolescent males, iron deficiency is directly associated with aggressive behavior.

Rosen et al. (1985) conducted a laboratory experiment on iron deficiency in juvenile delinquents. They showed that dopamine is a major neurotransmitter in the brain. Iron is highly concentrated in the dopamine pathways. Animal study has shown that iron deficiency diminishes dopamine in neurotransmission. This has a potent influence of behavior.

Wickham and Reed (1987) conducted an experiment and showed the influence of lithium for the control of aggressive and self-mutilating behavior. In another study Campbell et al. (1984) compared the hospitalized aggressive children with conduct disorder using lithium. It was found that lithium can reduce abnormal aggressive behavior.

Glenn et al. (1989) and Spreat et al. (1989) conducted experimental study on lithium carbonate for aggressive behavior in ten brain-injured patients and mentally retarded persons. They observed the deficiency of

lithium in these patients and concluded that aggression, self-destructive behavior and mental retardation are caused by the deficit of lithium carbonate.

Schrauzer and Shrestha (1990) found that the incidences of suicide, homicide and rape were significantly higher in counties whose drinking water supplies contained little or no lithium than in counties with higher water lithium levels. Corresponding associations with the incidences of robbery, burglary and theft were also significant.

Fierro (1988) conducted an experiment on the effect of low-dose lithium supplementation over aggressive behavior. Results suggested that low-dose lithium derived from vegetable concentrates may have a powerful effect on mental state and behavior.

Kantak (1988) conducted several studies about the effect of magnesium on aggression. The results of the studies showed that magnesium has a complex relationship with aggressive behavior. Magnesium deficiency reduces offensive aggressive behavior but increases defensive aggressive behavior.

Izenwasser et al. (1986) conducted a study to examine the stimulant-like effects of magnesium on aggression in mice. Results showed that lower levels of magnesium supplementation increase the number of attacks on intruders while higher levels have the opposite effect.

Henrotte (1986) conducted several studies to establish relationship between Type A behavior and magnesium metabolism. The findings of these studies showed that magnesium deficiency enhances catecholamine secretion and sensitivity to stress in humans. This may promote aggressive behavior. It has been suggested that Type A behavior pattern and aggressive behavior may cause and may be caused by magnesium deficiency. In an extended study, Banki et al. (1985) showed that suicide attempts, which are

violently aggressive acts against the self, have been correlated with lowered magnesium levels in the cerebrospinal fluid.

Gottschalk et al. (1991) found abnormalities in hair trace- elements as indicators of aberrant behavior. Gottschalk and his associates consistently found elevated hair manganese in a population of violent male offenders. This suggested that marginal manganese toxicity may be associated with violent criminal behavior.

Barlow (1983) conducted a pilot study on the mental levels in the hair of hyperactive children. It was found that men with a history of childhood hyperactivity have an increased rate of antisocial and drug use disorders. Chandra (1983) conducted an experiment on rats and found that chronic manganese exposure initially produces hyperactivity with an increased tendency to fight. This finding suggests that marginal manganese toxicity may promote overaggressive behaviors in adults.

Thomson et al. (1989) conducted a study to examine blood lead levels and children's behavior. The study is known as Edinburgh Lead Study. It included over 500 children between the ages of 6 and 9. The investigators found a significant relationship between the log of blood lead level and teacher's ratings of children's behavior on an aggressive / antisocial / hyperactive scale. Thus the study showed that brain damage due to toxic metal exposure may promote aggressive, antisocial and violent behaviors.

Pihl et al. (1982) conducted a study on hair element content of violent criminals. They found that hair lead levels from 19 violent criminals elevated in higher intensity as compared with those of 10 nonviolent criminals. On the basis of this study, Pihl and his associates have addressed the relationship of lead exposure and violent behavior in adults. This study was repeated 8 years later by the same research team with the same results.

Rees (1979) found that the exposure to aluminum may also contribute to over aggressive behaviors. It was found that aluminum levels of a group

of 22 juvenile offenders as well as 10 severely delinquent adolescent boys were elevated.

Roy et al. (1988) reported that serotonin, a major neurotransmitter, has been found to play an important role in modulating aggressive behavior. Impulsive, violent and suicidal behaviors have repeatedly been shown to be associated with a reduction in serotonergic activity in the central nervous system.

Giammanco et al. (1990) observed that tryptophan, an essential amino acid, is the dietary precursor to serotonin and several lines of evidence have suggested that the amount of tryptophan in the diet relates closely to aggressive behavior. The investigators conducted an experiment on rats. The rats were given a diet almost lacking in tryptophan. The results showed that the rats develop aggressive behavior towards mice.

Kitahara (1986) conducted an animal experiment to examine dietary tryptophan ratio and homicide in Western and Southern Europe. Kitahara has calculated the dietary tryptophan ratio for 18 European countries and attempted to relate it to homicide rates. Initially no correlation was found between low tryptophan ratios and homicide. But once social and cultural differences were controlled. Low tryptophan ratios were found to be associated with high homicide rates.

Branchey et al. (1984) conducted experiment on depression, suicide and aggression in alcoholics and their relationship to plasma amino acids. They measured the actual ratio in the blood plasma. This direct method helped the investigators to examine the relationship between the tryptophan ratio and aggression.

Chamberlain et al. (1987) conducted an experimental study to examine the effect of raising or lowering tryptophan levels on aggression in vervet monkeys. In this experiment, dietary tryptophan was manipulated in social groups of vervet monkeys by providing them with amino acid

mixtures that were tryptophan free, nutritionally balanced, or excessively high in tryptophan. These mixtures were shown to have a marked effect on plasma tryptophan levels. During spontaneous activity, the only effect of the different mixtures was increased aggression in the males on the tryptophan – free mixture. During competition for food, however, while the tryptophan-free mixture continued to increase male aggression, the high- tryptophan mixture reduced aggression in the both males and females. These data suggest that tryptophan supplementation may be most effective in reducing aggression during times of stress.

Morand et al. (1983) examined clinical response of aggressive schizophrenic to oral tryptophan. In this experiment hospitalized male schizophrenics were given tryptophan. It was found that only those patients with high levels of hostility and a high lifetime frequency of aggressive incidents were benefited from tryptophan.

Benton et al. (1982) conducted a study on relative hypoglycemia. It was found that hypoglycemia during glucose tolerance testing is related to hostile and aggressive behavior. Such behavior is generally seemed in habitually violent and impulsive criminals.

Schoenthaler et al. (1982-1983) investigated the issue of relative hypoglycemia by changing the amount of sugar in the diet and examined the behavioral effects. This experiment was conducted on thousands of incarcerated juvenile offenders in different locations around the United States. Compared to offenders on a placebo diet, the investigators to found a significant reduction in various forms of antisocial behavior such as assaultiveness, fighting, self-injury and suicide attempts. However, the findings of this experiment suggest that dietary sugar may influence behavior. But they did not examine blood sugar levels. Again, the study was conducted on males only. It is argued that males are more likely to engage in aggressive behaviors. And females are more sensitive to nutritional

influences on aggression. Hence the investigators suggested further studies in this area with female subjects.

A study conducted by Clarke (1950) suggested that over aggressive behaviors can be provoked by a reaction to common foods. Reactions range from irritability to a psychotic aggressive reaction. Children who improved after food eliminations had previously been irritable, fretful, and quarrelsome and could not get along with others. Often they had to be taken out of school as they upset the classes and were considered incorrigible. After food eliminations, however, their personalities dramatically changed, and they became happy and social.

Kokko and Pulkkinen (2000) conducted a study on aggression in childhood and long-term unemployment in adulthood. The study revealed a cycle of maladaptation and some protective factors. The participants were drawn from the on-going longitudinal study of personality and social development. The data gathered at the age of 8, 14, 27 and 36 years were used in the study. It was found that teacher rated aggression at the age 8 was related to subsequent long-term unemployment through a cycle of maladaptation. Specifically, childhood aggression predicted school maladjustment at age 14, which was both directly and indirectly related to long-term unemployment.

In a recent study Kirkparick and his associates (2002) found functional relationship between self-esteem and the differential prediction of aggression. On the basis of an evolutionary theory of self-esteem, it was hypothesized that self-esteem and aggression relationship differs across functionally distinct domains of self-esteem as well as across contexts. They conducted 2 experiments. In study 1, self-perceived superiority was positively related to aggression. In study 2, only a measure of self-perceived mate value emerged as a positive predictor of aggression. Global self-esteem failed to contribute to the prediction of aggression in either experiment.

A number of different researchers have investigated the interrelationship between the occurrence of violent and aggressive behavior and other internal (psychological or physiological) factors and external (environmental) factors. Most of the studies have reported that the expression of aggression is influenced by environmental stressors such as noise (Mueller, 1983), ambient temperature (Bell and Baron, 1981), the consumption of alcohol (Taylor and Leonard, 1983), and brain pathology (Moyer, 1981).

A number of investigators have reported that stressful events may be related to the occurrence of aggressive behavior. McMurray (1970) reports that during the six months before and after divorce, couples show higher rate of violent behavior. Holt (1982), Selzer (1969) and Selzer, Roger and Kern (1965) reported that social stressors in the form of personal crisis and quarrels with significant others contribute to an increase in aggressive behavior. Hampson (1984) reports three in-depth studies that identified emotional stress as a contributing factor in aggression. Selzer and Vinokur (1974) argue that life change and current subjective stress may be more important in the occurrence of aggression than personality or social factors. Stress may act in a number of different ways such as increasing aggression, or causing distraction. There is some implication in these studies that emotional stress may influence aggressive behavior, possibly by increasing risk taking, bad temper, or as Macdonald (1964) recorded, triggering suicide attempts. Valentine, Williams and Young (1977) found that increased risk taking while under stress may cause aggression. Schuman, Pelz, Ehrlich and Selzer (1967) reports that risk taking and aggressive behavior may be influenced by some stressful events. Hampson (1984) reports the indirect relationship between emotional stress and immediate human actions in the form of aggressive behavior.

Goffioul (1971) has suggested that the effect of modifying the expression of the personality leading to aggressive behavior. Payne and

Selzer (1962) have found the effect of alcohol in releasing aggressive personality traits. Yates, Meller and Troughton (1987) regard acts of aggression to be a major behavioral complication of alcoholism. They comment that alcohol seems to precipitate violence in some alcoholics. Yates et al (1987) also reports on the antisocial alcoholics were found to be involved in fights, marital disputes and suicide attempts. Barry (1973) has also reported that alcohol increases aggressive and nervous moods. The investigator conducted laboratory experiments on humans and has shown evidence for an increase in aggressive behavior due to alcoholism.

Research into the influence of brain pathology in aggression appears to be anecdotal. Maletzky (1973) has shown that brain diseases play a major role in the occurrence of aggressive behavior.

An overview of the preceding analytical approach of various studies related to aggression shows that human aggression may be preceded by a large number of factors. In fact, inability to control impulses may cause human aggression. An individual who has not been taught appropriate way of coping with frustration or distress may indulge in aggressive behavior. Thus the basic causes of aggression support the notion that social norms and values play an important role in human aggression. In this context, it may be cited that differences in gender, socio economic status and residential background may effect variation in social norms and value system causing differential amount of aggression in human behavior. The present study would reflect on these social factors of human aggression.

Rationale of the Study

Bangladesh is a poverty stricken country. Most of the people in Bangladesh live below the poverty line. They depend mainly on agriculture, small and cottage industries and manual labor for their livelihood. This leads them to low income and high illiteracy. Thus the unemployment problem in Bangladesh is rising day by day. As a result, people show intolerance and

the unemployed youths are involved in terrorism. Thus aggressive behavior has become the most prevalent social issue in Bangladesh. It is, therefore, argued that aggression is the most important social issue in the people of Bangladesh.

In a situation like this impulsive behavior in the people of Bangladesh, the aggressive behavior of people may be identified as the most persistent problem in this country. Due to increasing poverty and unemployment problem, people become the violators of social norms and laws of the land leading to impulsive and aggressive behavior. The present study would reflect on the social system and consequent aggressive behavior in the people.

Objective of the Study

The broad objective of the present study would be to conduct an investigation on psychosocial factors in aggressive behavior in males and females in Bangladesh. However, some specific objectives have been stated below:

1. To study the effect of gender issue on aggressive behavior.
2. To find-out the effect of socio-economic status on aggressive behavior.
3. To reflect on residential background as a causative factor of aggression.

Hypothesis of the Study

The hypotheses with their justifications have been described below.

H₁: *Female respondents would express more aggression as compared to male respondents.*

This hypothesis has been framed under the theoretical assumption that aggression is always a consequence of frustration and that frustration always

leads to some form of aggression. In the context of Bangladesh, it may be said that women are allowed less social, economic and political freedom. In societal environment, women have restricted movement and they are mostly dominated by men. In home environment, women are discriminated against men. In case of job opportunity, women have limited scope. These situational factors make the women frustrated in larger intensity as compared to men. In modern social context, the employed women have to bear more burdens. They have to look after their children and to keep household affairs along with their office works. Even the housewives have to bear extra burden of their families. Due to this differential role-play on the family, women become frustrated in most of the times. In the context of these theoretical assumptions and personal observations, it has been hypothesized that female respondents would express more aggression as compared to male respondents.

H₂: *Respondents with high socio-economic status would express more aggression followed by the respondents with middle socio-economic status and least by the respondents with low socio-economic status.*

This hypothesis has been framed under the assumptions of cognitive theory of aggression. The theory states that aggression stems from a complex interplay between cognitive factor, affecting states and additional variables. Thus, aggression is the results of many factors such as current modes and experiences, thought, memory as well as cognitive appraisals of the current situations. In the context of Bangladesh, it may be said that people with high, middle and low socio-economic status differ in their cognitive appraisals of the current situations. The people with low socio-economic status lead a simple way of life. They are satisfied with their simple livelihood. People with middle socio-economic status are known as carrier of culture and value system. So they prefer within the boundary of their cultural values and traditional social system. People with high socio-

economic status experience a social system characterized by modernization. They possess a new look in to the social system. Hence they are cognitive appraisals of the current situation's results in many complex way of livelihood. As a result, they express their thoughts in terms of more aggressive behavior. In the context of these theoretical assumptions and personal observations, it has been hypothesized that respondents with high socio-economic status would express more aggression followed by the respondents with middle socio-economic status and least by the respondents with low socio-economic status.

H₃: *Respondents with rural residential background would express more aggression as compared to the respondents with urban residential background.*

This hypothesis has been framed under the theoretical assumptions that human beings are not born with a large array of aggressive responses at their disposal. But they must acquire these in the same way that they acquire other complex form of the social behavior. In fact, rural people suffer from more economic constraints in their livelihood as compared to urban people in their environmental condition of Bangladesh. The economic hardship in which the rural people are exposed creates some conditions that help to learn aggression. From the perspectives of social relationships and inter-group behavior, it may be presumed that rural people have to face many conflicting inter-group relationships given birth to aggression. It is also important to note that rural people have to fight with the environment with their own resources. The natural calamities like floods, draughts, cyclones etc. Thus the natural forces teach the rural people to behave more violently with their environmental forces. On the basis of these theoretical assumptions and personal observations, it has been hypothesized that respondents with rural residential background would express more aggression as compared to the respondents with urban residential background.

CHAPTER-II

METHOD AND PROCEDURE

CHAPTER-II


METHOD AND PROCEDURE

The present study was designed to explore the phenomenon of aggression in males and females as a function of Socio-Economic Status and Residential Background in the social context of Bangladesh. The independent variables used in this study were Gender, Socio-Economic Status and Residential Background. The dependent variable was differential amount of aggression expressed by the respondents. Hence, special attention was given for the selection of appropriate sample and instrument. Thus the present chapter describes sample and instrument used for the collection of data. The design of the study and the procedure of data collection have also been described in this section.

Sample

A total of 240 respondents constituted the sample of the study. A stratified random sampling procedure was adopted for sample selection. The respondents were students of different institutions situated in Rajshahi City. In the first place, equal number of respondents (40 in each group) with high, middle and low socio-economic status was selected on incidental basis in the category of males. Similarly, equal number of respondents (40 in each group) with high, middle and low socio-economic status was selected on incidental basis in the category of females. Thus 120 respondents were included in each category of males and females. They were equally divided into respondents with urban residential background and rural residential background. This distribution of sample is presented in the following schematic diagram.

Table 1: Showing a schematic diagram of sample distribution.



Mode of Sample Selection

The sample of the present study was selected from different institutions of Rajshahi City. The institutions were different residential Halls in Rajshahi University Campus and Rajshahi College. Each respondent was approached individually. In the first place, male respondents were identified. They were asked about their residential background. A respondent who has come from villages and has completed his/ her educational carrier up to secondary level in rural atmosphere is considered to have rural residential background. Similarly, a respondent who belongs to a town and has completed his/ her educational carrier up to secondary level is considered to have urban residential background. Then the respondents were asked to fill-up Socio-Economic Status Scale (Huq, 1985). On the basis of their answers to this questionnaire, they were categorized as high, middle and low. Similar procedure was adopted in case of female respondents.

For determining the high, middle and low socio-economic status, the total scores of education, occupation, income and possessing of articles were summited for each respondent separately. The maximum possible score was 29 and minimum possible score was 0 (zero). Scores ranging from 0-9

indicated lower status, 10-19 indicated middle status, 20-29 indicated high status. The score card used in the SES scale is given in Appendix. A.

All the respondents belonged to 3rd year honors classes. Their age level ranged from 20-23 years. Male respondents were contacted through the male agents and female respondents were contacted through the female agents. They were properly motivated for participating in the psychological research. When proper rapport was established, the respondents were given the Measure of Aggressive Behavior Questionnaire. The MAB contained 25 statements. The respondents were asked to read the instruction given on the top of the measure. They were also asked to fill-up the blanks given in the front page of the measure. These were about personal information of the respondents. Then the respondent was required to express his / her opinion about each statement by giving a tick (\checkmark) mark on any point given against each statement. It was a five-point scale ranging from strong agreement to strong disagreement.

Characteristic of the Sample

The study used a student sample. The investigator preferred student sample for the following reasons:

- (i) Students represent the educated section of population.
- (ii) They are conscious part of population. They follow some political ideology.
- (iii) They are able to express their experiences, ideas and thoughts more accurately.
- (iv) They can express their ideas freely and without fear.
- (v) Students are marginal groups. They stay between traditionalism and modernity. Hence, they are capable to control their own affairs relating to social, economic and political inequalities.

- (vi) Students in general do not look after their family and as such they are less concerned with mundane affairs.
- (vii) In Bangladesh students are regarded as political force that can bring about necessary changes in social system following a democratic method.
- (viii) Students can protest against corruption in the society.
- (ix) Students can visualize future, can recall the past and are capable to work for the present.

In consideration of above positive aspects of students in our country, the present study utilized students as sample to investigate aggressive behavior in the context of Bangladesh.

Selection of Instrument

The selection of instrument is a difficult job. It requires several considerations. The first consideration is the objective of the study. This is the basic consideration for instrument selection. Because instrument will help to attain the objective of the study. The second consideration in the selection of instrument is the nature of sample. The investigator must bear it in mind that the nature of the sample will provide some directions about the basic element of the instrument. The third consideration is the amount of time at the investigator's disposal. This should get priority in selecting measuring instruments. The fourth consideration is the personal competence of the investigator. The fifth consideration is the involvement of ethical principles. Ethical principles will determine the type of instruments that may be applicable without harming others privacy and rights as to their liking and disliking. Lastly, attainment of accuracy for scoring the data, feasibility of using appropriate statistical technique and the interpretation of results may influence the mode of instrument selection in a psychological study.

In view of these considerations, selection of appropriate measure was done. In order to achieve this goal, various methods of test construction regarding the Measure of Aggressive Behavior were reviewed and used in the procedure of test construction. Among the factors taken into consideration in the selection of the test were (j) adaptability of the test, (ii) efficiency of the test (iii) financial consideration, (iv) suitability of the test, (v) practicability of administering and scoring, (vi) educational level of respondents and (vii) age and linguistic consideration of the respondents.

In perspective of the rationale, the investigator constructed Measure of Aggressive Behavior (MAB) to be used in the present study.

Measure of Aggressive Behavior (MAB)

Traditionally, measurement of aggression and violence in adolescents has been restricted to the examination of four factors such as Physical Aggression, Verbal Aggression, Anger and Hostility. Buss and Perry (1992) constructed a measure of Aggression Questionnaire containing 29 statements. This questionnaire was the revised form of Aggression Questionnaire developed earlier by Buss and Durkee (1957). The revised form of Aggression Questionnaire measures traits of aggressiveness through four distinct sub-traits. It represented by a sub-scale on the Aggression Questionnaire. These sub-traits are Physical Aggression, Verbal Aggression, Anger and Hostility. Buss and Perry (1992) demonstrated a significant relationship between peer nominations of aggressiveness and scores on these four aggressions sub-scale for male college students. They report a coefficient alpha for the AQ at .89 and test-retest reliability at .80.

Elliot, Huizinga, & Ageton (1985) developed a Delinquency Scale in which 10 items were most clearly related to aggressive behavior. Coefficient alpha for this index was .73. To form a reliable index of aggressive behavior it was necessary to standardize each item. A positive relation between violent video game play and aggressive behavior was found.

Fossati et al. (2003) examined the Italian version of the Aggression Questionnaire by Buss and Perry. Multisampling confirmatory factor analyses were carried out in samples of Italian University and high school students. Item-level multiple-group component analysis confirmed Buss and Perry's 4-factor structure of the Aggression Questionnaire items in both samples. The results of multisampling factor analysis of scale scores supported the hypothesis of single aggression underlying the four Aggression Questionnaire scales, the structure of which was invariant across the two samples.

Buss and Warren (2000) made further revision of Aggression Questionnaire of four factors developed by and parry (1992). The revised form Aggression Questionnaire (Buss and Warren, 2000) contained 34-items divided into five dimensions. These dimensions were used as subscales. These fine subscales were named as Physical Aggression (physical expression of anger), Verbal Aggression (argumentative and hostile language), anger (agitation and sense of control), hostility (resentment, social isolation, and paranoia), and indirect aggression (expression of anger without direct confrontation).

In the perspectives of these analytical approaches of various test construction on Aggression Questionnaire the present form of the Measure of Aggressive Behavior was developed to be used for data collection in the present study. The test utilized five dimension of aggression developed by Buss and Warren (2000). These have been conceptualized as follows. Students represent the educated section of population.

- (i) ***Physical Aggression:*** It has been conceptualized as anger expressed through physical movement of the body. Thus physical aggression consists of using force against the person, objects or situation. Fighting, with persons or destruction of objects or attacking the situation may be regarded as physical aggression.

- (ii) **Verbal Aggression:** It has been conceptualized as aggression expressed through language. It involves emotional outburst in the form of verbal expression. Thus hot talk with the opponent may be considered as verbal aggression. Loud voice mixed with anger at the time of argumentation may be regarded as verbal aggression. Similarly, use of hostile language is an example of verbal aggression.
- (iii) **Hostile Aggression:** It has been conceptualized as resentment in situations with other persons. It involves when a person can not tolerate his opponent. Hostile aggression results in social isolation. A person who is hostile to his environment expressed hostile aggression. A person may express hostile aggression in the absence of proper objects in the situation or environment. Thus a psychotic patient with the symptom of paranoia may express hostile aggression.
- (iv) **Anger Aggression:** It has been conceptualized as a physical symptom in an excited condition. When a person is agitated due to unbalance in the intergroup relationships, it is called anger aggression. In such situations, the person loses his sense of control.
- (v) **Indirect Aggression:** It has been conceptualized as the expression of anger without direct involvement with the person, object or situation. This type of aggression involves unequal relationships. It also refers to the fact that the person does not like to disturb the environment. Thus indirect aggression refers to behavioral expression of anger without direct confrontation with the opponent.

For the construction of the Measure of Aggressive Behavior, appropriate hypothetical situations were constructed on the basis of open-end questionnaire. The open-end questionnaire was administered on 20 males and 20 females. They were students of 1st year honors classes in the different faculties of Rajshahi University. On the basis of open-end questionnaire, 60 items about aggressive behavior were collected. Among these items, 40 items were found common in each subject. These items were

given to three judges to examine whether these items represented aggressive behavior. These judges were chosen from the teachers of psychology department in Rajshahi University. The judges were asked to categorize these 40 items in-to Physical Aggression (PA), Verbal Aggression (VA), Hostile Aggression (HA), Anger Aggression (AA) and Indirect Aggression. On the basis of common responses of the judges, 25 items were selected. According to the ratings of the judges 5 items were identified as Physical Aggression (PA), 9 items as Verbal Aggression (VA), 5 items as Hostile Aggression (HA), 3 items as Anger Aggression (AA) and 3 items as Indirect Aggression (IA).

Hypothetical situations were constructed on each item. Each item was followed by 5 alternatives ranging from totally true to totally false. Totally true was given 5 points, true was given 4 points, neutral was given 3 points, false was given 2 points and totally false was given 1 point. Thus the final form of MAB contained 25 items. The Highest Possible Score (HPS) was $25 \times 5 = 125$ and the Lowest Possible Score (LPS) was $25 \times 1 = 25$. Aggressive Behavior Score (ABS) was worked out using the following formula.

$$ABS = \frac{HPS - LPS}{2} + LPS$$

$$= \frac{125 - 25}{2} + 25 = 75$$

Hence, a score following on 75 or above was regarded as Aggressive Behavior Score. The final form of the measure is given in Appendix-B.

Reliability of Measure of Aggressive Behavior

In order to find out the reliability of Measure of Aggressive Behavior, the method of split- half reliability was adopted. In this method the reliability of the scale can be ascertained by preparing two parallel forms from the same material. For the determination of reliability of the Measure

of Aggressive Behavior, the criterion of split-half was attained with odd and even numbers of those 25 items in the final study. The correlation coefficient for split-half reliability was found .37. When Spearman- Brown formula was used, the correlation coefficient was found to increase from .37 to .54.

Validity of the Measure of Aggressive Behavior

The underlying principle for the validity of a scale must transcend the group, which it measures. The objectivity of a psychological test is closely associated with the validity of the test. Thus the validity of the test refers to the degree which the test actually measures what it wants to measure. The Measure of Aggressive Behavior was confirmed by validation at several stages. Items were constructed through open-end questionnaire. This indicated the content validity of MAB. Secondly, the scrutiny of each item was done by the judges. This procedure provided face validity for the Measure of Aggressive Behavior

Design of the Study

The present study used a 2 X 3 X 2 factorial design consisting of two levels of gender (Male / Female), three levels of socio-economic status (High / Middle / Low) and two levels of residential background (Urban / Rural).

Procedure of Data Collection

The Measure of Aggressive Behavior (MAB) was administered on 240 respondents. The investigator contacted each respondent individually. Before administering the Measure of Aggressive Behavior, proper rapport was established. The booklet of MAB was given to each respondent separately. The respondent was required to read the instruction given on the front page of the booklet. The instruction was given in Bengali in the following way.

“মানুষের আচরণ পরিবেশ নির্ভর। পরিবেশের প্রেক্ষাপটে বিভিন্ন ক্ষেত্রে আমরা আক্রমণাত্মক আচরণ প্রকাশ করি। এরূপ আক্রমণাত্মক আচরণের কতকগুলো কাল্পনিক পরিবেশ নিম্নে দেয়া হলো। প্রতিটি বাক্য মনোযোগ সহকারে পড়ুন এবং এরূপ পরিবেশে আপনার আচরণ কেমন হতে পারে তা প্রতিটি বাক্যের নিচে প্রদত্ত পাঁচটি বিকল্পের যে কোন একটিতে টিক (✓) চিহ্ন দিয়ে প্রকাশ করুন। বাক্যে প্রদত্ত বিষয়টি যদি আপনার নিকট সম্পূর্ণরূপে গ্রহণযোগ্য মনে হয় তবে “সম্পূর্ণ সত্য” এর উপর টিক (✓) চিহ্ন দিন। বিষয়টি যদি আপনার নিকট শর্ত সাপেক্ষে গ্রহণযোগ্য মনে হয় তবে “সত্য” এর উপর টিক (✓) চিহ্ন দিন। বিষয়টি সম্পর্কে যদি আপনার সুনির্দিষ্ট কোন মতামত না থাকে তবে “নিরপেক্ষ” এর উপর টিক (✓) চিহ্ন দিন। বিষয়টি যদি আপনার নিকট শর্ত সাপেক্ষে গ্রহণযোগ্য মনে না হয় তবে “মিথ্যা” এর উপর টিক (✓) চিহ্ন দিন। বিষয়টি যদি আপনার নিকট কোন অবস্থাতেই গ্রহণযোগ্য মনে না হয় তবে “সম্পূর্ণ মিথ্যা” এর উপর টিক (✓) চিহ্ন দিন। মনে রাখবেন এখানে সময়ের কোন বাধ্যবাধকতা নেই। তবে যথাসম্ভব কম সময়ে উত্তর দিতে চেষ্টা করুন।”

In first phase, 20 male respondents with high socio-economic status from urban residential background were selected for data collection. In the second phase, 20 male respondents with middle socioeconomic status from urban residential background were selected for data collection. In the third phase, 20 male respondents with low socio-economic status from urban residential background were selected for data collection. Following this procedure, 20 male respondents with high socio-economic status from rural residential background, 20 male respondents with middle socio-economic status from rural residential background and 20 male respondents with low socio-economic status from rural residential background were selected for data collection. Similar procedure was maintained for female respondents for data collection. As soon as the data collection was completed, coding was done properly for statistical analysis of the data.

CHAPTER-III

RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION

CHAPTER-III

RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION

The Measure of Aggressive Behavior contains five dimensions such as Physical Aggression (PA), Verbal Aggression (VA), Hostile Aggression (HA), Anger Aggression (AA) and Indirect Aggression (IA). The results were computed on each dimension separately using t-test. The total scores of aggression were the sum of the scores of five dimensions. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was computed on the total scores of the Measure of Aggressive Behavior. Thus the analysis of the results in this study was computed in two parts. In part-I, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was computed on the total scores of the Measure of Aggressive Behavior. In part-II, t-test was computed within-group and between-group comparisons on the scores of five dimensions of the Measure of Aggressive Behavior such as Physical Aggression (PA), Verbal Aggression (VA), Hostile Aggression (HA), Anger Aggression (AA) and Indirect Aggression (IA).

PART-I

In this section, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was computed on total scores of the Measure of Aggressive Behavior. Three independent variables such as (i) Gender, (ii) Socio-Economic Status (SES) and (iii) Residential Background were used. Thus, a three-way Analysis of Variance involving two levels of gender (Male / Female), three levels of SES (High / Middle / Low) and two levels of residential background (Urban / Rural) were subjected to statistical computation of ANOVA. The summary of ANOVA has been reported in Table-2.

Table 2: Showing summary of ANOVA involving Gender, Socio-Economic status and Residential Background on the total scores of the Measure of Aggressive Behavior.

SOURCES OF VARIANCE	SS	df	MS	F
GENDER (A)	429.3	1	429.30	5.14 *
RESIDENTIAL BACKGROUND (B)	51.3	1	51.30	0.61
SES (C)	550.6	2	275.30	3.30 *
AB	1495.1	1	1495.10	17.92 **
AC	96.9	2	48.45	0.58
BC	8.4	2	4.20	0.05
ABC	1184.9	2	592.45	7.10 **
WITHIN CELL (EXPERIMENTAL ERROR)	19012.3	228	83.387	
Total	22828.8	239		

Note: P* < 0.05; p** < 0.01

The results on total score of the Measure of Aggressive Behavior (Table-2) have showed that the main effect for gender and socio-economic status was statistically significant. A two-way interaction between gender and residential background was also statistically significant. Furthermore, a three-way interaction involving gender, residential background and socio-economic status was statistically significant.

Main Effect

Gender

The results of AVOVA (Table-2) have reported significant main effect for gender ($F=5.14$, $df=1/228$, $p<0.05$).

Table-3: Showing overall mean scores and significant mean differences between males and females on the total scores of the Measure of Aggressive Behavior.

MALE	74.35a
FEMALE	77.03b

Note: Mean difference was computed using Newman-Keuls formula.

According to the criterion of Aggressive Behavior Score, a score following on 75 or above is regarded as an act of aggression. An inspection of mean scores (Table-3) shows that male respondents have failed to achieve Aggressive Behavior Score. Thus, regardless of socio-economic status and residential background, female respondents ($M=77.03$) showed significantly higher intensity of aggression as compared to male respondents ($M=74.35$).

Interaction Effects

Gender × Residential Background

The results (Table-2) showed that a two-way interaction involving gender and residential background was statistically significant ($F=17.92$, $df=1/228$, $p<0.01$).

Table-5: Showing overall mean scores and significant mean differences between gender and residential background on the total scores of the Measure of Aggressive Behavior.

	URBAN	RURAL
MALE	71.40a	77.31b
FEMALE	79.06c	75.00d

Note: Mean difference was computed using Newman-Keuls formula.

An inspection of mean scores (Table-5) showed that all the comparison groups reported mean scores above the criterion of the Measure of Aggressive Behavior. It indicated that all the groups expressed aggression in their attitudinal preferences. Thus, the results showed that female respondents with urban residential background ($M=79.06$) expressed significantly more aggression as compared to male respondents with urban residential background ($M=71.40$). But, male respondents with rural residential background ($M=77.31$) expressed significantly more aggression as compared to female respondents with rural residential background ($M=75.00$). Male respondents with rural residential background ($M=77.31$) expressed significantly more aggression than their urban counterparts ($M=71.40$). But female respondents with urban residential background ($M=79.06$) have expressed significantly

more aggression as compared to their rural counterparts (M=75.00). Thus an interaction was effected between gender, and residential background. The interaction effect has been graphically plotted in figure 1.




Figure-1: Showing two-way interaction between gender and residential background on the total scores of the Measure of Aggressive Behavior.

Gender × Socio-Economic Status (SES) × Residential Background

The results (Table-2) showed that a three-way interaction involving gender, Socio-Economic Status and residential background was statistically significant ($F=7.10$, $df=1/228$, $p<0.01$).

Table-6: Showing overall mean scores and significant mean differences between gender, socio-economic status and residential background on the total scores of the Measure of Aggressive Behavior.

		HIGH	MIDDLE	LOW
MALE	URBAN	73.10a	73.15a	67.95b
	RURAL	81.20c	72.60a	78.15d
FEMALE	URBAN	81.85c	76.25e	79.10d
	RURAL	75.00e	78.20d	71.80a

Note: Mean difference was computed using Newman-Keuls formula.

An inspection of mean scores (Table-6) showed that male respondents with urban residential background and high socio-economic status (M=73.10) expressed significantly more aggression as compared to their counterpart respondents with low socio-economic status (M=67.95). Similarly, male respondents with urban residential background and middle socio-economic status (M=73.15) expressed significantly more aggression as compared to their counterpart respondents with low socio-economic status (M=67.95). However, no statistically significant mean difference in aggression was found between male respondents with urban residential background and high socio-economic status (M=73.10) and their counterpart respondents with middle socio-economic status (M=73.15).

Male respondents with rural residential background and high socio-economic status (M=81.20) expressed significantly more aggression as compared to their counterpart respondents with middle socio-economic status (M=72.60) and low socio-economic status (M=78.15). But male respondents with rural residential background and low socio-economic status (M=78.15) expressed significantly more aggression as compared to their counterpart respondents with middle socio-economic

status (M=72.60). Thus the results revealed that highest aggression was expressed by male respondents with rural residential background and high socio-economic status (M=81.20) followed by the counterpart respondents with low socio-economic status (M=78.15) and least by the rural respondents with middle socio-economic status (M=72.60).

In case of females, it was found that urban respondents with high socio-economic status (M=81.85) expressed significantly more aggression as compared to urban respondents with middle socio-economic status (M=76.25). Again, urban respondents with high socio-economic status (M=81.85) expressed significantly more aggression as compared to urban respondents with low socio-economic status (M=79.10). But it was found that urban respondents with low socio-economic status (M=79.10) expressed significantly more aggression as compared to urban respondents with middle socio-economic status (M=76.25). Thus, highest aggression was reported by urban female respondents with high socio-economic status (M=81.85) followed by urban female respondents with low socio-economic status (M=79.10) and least by the urban female respondents with middle socio-economic status (M=76.25).

In case of females, it was also found that rural respondents with middle socio-economic status (M=78.20) expressed significantly more aggression as compared to rural respondents with high socio-economic status (M=75.00) as well as rural respondents with low socio-economic status (M=71.80). Again, rural respondents with middle socio-economic status (M=78.20) expressed significantly more aggression as compared to rural respondents with low socio-economic status (M=71.80). Thus rural female respondents with middle socio-economic status (M=78.20) expressed highest aggression followed by rural female respondents with high socio-economic status (M=75.00)

and least by the rural female respondents with low socio-economic status (M=71.80). A three-way interaction effect has been graphically plotted in figure 2.




Figure-2: Showing three-way interaction between gender, socio-economic status and residential background on the total scores of the Measure of Aggressive Behavior.

PART-II

Within-Group Comparisons

Scores on Physical Aggression (PA), Verbal Aggression (VA), Hostile Aggression (HA), Anger Aggression (AA) and Indirect Aggression (IA) were subjected to the analysis of t-test. These are given below.

Physical Aggression

Table-7: Showing mean differences of male respondents between different comparison groups of socio-economic status and residential background on the scores of Physical Aggression (N=20 for each group).

	Mean	SD	MHU	MHR	MMU	MMR	MLU	MLR
MHU	14.55	3.33		2.47*	0.56	0.13	1.23	2.39*
MHR	16.90	2.55			3.37**	2.55*	1.25	0.12
MMU	14.00	2.78				0.39	1.95	3.33**
MMR	14.40	3.46					1.35	2.50*
MLU	15.80	2.94						1.14
MLR	16.80	2.46						

Note: P* < 0.05; p** < 0.01

Mean comparisons within group were computed using t-test. The results (Table-7) showed that male respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background (M=16.90) expressed significantly more physical aggression ($t=2.47$, $df=38$, $p<0.05$) as compared to male respondents of high socio-economic status with urban residential background (M=14.55). Similarly, male respondents of low socio-economic status with rural residential background (M=16.80) expressed significantly

more physical aggression ($t=2.39$, $df=38$, $p<0.05$) as compared to male respondents of high socio-economic status with urban residential background ($M=14.55$).

Table-8: Showing mean differences of female respondents between different comparison groups of socio-economic status and residential background on the scores of Physical Aggression (N=20 for each group).

	Mean	SD	FHU	FHR	FMU	FMR	FLU	FLR
FHU	15.40	3.01		0.10	0.45	1.46	2.52*	0.17
FHR	15.30	3.07			0.85	1.55	2.52*	0.28
FMU	15.90	3.82				0.84	1.79	0.34
FMR	16.85	3.11					1.06	1.62
FLU	17.95	3.28						2.82**
FLR	15.55	2.36						

Note: $P^*<0.05$; $p^{**}<0.01$

Results (Table-8) showed that female respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background ($M=17.95$) expressed significantly more physical aggression ($t=2.52$, $df=38$, $p<0.05$) as compared to female respondents of high socio-economic status with urban residential background ($M=15.40$). Similarly, female respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background ($M=17.95$) expressed significantly more physical aggression ($t=2.52$, $df=38$, $p<0.05$) as compared to female respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background ($M=15.30$). Again, female respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background ($M=17.95$) expressed significantly more physical aggression ($t=2.82$, $df=38$, $p<0.01$) as compared to female

respondents of low socio-economic status with rural residential background (M=15.55).

Verbal Aggression

Table-9: Showing mean differences of male respondents between different comparison groups of socio-economic status and residential background on the scores of Verbal Aggression (N=20 for each group).

	Mean	SD	MHU	MHR	MMU	MMR	MLU	MLR
MHU	27.85	3.79		2.99*	0.55	0.04	1.19	0.70
MHR	31.10	2.83			2.04*	2.29*	4.27**	1.60
MMU	28.60	4.54				0.40	1.64	0.18
MMR	27.95	5.32					1.05	0.55
MLU	26.35	3.97						1.68
MLR	28.90	5.31						

Note: P* < 0.05; p** < 0.01

Results (Table-9) showed that male respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background (M=31.10) expressed significantly more verbal aggression (t=2.99, df=38, p<0.01) as compared to male respondents of high socio-economic status with urban residential background (M=27.85). Similarly, male respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background (M=31.10) expressed significantly more verbal aggression (t=2.04, df=38, p<0.05) as compared to male respondents of middle socio-economic status with urban residential background (M=28.60). Again, male respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background (M=31.10) expressed significantly more verbal aggression (t=2.29, df=38, p<0.05) as compared to male respondents of middle socio-economic status with rural residential

background (M=27.95). Also, male respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background (M=31.10) expressed significantly more verbal aggression ($t=4.27$, $df=38$, $p<0.01$) as compared to male respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background (M=26.35).

Table-10: Showing mean differences of female respondents between different comparison groups of socio-economic status and residential background on the scores of Verbal Aggression (N=20 for each group).

	Mean	SD	FHU	FHR	FMU	FMR	FLU	FLR
FHU	30.05	3.43		1.63	1.59	1.33	1.25	3.22*
FHR	28.55	2.14			0.42	0.20	3.43**	2.17*
FMU	28.10	4.09				0.19	2.83**	1.19
FMR	28.35	3.75					2.78**	1.50
FLU	31.30	2.97						4.89**
FLR	26.70	3.08						

Note: $P^*<0.05$; $p^{**}<0.01$

Results (Table-10) showed that female respondents of high socio-economic status with urban residential background (M=30.05) expressed significantly more verbal aggression ($t=3.22$, $df=38$, $p<0.01$) as compared to female respondents of low socio-economic status with rural residential background (M=26.70). It was also found that female respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background (M=31.30) expressed significantly more verbal aggression ($t=3.43$, $df=38$, $p<0.01$) as compared to female respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background (M=28.55). But, female respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background (M=28.55) expressed significantly more verbal aggression ($t=2.17$, $df=38$, $p<0.05$) as compared to

female respondents of low socio-economic status with rural residential background (M=26.70). Again, female respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background (M=31.30) expressed significantly more verbal aggression ($t=2.83$, $df=38$, $p<0.01$) as compared to female respondents of middle socio-economic status with urban residential background (M=28.10). Furthermore, female respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background (M=31.30) expressed significantly more verbal aggression ($t=2.78$, $df=38$, $p<0.01$) as compared to female respondents of middle socio-economic status with rural residential background (M=28.35). Similarly, female respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background (M=31.30) expressed significantly more verbal aggression ($t=4.89$, $df=38$, $p<0.01$) as compared to female respondents of low socio-economic status with rural residential background (M=26.70).

Hostile Aggression

Table-11: Showing mean differences of male respondents between different comparison groups of socio-economic status and residential background on the scores of Hostile Aggression (N=20 for each group).

	Mean	SD	MHU	MHR	MMU	MMR	MLU	MLR
MHU	11.85	2.90		0.11	0.15	0.13	2.53*	1.31
MHR	11.75	2.57			0.05	0.23	2.63*	1.45
MMU	11.70	3.33				0.25	2.13*	1.37
MMR	12.00	3.89					2.20*	1.05
MLU	9.80	2.06						3.41**
MLR	13.35	4.07						

Note: P* <0.05 ; p** <0.01

The results (Table-11) showed that male respondents of middle socio-economic status with rural residential background (M=12.00) expressed

significantly more hostile aggression ($t=2.53$, $df=38$, $p<0.05$) as compared to male respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background ($M=11.85$), male respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background ($M=11.75$, $t=2.63$, $df=38$, $p<0.05$), male respondents of middle socio-economic status with urban residential background ($M=11.70$, $t=2.13$, $df=38$, $p<0.05$) and male respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background ($M=9.80$, $t=2.20$, $df=38$, $p<0.05$). It was also found that male respondents of low socio-economic status with rural residential background ($M=13.35$) expressed significantly more hostile aggression ($t=3.41$, $df=38$, $p<0.01$) as compared to male respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background ($M=9.80$).

Table-12: Showing mean differences of female respondents between different comparison groups of socio-economic status and residential background on the scores of Hostile Aggression (N=20 for each group).

	Mean	SD	FHU	FHR	FMU	FMR	FLU	FLR
FHU	14.15	4.11		1.33	1.13	1.19	0.33	2.63*
FHR	12.35	4.28			0.42	0.38	1.77	0.93
FMU	12.85	2.97				0.05	1.66	1.78
FMR	12.80	2.80					1.75	1.78
FLU	14.55	3.38						3.45**
FLR	11.30	2.39						

Note: $P^*<0.05$; $p^{**}<0.01$

Results (Table-12) showed that female respondents of high socio-economic status with urban residential background ($M=14.15$) expressed

significantly more hostile aggression ($t=2.63$, $df=38$, $p<0.05$) as compared to female respondents of low socio-economic status with rural residential background ($M=13.30$). Similarly, female respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background ($M=14.55$) expressed significantly more hostile aggression ($t=3.45$, $df=38$, $p<0.01$) as compared to female respondents of low socio-economic status with rural residential background ($M=11.30$).

Anger Aggression

Table-13: Showing mean differences of male respondents between different comparison groups of socio-economic status and residential background on the scores of Anger Aggression (N=20 for each group).

	Mean	SD	MHU	MHR	MMU	MMR	MLU	MLR
MHU	8.10	2.23		2.64*	0.72	1.49	1.04	1.00
MHR	9.95	2.13			1.75	1.26	3.92**	1.17
MMU	8.65	2.48				0.61	1.73	0.20
MMR	9.10	2.09					2.65*	0.44
MLU	7.40	1.96						2.15*
MLR	8.80	2.11						

Note: $P^*<0.05$; $p^{**}<0.01$

Results (Table-13) showed that male respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background ($M=9.95$) expressed significantly more anger aggression ($t=2.64$, $df=38$, $p<0.05$) as compared to male respondents of high socio-economic status with urban residential background ($M=8.10$). Similarly, male respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background ($M=9.95$) expressed significantly

more anger aggression ($t=3.92$, $df=38$, $p<0.01$) as compared to male respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background ($M=7.40$). Furthermore, male respondents of middle socio-economic status with rural residential background ($M=9.10$) expressed significantly more anger aggression ($t=2.65$, $df=38$, $p<0.05$) as compared to male respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background ($M=7.40$). It was also found that male respondents of low socio-economic status with rural residential background ($M=8.80$) expressed significantly more anger aggression ($t=2.15$, $df=38$, $p<0.05$) as compared to male respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background ($M=7.40$).

Table-14: Showing mean differences of female respondents between different comparison groups of socio-economic status and residential background on the scores of Anger Aggression (N=20 for each group).

	Mean	SD	FHU	FHR	FMU	FMR	FLU	FLR
FHU	11.30	2.00		3.00**	2.30*	2.00	2.30*	4.19**
FHR	9.20	2.36			0.36	1.36	0.84	0.73
FMU	9.50	2.82				0.81	0.37	1.05
FMR	10.10	1.73					0.50	2.45*
FLU	9.80	2.06						1.74
FLR	8.70	1.85						

Note: $P^*<0.05$; $p^{**}<0.01$

Results (Table-14) showed that female respondents of high socio-economic status with urban residential background ($M=11.30$) expressed significantly more anger aggression ($t=3.00$, $df=38$, $p<0.01$) as compared to female respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background ($M=9.20$), female respondents of middle socio-economic status

with urban residential background (M=9.50; t=2.30, df=38, p<0.05), female respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background (M=9.80; t=2.30, df=38, p<0.05) and female respondents of low socio-economic status with rural residential background (M=8.70, t=4.19, df=38, p<0.01). It was also found that female respondents of middle socio-economic status with rural residential background (M=10.10) expressed significantly more anger aggression (t=2.45, df=38, p<0.05) as compared to female respondents of low socio-economic status with rural residential background (M=8.70).

Indirect Aggression

Table-15: Showing mean differences of male respondents between different comparison groups of socio-economic status and residential background on the scores of Indirect Aggression (N=20 for each group).

	Mean	SD	MHU	MHR	MMU	MMR	MLU	MLR
MHU	10.80	2.92		0.87	1.00	1.91	2.82**	0.22
MHR	11.50	1.99			2.34*	3.35**	4.83**	1.21
MMU	10.00	2.00				1.19	2.29*	0.81
MMR	9.15	2.41					0.80	1.81
MLU	8.60	1.83						2.77**
MLR	10.60	2.58						

Note: P* < 0.05; p** < 0.01

Results (Table-15) showed that male respondents of high socio-economic status with urban residential background (M=10.80) expressed significantly more indirect aggression (t=2.82, df=38, p<0.01) as compared to male respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential

background (M=8.60). It was also found that male respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background (M=11.50) expressed significantly more indirect aggression ($t=2.34$, $df=38$, $p<0.05$) as compared to male respondents of middle socio-economic status with urban residential background (M=10.00), male respondents of middle socio-economic status with rural residential background (M=9.15; $t=3.35$, $df=38$, $p<0.01$) and male respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background (M=8.60; $t=4.83$, $df=38$, $p<0.01$). Again, male respondents of middle socio-economic status with urban residential background (M=10.00) expressed significantly more indirect aggression ($t=2.29$, $df=38$, $p<0.05$) as compared to male respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background (M=8.60). Similarly, male respondents of low socio-economic status with rural residential background (M=10.60) expressed significantly more indirect aggression ($t=2.77$, $df=38$, $p<0.01$) as compared to male respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background (M=8.60).

Table-16: Showing mean differences of female respondents between different comparison groups of socio-economic status and residential background on the scores of Indirect Aggression (N=20 for each group).

	Mean	SD	FHU	FHR	FMU	FMR	FLU	FLR
FHU	10.95	2.01		2.08*	1.63	1.30	0.33	2.41*
FHR	9.45	2.49			0.82	0.89	1.94	0.07
FMU	10.00	1.58				0.16	1.47	0.96
FMR	10.10	2.07					1.08	1.00
FLU	10.75	1.64						2.35*
FLR	9.50	1.72						

Note: $P^*<0.05$; $p^{**}<0.01$

Results (Table-16) showed that female respondents of high socio-economic status with urban residential background (M=10.95) expressed significantly more indirect aggression ($t=2.08$, $df=38$, $p<0.05$) as compared to female respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background (M=9.45). Similarly, female respondents of high socio-economic status with urban residential background (M=10.95) expressed significantly more indirect aggression ($t=2.41$, $df=38$, $p<0.05$) as compared to female respondents of low socio-economic status with rural residential background (M=9.50). Again, female respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background (M= 10.75) expressed significantly more indirect aggression ($t=2.35$, $df=38$, $p<0.05$) as compared to female respondents of low socio-economic status with rural residential background (M=9.50).

Between-Group Comparisons

Physical Aggression

Table-17: Showing mean differences between MHU Vs FHU, MHR Vs FHR, MMU Vs FMU, MMR Vs FMR, MLU Vs FLU and MLR Vs FLR on the scores of Physical Aggression (N=20 for each group).

	Mean	SD		Mean	SD	t-value	Level of significance
MHU	14.55	3.33	FHU	15.40	3.01	0.83	ns
MHR	16.90	2.55	FHR	15.30	3.07	1.75	ns
MMU	14.00	2.78	FMU	15.90	3.82	1.57	ns
MMR	14.40	3.46	FMR	16.85	3.11	2.31*	0.05
MLU	15.80	2.94	FLU	17.95	3.28	2.15*	0.05
MLR	16.80	2.46	FLR	15.55	2.36	1.62	ns

Note: P* <0.05 ; p** <0.01

The results (Table-17) have reported between-group comparisons using t-test. It has been found that female respondents of middle socio-economic status with rural residential background (M=16.85) expressed significantly more physical aggression ($t=2.31$, $df=38$, $p<0.05$) as compared to male respondents of middle socio-economic status with rural residential background (M=14.40). Similarly, female respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background (M=17.95) expressed significantly more physical aggression ($t=2.15$, $df=38$, $p<0.05$) as compared to male respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background (M=15.80).

Verbal Aggression

Table-18: Showing mean differences between MHU Vs FHU, MHR Vs FHR, MMU Vs FMU, MMR Vs FMR, MLU Vs FLU and MLR Vs FLR on the scores of Verbal Aggression (N=20 for each group).

	Mean	SD		Mean	SD	t-value	Level of significance
MHU	27.85	3.79	FHU	30.05	3.43	1.89	ns
MHR	31.10	2.83	FHR	28.55	2.14	3.14**	0.01
MMU	28.60	4.54	FMU	28.10	4.09	0.35	ns
MMR	27.95	5.32	FMR	28.35	3.75	0.27	ns
MLU	26.35	3.97	FLU	31.30	2.97	4.38**	0.01
MLR	28.90	5.31	FLR	26.70	3.08	1.57	ns

Note: $P^*<0.05$; $p^{**}<0.01$

The results (Table-18) showed that male respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background (M=31.10) expressed significantly more verbal aggression ($t=3.14$, $df=38$, $p<0.01$) as compared to

female respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background (M=28.55). Again, female respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background (M=31.30) expressed significantly more verbal aggression (t=4.38, df=38, p<0.01) as compared to male respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background (M=26.35).

Hostile Aggression

Table-19: Showing mean differences between MHU Vs FHU, MHR Vs FHR, MMU Vs FMU, MMR Vs FMR, MLU Vs FLU and MLR Vs FLR on the scores of Hostile Aggression (N=20 for each group).

	Mean	SD		Mean	SD	t-value	Level of significance
MHU	11.85	2.90	FHU	14.15	4.11	2.01*	0.05
MHR	11.75	2.57	FHR	12.35	4.28	0.52	ns
MMU	11.70	3.33	FMU	12.85	2.97	1.13	ns
MMR	12.00	3.89	FMR	12.80	2.80	0.73	ns
MLU	9.80	2.06	FLU	14.55	3.38	5.27**	0.01
MLR	13.35	4.07	FLR	11.30	2.39	1.89	ns

Note: P* < 0.05; p** < 0.01

Results (Table-19) showed that female respondents of high socio-economic status with urban residential background (M=14.15) expressed significantly more hostile aggression (t=2.01, df=38, p<0.05) as compared to male respondents of high socio-economic status with urban residential background (M=11.85). Similarly, female respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background (M=14.55) expressed significantly more hostile aggression (t=5.27, df=38, p<0.01) as compared to

male respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background (M=9.80).

Anger Aggression

Table-20: Showing mean differences between MHU Vs FHU, MHR Vs FHR, MMU Vs FMU, MMR Vs FMR, MLU Vs FLU and MLR Vs FLR on the scores of Anger Aggression (N=20 for each group).

	Mean	SD		Mean	SD	t-value	Level of significance
MHU	8.10	2.23	FHU	11.30	2.00	4.70**	0.01
MHR	9.95	2.13	FHR	9.20	2.36	1.04	ns
MMU	8.65	2.48	FMU	9.50	2.82	1.00	ns
MMR	9.10	2.09	FMR	10.10	1.73	1.66	ns
MLU	7.40	1.96	FLU	9.80	2.06	3.75**	0.01
MLR	8.80	2.11	FLR	8.70	1.85	0.15	ns

Note: P* < 0.05; p** < 0.01

Results (Table-20) showed that female respondents of high socio-economic status with urban residential background (M=11.30) expressed significantly more anger aggression (t=4.70, df=38, p<0.01) as compared to male respondents of high socio-economic status with urban residential background (M=8.10). Similarly, female respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background (M=9.80) expressed significantly more anger aggression (t=3.75, df=38, p<0.01) as compared to male respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background (M=7.40).

Indirect Aggression

Table-21: Showing mean differences between MHU Vs FHU, MHR Vs FHR, MMU Vs FMU, MMR Vs FMR, MLU Vs FLU and MLR Vs FLR on the scores of Indirect Aggression (N=20 for each group).

	Mean	SD		Mean	SD	t-value	Level of significance
MHU	10.80	2.92	FHU	10.95	2.01	0.18	ns
MHR	11.50	1.99	FHR	9.45	2.49	2.84**	0.01
MMU	10.00	2.00	FMU	10.00	1.58	0.00	ns
MMR	9.15	2.41	FMR	10.10	2.07	1.31	ns
MLU	8.60	1.83	FLU	10.75	1.64	3.90**	0.01
MLR	10.60	2.58	FLR	9.50	1.72	1.57	ns

Note: P* < 0.05; p** < 0.01

Results (Table-21) showed that male respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background (M=11.50) expressed significantly more indirect aggression (t=2.84, df=38, p<0.01) as compared to female respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background (M=9.45). But, female respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background (M=10.75) expressed significantly more indirect aggression (t=3.90, df=38, p<0.01) as compared to male respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background (M=8.60).

Summary of the Results

1. Regardless of socio-economic status and residential background, female respondents expressed more aggression than the male respondents.
2. Regardless of gender and residential background, respondents with high socio-economic status expressed more aggression than the respondents with middle socio-economic status and low socio-economic status. Also respondents with middle socio-economic status expressed more aggression than the respondents with low socio-economic status.
3. Male respondents with rural residential background expressed more aggression than the male respondents with urban residential background.
4. Female respondents with urban residential background expressed more aggression than the female respondents with rural residential background.
5. In case of urban residential background, female respondents expressed more aggression than the male respondents did.
6. In case of rural residential background, male respondents expressed more aggression than the female respondents.
7. In case of urban residential background, male respondents with high socio-economic status and middle socio-economic status expressed more aggression than the male respondents with low socio-economic status. But, female respondents with high socio-economic status expressed highest aggression followed by female respondents with low socio-economic status and least by female respondents with middle socio-economic status.
8. In case of rural residential background, male respondents with high socio-economic status expressed highest aggression followed by male respondents with low socio-economic status and least by male respondents with middle socio-economic status. But female respondents with middle socio-economic status expressed highest aggression followed by female respondents with high socio-economic status and least by female respondents with low socio-economic status.
9. Male respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background expressed more physical aggression than the male respondents of high socio-economic status with urban residential background.

10. Male respondents of low socio-economic status with rural residential background expressed more physical aggression than the male respondents of high socio-economic status with urban residential background.
11. Male respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background expressed more physical aggression than the male respondents of middle socio-economic status with urban residential background.
12. Male respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background expressed more physical aggression than the male respondents of middle socio-economic status with rural residential background.
13. Male respondents of low socio-economic status with rural residential background expressed more physical aggression than the male respondents of middle socio-economic status with urban residential background.
14. Male respondents of low socio-economic status with rural residential background expressed more physical aggression than the male respondents of middle socio-economic status with rural residential background.
15. Female respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background expressed more physical aggression than the female respondents of high socio-economic status with urban residential background.
16. Female respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background expressed more physical aggression than the female respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background.
17. Female respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background expressed more physical aggression than the female respondents of low socio-economic status with rural residential background.
18. Male respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background expressed more verbal aggression than the male respondents of high socio-economic status with urban residential background, male respondents of middle socio-economic status with urban residential background, male respondents of middle socio-economic status with

rural residential background and male respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background.

19. Female respondents of high socio-economic status with urban residential background expressed more verbal aggression than the female respondents of low socio-economic status with rural residential background.
20. Female respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background expressed more verbal aggression than the female respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background, female respondents of middle socio-economic status with urban residential background and female respondents of middle socio-economic status with rural residential background.
21. Female respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background expressed more verbal aggression than the female respondents of low socio-economic status with rural residential background.
22. Female respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background expressed more verbal aggression than the female respondents of low socio-economic status with rural residential background.
23. Male respondents of high socio-economic status with urban residential background, male respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background, male respondents of middle socio-economic status with urban residential background, male respondents of middle socio-economic status with rural residential background and male respondents of low socio-economic status with rural residential background expressed more hostile aggression than the male respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background.
24. Female respondents of high socio-economic status with urban residential background and female respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background expressed more hostile aggression than the female respondents of low socio-economic status with rural residential background.
25. Male respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background expressed more anger aggression than the male respondents of high socio-economic status with urban residential background.

26. Male respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background, male respondents of middle socio-economic status with rural residential background and male respondents of low socio-economic status with rural residential background expressed more anger aggression than the male respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background.
27. Female respondents of high socio-economic status with urban residential background expressed more anger aggression than the female respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background, female respondents of middle socio-economic status with urban residential background, female respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background and female respondents of low socio-economic status with rural residential background.
28. Female respondents of middle socio-economic status with rural residential background expressed more anger aggression than the female respondents of low socio-economic status with rural residential background.
29. Male respondents of high socio-economic status with urban residential background, male respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background, male respondents of middle socio-economic status with urban residential background and male respondents of low socio-economic status with rural residential background expressed more indirect aggression than the male respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background.
30. Male respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background expressed more indirect aggression than the male respondents of middle socio-economic status with urban residential background and male respondents of middle socio-economic status with rural residential background.
31. Female respondents of high socio-economic status with urban residential background expressed more indirect aggression than the female respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background and female respondents of low socio-economic status with rural residential background.
32. Female respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background expressed more indirect aggression than the female respondents of low socio-economic status with rural residential background.

33. In case of middle socio-economic status with rural residential background, female respondents expressed more physical aggression than the male respondents.
34. In case of low socio-economic status with urban residential background, female respondents expressed more physical aggression than the male respondents.
35. In case of high socio-economic status with rural residential background, male respondents expressed more verbal aggression than the female respondents.
36. In case of low socio-economic status with urban residential background, female respondents expressed more verbal aggression than the male respondents.
37. In case of high socio-economic status with urban residential background, female respondents expressed more hostile aggression than the male respondents.
38. In case of low socio-economic status with urban residential background, female respondents expressed more hostile aggression than the male respondents.
39. In case of high socio-economic status with urban residential background, female respondents expressed more anger aggression than the male respondents.
40. In case of low socio-economic status with urban residential background, female respondents expressed more anger aggression than the male respondents.
41. In case of high socio-economic status with rural residential background, male respondents expressed more indirect aggression than the female respondents.
42. In case of low socio-economic status with urban residential background, female respondents expressed more indirect aggression than the male respondents.

CHAPTER-IV

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

CHAPTER- IV

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The present study was conducted to explore aggressive behavior in males and females related to some psychosocial factors in the context of Bangladesh. Aggression as biological, social and environmental phenomenon has arrested the attention of social psychologists and as such the present investigation reflects on some important aspects of aggression in relation to gender, socio-economic status and residential background. The computation of data has provided some important findings on gender, socio-economic status and residential background responsible for induction of aggression. These results have been discussed and necessary interpretations have been provided below.

The 1st hypothesis of the present study was that female respondents would express more aggression as compared to male respondents. The result of the present study has provided confirmation to this hypothesis. The analysis of result has reported that regardless of socio-economic status and residential background, female respondents expressed significantly more aggression as compared to male respondents. This finding might be explained in the social and environmental context of Bangladesh. It is argued that Bangladesh is a developing country. In recent years, women are actively taking part in improving and building their carrier through education in the same way as the men are doing. Hence, a self-respect and self-reliance is developing in women. In this competition with their counterpart, the women are found to face many problems. It is, therefore, plausible that the women express protest behavior against unequal treatment and injustice through aggression.

This finding about greater aggression in women than men has been supported by some research findings conducted in recent years. Thus,

Lanctot et al. (2003) conducted the Gender and Aggression Project (GAP) in Canadian Institutes for Health Research (CIHR) and reported that gender difference in aggression have several forms. It was concluded that females tend to engage more in relational aggression, but males tend to engage more in physical aggression (Cote, 2002; and Crick, 1995). These findings partially supported the findings of the present study relating to gender differences in aggression.

The 2nd hypothesis formulated in this study was that respondents with rural residential background would express more aggression as compared to respondents with urban residential background. In general, this hypothesis has not been supported by the findings of the present study. But there are some specific findings relating to residential background that may be cited in favor of partial support of this hypothesis.

For example, a two-way interaction involving gender and residential background has shown that male respondents with rural residential background expressed more aggression as compared to male respondents with urban residential background. Similarly, male respondents of high socio-economic status as well as low socio-economic status with rural residential background expressed more aggression as compared to male respondents of high socio-economic status as well as low socio-economic status with urban residential background. It was also found that female respondents of middle socio-economic status with rural residential background expressed significantly more aggression as compared to female respondents of middle socio-economic status with urban residential background. These findings may be considered to provide partial support to the hypothesis relating to residential background.

The 3rd hypothesis formulated for this study was that respondents with high socio-economic status would express more aggression followed by respondents with middle socio-economic status and least by the respondents with low socio-economic status. The findings of the present study have provided full support to the hypothesis. It was found that regardless of

gender and residential background, respondents with high socio-economic status expressed more aggression than the respondents with middle socio-economic status and low socio-economic status. Also respondents with middle socio-economic status expressed more aggression than the respondents with low socio-economic status.

One probable explanation of this finding might be related with the domain-specific theory of self-esteem (Rosenberg, 1965; Rubin and Hewstone, 1998; Baumeister, 1998; Kirkpatrick et al., 2002). This theory states that functionally distinct domains of self-esteem would predict aggression differentially. It is, perhaps, important to note that socio-economic status may be regarded as functionally distinct domains of self-esteem. The persons with high socio-economic status perceive superiority. The persons with low socio-economic status, on other hand, perceive social exclusion. Thus, social superiority and social exclusion emerged as reliable and positive predictor of hostile aggression (Baumeister and Boden, 1998; Bushman and Baumeister, 1998).

The findings of the present study may be approached from the viewpoint of these theoretical perspectives. The respondents with high socio-economic status might perceive superiority as the predictor of self-esteem. The respondents with low socio-economic status might perceive inferiority and social exclusion. Hence, it might be argued that feelings of superiority would increase aggression and the feelings of social exclusion and inferiority would decrease aggression.

This finding about socio-economic status may be explained in terms of social power (Secord and Backman, 1959). The respondents with high socio-economic status possess more social power in terms of dominance and wealth leading to more aggressive behavior. The respondents with low socio-economic status possess more social power in terms of dominance, prestige and wealth leading to relatively lower frequency in aggressive behavior.

In the context of Bangladesh, persons with high socio-economic status have more wealth, more self-esteem, more prestige and they can dominate the people belonging to middle and low socio-economic status. It is, perhaps, these reasons that are responsible for differential aggression in people with high, middle and low socio-economic status in the context of Bangladesh.

Within-group comparisons have provided an array of diversified findings on Physical Aggression (PA), Verbal Aggression (VA), Hostile Aggression (HA), Anger Aggression (AA) and Indirect Aggression (IA).

In case of physical aggression for males, it was found that respondents of high socio-economic status and low socio-economic status with rural residential background expressed highest aggression as compared to other comparison groups. But in case of female, it was found that respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background expressed highest physical aggression in comparison to respondents of high socio-economic status with urban and rural as well as the respondents of low socio-economic status with rural residential background. These findings show in an important way the saliency of residential background in physical aggression.

In case of verbal aggression for males, it was found that respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background expressed highest aggression in comparison to other relevant groups. But in case of female, it was found that respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background expressed highest verbal aggression followed by respondents of high socio-economic status with urban residential background. It is thus obvious that residential background is an important variable for effecting verbal aggression in highest intensity.

In case of hostile aggression for males, it was found that respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background expressed least aggression in comparison to other relevant groups. Thus, respondents of low socio-economic status with rural residential background expressed

highest hostile aggression. Similarly, for females, it was found that respondents of high socio-economic status with urban residential background expressed highest hostile aggression. It is, therefore, obvious that urban residential background has emerged as an important psycho-social factor to account for hostile aggression.

In case of anger aggression for males, it was found that respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background expressed highest aggression followed by respondents of middle socio-economic status with rural residential background and least by the respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background. But in case of females, it was found that respondents of high socio-economic status with urban residential background expressed highest anger aggression followed by the respondents of middle socio-economic status with rural residential background and least by the respondents of low socio-economic status with rural residential background. In consideration of these diverse findings, it may be concluded that socio-economic status and residential background have joint effect to account for anger aggression.

In case of indirect aggression for males, it was found that respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background expressed highest aggression and least by the respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background expressed least aggression. For females, however, it was found that respondents of high socio-economic status with urban residential background expressed highest indirect aggression and the respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background expressed least indirect aggression. Thus, males and females are found to express differential amount of indirect aggression conditioned by socio-economic status and residential background.

Between-group comparisons on physical aggression have shown that female respondents of middle socio-economic status with rural residential background expressed more aggression than their counterpart male respondents. Similarly, female respondents of low socio-economic status

were found to express more aggression than their counterpart male respondents. These findings are indicative of the fact that women express physical aggression in higher intensity than men.

Between-group comparisons on verbal aggression have shown that male respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background were more aggressive than their counterpart female respondents. But female respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background expressed more verbal aggression than their counterpart male respondents. A probe into these findings appears to indicate that socio-economic status and residential background may account for verbal aggression for men and women. Thus social stratification and residence have emerged as important factor in the study of verbal aggression.

Findings on hostile aggression have provided partial support to the prediction that women are more aggression than men. It was found that female respondents of high socio-economic status with urban residential background were more aggressive than their counterpart male respondents. Similarly, female respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background were found to express more hostile aggression than their counterpart male respondents. These findings about hostile aggression show that urban residential background as well as high and low socio-economic status play an important role for inducing differentiation in hostile aggression for men and women.

Findings on anger aggression have also provided partial support to the hypothesis that women would express more aggression than men. It was found that female respondents of high socio-economic status with urban residential background were more aggressive than their counterpart male respondents. Similarly, female respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background were found to express more anger aggression than their counterpart male respondents. Thus the respondents of high and low socio-economic status from urban residential background exhibited differentiation in anger aggression for women than men.

In case of indirect aggression however, male respondents of high socio-economic status with rural residential background exhibited more aggression than their counterpart female respondents. But, female respondents of low socio-economic status with urban residential background were found to express more indirect aggression than their counterpart male respondents. These findings demonstrate that the relationships between gender, socio-economic status and residential background are complex in the study of indirect aggression. In fact, these psychosocial variables has emerged as important factors positively related with the predictive of aggression. In other words the dynamic, functional, and domain-specific nature of psychosocial variables have highlighted the differential nature of aggression (Baumeister and Boden, 1998).

Limitation and Implications

The present study on psycho-social factors in aggressive behavior in males and females has several limitations. The first limitation of the study concerns of the generalizability of the findings. The study relates to student sample, which fails to represent the whole population of the country. Hence there is probability of committing errors for future nature of aggression and as such prediction would be futile. The second limitation of the study concerns about the design, which reflects the specific domains of aggression. The design of the study deals with the psycho-social factors, which have been culled from the available literature and represent comparatively broad categories of domains. The design has been framed specifically to capture the functional dimensions of aggression. Hence the design can not reveal the structural differences of aggression. It has focused on aggression at one point in time and can not outline one general index of aggression. The third limitation of the study is that males and females are treated as two homogeneous subgroups and as such the variability within gender is overlooked. In spite of these limitations, the study has important practical implications in the present social context of Bangladesh. The new generation in Bangladesh is facing troubles in their mental growth as well as social and

emotional development. They are exposed to modern technology of mass media where aggression is a common phenomenon. Again poor economic conditions create an atmosphere where tolerance is at the minimum. In such cases the present study relating to psycho-social factors of aggression would provide insight for framing suitable and workable plans for training the youths of the country to keep aggression at a minimum level. Thus one might expect to encounter problems relating to aggressive behavior and simultaneously it would work as predictor of aggression.

Conclusions

In conclusion, it can be said that the results of the present study in conjunction with previous research demonstrate that the relationships among different dimensions of aggression such as Physical Aggression (PA), Verbal Aggression (VA), Hostile Aggression (HA), Anger Aggression (AA) and Indirect Aggression (IA) are complex. The generic value of aggression is difficult due to overlapping relationships among different dimensions of aggression. Thus relationships among these dimensions may be regarded as positively correlate and may be used as predictive of aggression. In other words, the absence of inverse relation of these dimensions of aggression indicate that the findings of the present study are embedded in the psycho-social factors of aggression. In the light of these arguments, it can be said that the dynamic, functional and domain-specific nature of aggression will be highlighted through future research in the social context of Bangladesh.

References

References

References

- American Psychiatric Association (1987): Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, *Third Edition, Revised*. Washington, D.C., American Psychiatric Association.
- Anderson, C. A. (1997). Effects of violent movies and trait hostility on hostile feelings and aggressive thoughts. *Aggressive Behavior*, *23*, 161-178.
- Anderson, C. A. & Anderson, K. B. (1996). Violent crime rate studies in philosophical context: A destructive testing approach to heat and southern culture of violence effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *70*, 740-756.
- Anderson, C. A., Anderson, K. B. & Deuser, W. E. (1996). Examining an affective aggression framework: Weapon and temperature effects on aggressive thoughts, affect, and attitudes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *22*, 366-376.
- Anderson, K. B., Anderson, C. A., Dill, K. E. & Deuser, W. E. (1998). The interactive relations between trait hostility, pain, and aggressive thoughts. *Aggressive Behavior*, *24*, 161-171.
- Anderson, C. A., Benjamin, A. J. & Bartholow, B. D. (1998). Does the gun pull the trigger? Automatic priming effects of weapon pictures and weapon names. *Psychological Science*, *9*, 308-314.
- Anderson, C. A. & Bushman, B. J. (1997). External validity of "trivial" experiments: The case of laboratory aggression. *Review of General Psychology*, *1*, 19-41.
- Anderson, C. A., Deuser, W. E. & DeNeve, K. M. (1995). Hot temperatures, hostile affect, hostile cognition, and arousal: Tests of a general model

- of affective aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21, 434-448.
- Anderson, C. A. & Dill, K. E. (2000). Video Games and Aggressive Thoughts, Feelings, and Behavior in the Laboratory and in Life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78(4), 772-790.
- Anderson, C. A. & Ford, C. M. (1986). Affect of the game player: Short term effects of highly and mildly aggressive video games. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 12, 390-402.
- Anderson, C. A., Lindsay, J. J. & Bushman, B. J. (1999). Research in the psychological laboratory: Truth or triviality? *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 8, 3-9.
- Archer, D., & Gartner, R. (1984). *Violence and crime in cross-national perspective*. New Heaven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Aronson, E., Wilson, T. D., & Akert, R. M. (1997). *Social psychology*. New York, NY: Longman, Inc.
- Bach, G.R. and Torbet, L. (1983). *The Inner Enemy: How to Fight Fair with yourself, 1st ed.*, New York, Morrow.
- Ballard, M. E. & Weist, J. R. (1996). Mortal Kombat: The effects of violent video game play on males' hostility and cardiovascular responding. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 26, 717-730.
- Bandura, A. (1971). Social learning theory of aggression. In J. G. Knutson (Ed.), *Control of aggression: Implications from basic research* (pp. 201-250). Chicago: Aldine-Atherton.
- Bandura, A. (1973). *Aggression: A social learning analysis*. (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall)

- Bandura, A., Ross, D. & Ross, S. A. (1961). Transmission of aggression through imitation of aggressive models. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 66, 575-582.
- Bandura, A., Ross, D. & Ross, S. A. (1963). Imitation of film-mediated aggressive models. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 66, 3-11.
- Banki, C.M., et. al. (1985). Cerebrospinal fluid magnesium and calcium related to amine metabolites, diagnosis and suicide attempts. *Biol. Psychiatry* 20 (2): 163-171.
- Barchas, P. R. (1981). Vantage points for viewing aggression. In D. A. Hamburg and M. B. Trudeau (Eds.). *Biobehavioural aspects of aggression* (pp.17-26). New York: Alan R. Liss.
- Bargh, J. A. (1994). The four horsemen of automaticity: Awareness, intention, efficiency, and control in social cognition.(In R. S. Wyer, Jr. & T. K. Srull (Eds.), *Handbook of social cognition: Basic processes* (2nd ed., pp. 1-40). New York: Guilford Press.)
- Barlow, P.J. (1983). *A pilot study on the metal levels in the hair of hyperactive children. Med. Hypotheses*, 11(3): 309-318.
- Barton, E. J. (1981). Developing sharing: An analysis of modeling and other behavioral techniques. *Behavior Modification*, 5, 396-398.
- Baron, R. (1977). *Human aggression*. New York: Plenum.
- Baron, R. A. & Richardson, D. R. (1994). *Human Aggression* (2nd ed.) New York Plenum.
- Barry, H. (1973). 'Motivational and cognitive effects of alcohol'. *Journal of SafetyResearch*, 5, 200-221.

- Baumeister, R. F. (1998). The self. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (Vol. 1, 4th ed., pp. 680-740). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Boden, J. M. (1998). Aggression and the self: High self-esteem, low self-control, and ego threat. In R. Geen & E. Donnerstein (Eds.), *Human aggression: Theories, research, and implications for social policy* (pp. 111-137). San Diego, CA: Academic.
- Beck, M. (1985). Understanding and managing the acting out child. *The Pointer*, 29, 27-29.
- Bee, H. (1998). *Life span development*. New York, NY: Longman, Inc.
- Bell, P. A. and Baron, R. A. (1981). Ambient temperature and human violence. In P. F. Brain and D. Benton. *Multidisciplinary approaches to aggression research* (pp.421-430). Amsterdam: Elsevier/North-Holland Biomedical Press.
- Berkowitz, L. (1981, June). How guns control us. *Psychology Today*, 11-12.
- Berkowitz, L. (1984). Some effects of thoughts on anti- and prosocial influence of media events: A cognitive neoassociationist analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 95, 410-427.
- Berkowitz, L. (1990). On the formation and regulation of anger and aggression. *American Psychologist*, 45, 494-503.
- Berkowitz, L. (1993). *Aggression: Its causes, consequences, and control*. (New York: McGraw-Hill).
- Berkowitz, L. (1994). Is something missing? Some observations prompted by the cognitive-neoassociationist view of anger and emotional aggression. In L. R. Huesmann (Ed.), *Aggressive behavior: Current perspectives* (pp. 35-57). New York: Plenum.

- Berkowitz, L. & LePage, A. (1967). Weapons as aggression-eliciting stimuli. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 7, 202-207.
- Berkowitz, L. & Knurek, D. (1967). Label-mediated hostility generalization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 5, 364-368.
- Berres, M. and Long, N. (1979). The passive-aggressive child. *The Pointer*, 24, 27-31.
- Bettencourt, B. A. & Miller, N. (1996). Gender differences in aggression as a function of provocation: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 119, 422-447.
- Bjorkqvist, K. Osterman, K. & Hjelt-Back, M. (1994). Aggression among university employees. *Aggressive behavior*, 20, 173-184.
- Boulton, M. J. and Smith, P. K. (1994). Bully/victim problems in middle-school children: Stability, self-perceived competence, peer perceptions and peer acceptance. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 12, 315-329.
- Bowers, L., Smith, P. K., and Binney, V. (1994). Perceived family relationships of bullies, victims and bully/victims in middle childhood. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 11, 215-232.
- Brain, P. F. (1981). Classical ethology and human aggression. In P. F. Brain and D. Benton (Eds.). *The biology of aggression* (pp.603-623). Alphen aanden Rijn, The Netherlands: Sitjhoff and Noordhoff.
- Braun, C. & Giroux, J. (1989). Arcade video games: Proxemic, cognitive and content analyses. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 21, 92-105.
- Branchey, L. et al. (1984). Depression, suicide and aggression in alcoholics and their relationship to plasma amino acids. *Psychiatry Res.* 12(3):219-26.

- Brown, B., Mory, M., & Kinney, D. (1994). Casting crowds in a relational perspective :Caricature, channel, and context. In R. Montemayor, G. Adams, & T. Gullota (Eds.), *Advances in adolescent development, vol. 5 : Personal relationships during adolescence*. Newbury Park, CA :Sage.
- Bushman, B. J. (1995). Moderating role of trait aggressiveness in the effects of violent media on aggression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*, 950-960.
- Bushman, B. J. & Anderson, C. A. (1998). Methodology in the study of aggression: Integrating experimental and nonexperimental findings.(In R. Geen & E. Donnerstein (Eds.), *Human aggression: Theories, research, and implications for social policy* (pp. 23-48). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.)
- Bushman, B. J., & Baumeister, R. F. (1998). Threatened egotism, narcissism, self-esteem, and direct and displaced aggression: Does self-love or self-hate lead to violence? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*, 219-229.
- Buss, A. H. (1961). *The Psychology of Aggression*. New York: Wiley.
- Buss, A. H. & Durkee, A. (1957). An inventory for assessing different kinds of hostility. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 21*, 343-349.
- Buss, A. H. & Perry, M. P. (1992). The aggression questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63*, 452-459.
- Buss, A. H. & Warren, W. L. (2000). *The aggression questionnaire Manual*. Los Angeles: *Western Psychological Services*.
- Butterfield, F. (1992, October 23). Dispute threatens U.S. plan on violence. *New York Times*, p. A8.
- Byrne, D. (1971). *The attraction paradigm*. New York: Academic Press.

- Byrne, B. (1993). *Coping with bullying in schools*. Dublin: The Columbia Press.
- Calvert, S. L. & Tan, S. (1994). Impact of virtual reality on young adults' physiological arousal and aggressive thoughts: Interaction versus observation. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 15*, 125-139.
- Campbell, M., et. al. (1984). Behavioral efficacy of halo-peridol and lithium carbonate. A comparison in hospitalized aggressive children with conduct disorder. *Arch. Gen. Psychiatry, 41 (7)*: 650-656.
- Caprara, G. V. (1982). A comparison of the frustration-aggression and emotional susceptibility hypothesis. *Aggressive Behavior, 8*, 234-236.
- Caprara, G. V., Cinanni, V., D'Imperio, G., Passerini, S., Renzi, P. & Travaglia, G. (1985). Indicators of impulsive aggression: Present status of research on irritability and emotional susceptibility scales. *Personality and Individual Differences, 6*, 665-674.
- Carlson, M., Marcus-Newhall, A. & Miller, N. (1989). Evidence for a general construct of aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 15*, 377-389.
- Carlson, M., Marcus-Newhall, A. & Miller, N. (1990). Effects of situational aggressive cues: A quantitative review. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*, 622-633.
- Chambers, J. H. & Ascione, F. R. (1987). The effects of prosocial and aggressive video games on children's donating and helping. *Journal of Genetic Psychology, 148*, 499-505.
- Chamberlain, B. et. al. (1987). The effect of raising or lowering tryptophan levels on aggression in vervet monkeys. *Pharmacol. Biochem. Behav. 28 (4)*, 503-510.

- Chandra, S.V. (1983). Psychiatric illness due to manganese poisoning. *Acta. Psychiatr. Scand. Suppl. 303*, 49-54.
- Clarke, T.W. (1950). The relation of allergy to character problems in children. *A survey. Ann. Allergy. March-April*, pp. 175-187.
- Cofer, C. N. and Appley, M. H. (1964). *Motivation: Theory and research*. New York: Wiley.
- Coie, J. & Dodge, K. (1986). *Hostile and instrumentally aggressive children: A social information processing perspective*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association. New York: Plenum.
- Cooper, J. & Mackie, D. (1986). Video games and aggression in children. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 16*, 726-744.
- Court-Brown, W. M. (1967). *Human population cytogenetics*. New York: Wiley.
- Creasey, G. L. & Myers, B. J. (1986). Video games and children: Effects on leisure activities, schoolwork, and peer involvement. *Merrill Palmer Quarterly, 32*, 251-262.
- Crick, N. R. & Dodge, K. A. (1994). A review and reformulation of social information-processing mechanisms in children's social adjustment. *Psychological Bulletin, 115*, 74-101.
- Daro, D. & McCurdy, K. (1992). *Current trends in child abuse reporting fatalities: The results of the 1990 annual fifty-state survey*. Chicago: National Center on Child Abuse Prevention Research.
- Desmond, E. W. (1987, November 30). Out in the open. *Time*, 80-90.
- Dietz, T. L. (1998). An examination of violence and gender role portrayals in video games: Implications for gender socialization and aggressive behavior. *Sex Roles, 38*, 425-442.

- Dill, K. E., Anderson, C. A., Anderson, K. B. & Deuser, W. E. (1997). Effects of aggressive personality on social expectations and social perceptions. *Journal of Research in Personality, 31*, 272-292.
- Dill, K. E. & Dill, J. C. (1998). Video game violence: A review of the empirical literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior: A Review Journal, 3*, 407-428.
- Dodge, K. A. & Crick, N. R. (1990). Social information-processing bases of aggressive behavior in children. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 16*, 8-22.
- Dollard, J., Doob, L. W. Miller, N. E., Mowrer, O. H. and Sears, R. R. (1939). *Frustration and aggression*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Dominick, J. R. (1984). Videogames, television violence, and aggression in teenagers. *Journal of Communication, 34*, 136-147.
- Dorr, N. & Anderson, C. A. (1995, May). *Resolution of the temperature aggression debate*. (Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago)
- Edmunds, G. and Kendrick, D. C. (1980). *The measurement of human aggressiveness*. Chichester, England: Ellis Horwood.
- Elliot, D. S., Huizinga, D. & Ageton, S. S. (1985). *Explaining delinquency and drug use*. (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage)
- Elmer-Dewitt, P. (1993, September 27). The amazing video game boom. *Time, , 66-73*.
- Emes, C. E. (1997). Is Mr. Pac Man eating our children? A review of the effect of video games on children. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 42*, 409-414.

- Eron, L. D., Huesmann, L. R., Dubow, E., Romanoff, R. & Yarmel, P. (1987). Aggression and its correlates over 22 years.(In D. Crowell, I. Evans, & D. O'Donnell (Eds.), *Childhood aggression and violence* (pp. 249-262). New York: Plenum.)
- Eron, L. D. (1980). Prescription for reduction of aggression. *American Psychologist*, 35, 244- 252.
- Fierro, A.A. (1988). Natural low dose lithium supplementation in manic-depressive disease. *Nutr. Perspectives January*, 10-11
- Fling, S., Smith, L., Rodriguez, T., Thornton, D., Atkins, E. & Nixon, K. (1992). Videogames, aggression, and self-esteem: A survey. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 20, 39-46.
- Fraser, M. W. (1996). Aggressive behavior in childhood and early adolescence: An ecological-developmental perspective on youth violence. *Social Work*, 41, (4), 347-361.
- Fossati, A., Maffei, C., Acquarini, E. & Ceglie, A. D. (2003).Multigroup confirmatory component and factor analyses of the Italian version of the Aggression Questionnaire(1). *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 19 (1), 54-65.
- Geen, R. G. (1990). *Human aggression*. (Pacific Grove, CA: McGraw-Hill)
- Geen, R. G. & Quanty, M. B. (1977). The catharsis of aggression: An evaluation of a hypothesis.(In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 10, pp. 1-37). New York: Academic Press.
- Geen, R. G., Stonner, D. & Shope, G. L. (1975). The facilitation of aggression by aggression: Evidence against the catharsis hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 31, 721-726.

- Gelenberg, A.J. (1988). Psychiatric Disorders, in DM Paige, Ed. *Clinical Nutrition, Second Edition*. St. Louis, The C.V. Mosby Company.
- Gerbner, G., Gross, L., Morgan, M. & Signorelli, N. (1980). The "mainstreaming" of America: Violence profile no. II. *Journal of Communication, 30*, 10-29.
- Giammanco, S., et. al. (1990). Short term diet of precooked corn meal almost lacking in tryptophan and interspecific rat-mouse aggressive behavior. *Arch. Int. Physiol. Biochim. 98 (1)*: 23-26.
- Giancola, P. R. & Chermack, S. T. (1998). Construct validity of laboratory aggression paradigms: A response to Tedeschi and Quigley (1996). *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 3*, 237-253.
- Glenn, M. B., et. al. (1989). Lithium carbonate for aggressive behavior or effective instability in tenbrain-injured patients. *Am. J. Phys. Med. Rehabil. 68 (5)*: 221-226.
- Graybill, D., Strawniak, M., Hunter, T. & O'Leary, M. (1987). Effects of playing versus observing violent versus nonviolent video games on children's aggression. *Psychology: A Quarterly Journal of Human Behavior, 24*, 1-8.
- Goffioul, F. (1971). Alcoholism at the wheel. Psychopathological aspects. *Feuillets Psychiatriques de Liege, 4*, 221-229. (From *Psychological Abstracts, 49*, Abstract No. (07154).
- Gosttschalk, L.A., et. al. (1991). Abnormalities in hair trace-elements as indicators of aberrant behavior. *Compr. Psychiatry, 32*: 229-237.
- Haggard, L. M., & Williams, D. R. (1992). Identity affirmation through leisure activities: Leisure symbols of the self. *Journal of Leisure Research, 24 (1)*, 1-18.

- Harris, M. B. & Williams, R. (1985). Video games and school performance. *Education, 105*, 306-309.
- Hampson, G. (1984). *Contributing factors in road crashes*. (Report No. WD 78). Canberra: Office of Road Safety.
- Hanes (1974). Health and Nutrition Examination Survey. *U.S. Dept. of HEW Publication No.(HRA) 74-1219-1*, Rockville, MD.
- Henrotte, J.G. (1986). Type A behavior and magnesium metabolism. *Magnesium, 5*: 201-210.
- Holt, P. C. (1982). 'Stressful life events preceding road traffic accidents'. *Injury: The British Journal of Accident Surgery, 13*, 111-115.
- Holtzworth-Munroe, A. & Stuart, G. L. (1994). Typologies of male batterers: Three sub types and the differences among them. *Psychological Bulletin, 116*, 476-497.
- Hook, E. B. (1973). Behavioral implications of the human XYY genotype. *Science, 179*, 139-150.
- Hoover, J. H., Oliver, R., and Hazler, R. J. (1992). Bullying: perceptions of adolescent victims in the Midwestern USA. *School Psychology International, 13*, 5-16.
- Huesmann, L. R. (1986). Psychological processes promoting the relation between exposure to media violence and aggressive behavior by the viewer. *Journal of Social Issues, 42*, 125-139.
- Huesmann, L. R. (1994). *Aggressive behavior: Current perspectives*. (New York: Plenum Press)
- Huesmann, L. R. & Miller, L. S. (1994). Long-term effects of repeated exposure to media violence in childhood.(In L. R. Huesmann (Ed.), *Aggressive behavior: Current perspectives* (pp. 153-188). New York: Plenum Press.

- Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1980). *The social psychology of leisure and recreation*. Dubuque, IA: Wm.C. Brown Company Publisher.
- Iso-Ahola, S. E., & Crowley, E. D. (1991). Adolescent substance abuse and leisure time boredom. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 23, 260-271.
- Izenwasser, S. E. et al (1986). Stimulant-like effects of magnesium on aggression in mice. *Pharmacol. Biochem. Behav.* 25(6),1195-9.
- Jacobs, P. A., Brunton, M. & Melville, M. M. (1965). Aggressive behavior, mental subnormality and the XYY male. *Nature*, 208, 1351-1352.
- Jarvik, I. F., Koldin, V. & Matsuyama, S. S. (1973). Human aggression and the extra Y chromosome: Fact or fantasy? *American Psychologist*, 28, 674-682.
- Kantak, K. M. (1988). Magnesium deficiency alters aggressive behavior and catecholamine function. *Behavioral Neurosci.* 102(2), 304- 11.
- Kaufmann, H. (1965). 'Definitions and methodology in the study of aggression'. *Psychological Bulletin*, 64, 351-364.
- Kirkpatrick, L. A., & Ellis, B. J. (2001). Evolutionary perspectives on self-evaluation and self-esteem. In G. Fletcher & M. Clark (Eds.), *The Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Vol. 2: Interpersonal processes* (pp. 411-436). Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Kirkpatrick, L. A., Waugh, C. E., Valencia, A., & Webster, G. D. (2002). The functional domain specificity of self-esteem and the differential prediction of aggression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 756-767.
- Kirsh, S. J. (1998). Seeing the world through Mortal Kombat-colored glasses: Violent video games and the development of a short-term hostile attribution bias. *Childhood*, 5, 177-184.

- Kitahara, M. (1986). Dietary tryptophan ratio and homicide in Western and Southern Europe. *J. Orthomol. Med.* 1(1):13-6.
- Klein, M. H. (1984). The bite of Pac-Man. *The Journal of Psychohistory*, 11, 395-401.
- Kokko, K., Pulkkinen, L. & Puustinen, M. (2000). Selection into long-term unemployment and its psychological consequences. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*.
- Lagerspetz, K. M. J., Bjorkqvist, K., Berts, M., and King, E. (1982). Group aggression among school children in three schools. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 23, 45-52.
- Lanctot, N., & LeBlanc, M. (2003). The structure and growth of violence Interdisciplinary Conference, Edinburgh, 7-12, July.
- Leyens, J. P. & Picus, S. (1973). Identification with the winner of a fight and name mediation: Their differential effects upon subsequent aggressive behavior. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 12, 374-377.
- Lindsay, J. J. & Anderson, C. A. (in press). From antecedent conditions to violent actions: A general affective aggression model. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, ,
- Loftus, G. A. & Loftus, E. F. (1983). *Mind at play: The psychology of video games*. (New York: Basic Books)
- Lorenz, K. . (1966). *On aggression*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World.
- Maccoby, E. E., & Jacklin, C. N. (1974). *The psychology of sex differences*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- MacMahon, J. R. (1990). The psychological benefits of exercise and the treatment of delinquent adolescents. *Sports Medicine*, 9 (6), 344-351.

- MacDonald, J. M. (1964). 'Suicide and homicide by automobile'. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 121, 366-370.
- Maletzky, B. M. (1973). The episodic dyscontrol syndrome. *Diseases of the Nervous System*, 34, 178-185.
- Mayer, G. R. (1992). Preventing antisocial behavior in the schools. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 28, 467-478.
- McMurray, L. (1970). 'Emotional stress and driving performance: The effect of divorce'. *Behavioral Research in Highway Safety*, 1, 100-114.
- Mental Measurements Yearbook* (8th Edition) (1978). New Jersey: Gryphon Press.
- Moffitt, T. E. (1991). *Juvenile delinquency: a seed of a career in violent crime, just sowing wild oats-or both?* Paper presented at the Science and Public Policy Seminars of the Federation of behavioral, Psychological, and Cognitive Sciences, Washington, DC.
- Morand, C. et al. (1983). Clinical response of aggressive schizophrenics to oral tryptophan. *Biol. Psychiatry* 18(5):575-8.
- Moyer, K. E.. (1976). *The psychology of aggression*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Moyer, K. E. (1981). Biological substrates and implications for control. In P. F. Brain and D. Benton (Eds.). *The biology of aggression* (pp.47-67). Alphen aanden Rijn, The Netherlands: Sitjhoff and Noordhoff.
- Mueller, C. W. (1983). Environmental stressors and aggressive behaviour. In R. G. Geen and E. I. Donnerstein (Eds.). *Aggression: Theoretical and empirical reviews. (Volume 2). Issues in research.* (pp.51-75). New York: Academic Press.
- Mukerjee, S. K., & Dagger, D. (1990). *The size of the crime problem in Australia* (2nd ed.). Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology.

- Nuttal, E. V., & Kalesnik, J. (1987). Personal violence in the schools: The role of the counselor. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 65, 372-375.
- Olweus, D. (1980). Familial and temperamental determinants of aggressive behavior in adolescent boys: A causal analysis. *Developmental Psychology*, 16, 644-660.
- Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Orcutt, J. D. (1984). Contrasting effects of two kinds of boredom on alcohol use. *Journal of Drug Issues*, 14, 161-173.
- Peterson, L. & Brown, D. (1994). Integrating child injury and abuse- neglect research: Common histories, etiologies and solutions. *Psychological Bulletin*, 116, 293- 315.
- Pihl, R. O. et al. (1982). Hair element content of violent criminals. *Can. J. Psychiatry* 27:533.
- Plutchik, R. and Kellerman, H. (Eds.). (1980). *Emotion: Theory, research and experience*.
- Pooley, E. (1999, May 10). Portrait of a deadly bond. *Time*, , 26-32.
- Potkay, C.R., Allen, B.P. (1986). *Personality: Theory Research and Application*. Monerey, California, Brooks Cole Publishing Company.
- Rosen, G. M. (1985). Deinard AS, Schwartz S et al: Iron deficiency among incarcerated juvenile delinquents. *J. Adolesc. Health Care* 6:419-23.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Rees, E. L. (1979). Aluminum toxicity as indicated by hair analysis. *Journal. Orthomol. Psychiatry* 8:37.

- Roy, A. et al. (1988). Monamines, glucose metabolism, aggression towards self and others. *Int. J. Neurosci.* 41(3-4):261-4.
- Rubin, M., & Hewstone, M. (1998). Social identity theory's self-esteem hypothesis: A review and some suggestions for clarification. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 2, 40-62.
- Schrauzer, G.N., Shrestha, K.P. (1990). Lithium in drinking water and the incidences of crimes, suicides, and arrests related to drug addictions. *Biol. Trace Elem. Res*, 25(2), 105-113.
- Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Post-Gorden, J. C. & Rodasta, A. L. (1988). Effects of playing video games on children's aggressive and other behaviors. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 18, 454-460.
- Schoenthaler, S.J. (1982-3). *Int. J. Biosocial Res.* Vol. 3-5.
- Schuman, S. H., Pelz, D. C., Ehrlich, N. J., and Selzer, M. L. (1967). 'Young male drivers: Impulse expression, accidents, and violations'. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 200, 1026-1030.
- Scott, D. (1995). The effect of video games on feelings of aggression. *The Journal of Psychology*, 129, 121-132.
- Selzer, M. L. (1969). 'Alcoholism, mental illness and stress in 96 drivers causing fatal accidents'. *Behavioral Science*, 14, 1-10.
- Selzer, M. L. and Payne, C. E. (1962). 'Automobile accidents, suicide and unconscious motivation'. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 119, 237-240.
- Selzer, M. L. and Vinokur, A. (1974). 'Life events, subjective stress, and traffic accidents'. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 131, 903-906.
- Selzer, M. L., Rogers, J. E. and Kern, S. (1968). 'Fatal accidents: The role of psychopathology, social stress and acute disturbance'. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 124, 1028-1036.

- Selzer, M. L., Vinokur, A. and Wilson, T. D. (1977). 'A psychosocial comparison of drunken drivers and alcoholics'. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 38, 1294-1312.
- Seppala, T., Linnoila, M. and Mattila, M. J. (1979). 'Drugs, alcohol and driving'. *Drugs*, 17, 389-408.
- Silvern, S. B. & Williamson, P. A. (1987). The effects of video game play on young children's aggression, fantasy and prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 8, 453-462.
- Speart, S., et. al. (1989). Lithium carbonate for aggression in mentally retarded persons. *Comp. Psychiatry*, 30(6), 505-511.
- Smith, E. A., & Caldwell, L. L. (1989). The perceived quality of leisure experiences among smoking and nonsmoking adolescents. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 12, 319-332.
- Straus, M. A. & Gelles, R. J. (1988). Violence in American families: How much is there and why does it occur? In E.W. Nunnally, C.S. Coleman, F.M. Cox (Eds.), *Families in trouble* (Series 3, pp. 141-162). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Sylwester, R. (1999). In search of the roots of adolescent aggression. *Educational Leadership*, 57, 65-70.
- Taylor, S. P. and Leonard, K. E. (1983). Alcohol and human physical aggression. In R. G. Geen and E. I. Donnerstein (Eds.). *Aggression: Theoretical and empirical reviews. (Volume 2). Issues in research* (pp.77-101). New York: Academic Press.
- Tedeschi, J.T., Smith, R. B., III, & Brown, R. C. (1974). A reinterpretation of research on aggression. *Psychological Bulletin*, 81, 540-562.

- Tepperman, J. (1997). What do children learn from media violence? Children's Advocate Available: <http://www.4children.org/news/1-97toxl.htm> .
- Thomas, E. (1995). Media violence: The search for solutions. *The Momentum*, 26 (1), 47-49.
- Thomson, G.O. et al. (1989). Blood-lead levels and children's behaviour: results from the Edinburgh Lead Study. *J. Child Psychol. Psychiatry* 30(4):515-28.
- Tieger, T. (1980). On the biological basis of sex differences in aggression, *Child development*, 51, 943-963.
- Van Schie, E. G. M. & Wiegman, O. (1997). Children and video games: Leisure activities, aggression, social integration, and school performance. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 27, 1175-1194.
- Winkel, M., Novak, D. M. & Hopson, M. (1987). Personality factors, subject gender and the effects of aggressive video games on aggression in adolescents. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 21, 211-223.
- Webb, T.E., Oski, F.A. (1974). Behavioral status of young adolescents with iron deficiency anemia. *J. Special Ed.* 8(2), 153-156.
- Wickham, E.A., Reed, J.V. (1987). Lithium for the control of aggressive and self-mutilating behavior. *Int. Clin. Psychopharmacol.* 2(3), 181-190.
- Yates, W. R., Meller, W. and Troughton, E. P. (1987). 'Behavioural complications of alcoholism'. *American Family Physician*, 35, 171-175.
- Youdim, M.B., et al. (1990). Putative biological mechanisms of the effect of iron deficiency on brain biochemistry and behavior. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* 50(3 Suppl.), 607-615.

APPENDICES
APPENDICES

APPENDIX-A
Socio-Economic Status Scale
(Score-Card)

Items	Weight	
A. Education		
1. Professional degree / M. A. / M. Sc.	10	
2. B. A. / B. Sc.0	05	
3. Intermediate	04	
4. High School Certificate	03	
5. Middle School Certificate	02	
6. Primary School	01	
7. Illiterate	00	
B. Occupation		
1. Teacher / Officer / Doctor / Lawyer / Engineer / Big-Businessman	10	
2. Clerk / Small-Businessman	03	
3. Farmer	02	
4. Worker	01	
5. Unemployed	00	
C. Income		
1. Tk.5000.00 and above	01	
2. Below Tk.5000.00	00	
D. Possession of articles		
	yes	no
1. Having brick built house	01	00
2. Having radio	01	00
3. Having television	01	00
4. Having telephone	01	00
5. Keeping servant	01	00
6. Keeping daily newspaper	01	00
7. Having motorcycle	01	00
8. Having motorcar	01	00

APPENDIX B
Questionnaire for Measure of Aggressive Behavior (MAB)
(Bengali Version)

নামঃ

বয়সঃ

লিঙ্গঃ -- পুরুষ / মহিলা (প্রযোজ্য শব্দের উপর টিক (✓) চিহ্ন দিন)।

শিক্ষাগত যোগ্যতাঃ

বাসস্থানঃ -- শহর / গ্রাম (প্রযোজ্য শব্দের উপর টিক (✓) চিহ্ন দিন)।

ঠিকানাঃ

মনে রাখবেন এ তথ্য মনোবিজ্ঞান বিষয়ের গবেষণা কার্যে ব্যবহার করা হবে এবং এর গোপনীয়তা রক্ষা করা হবে। আপনার সক্রিয় সহযোগিতার জন্য ধন্যবাদ।

নির্দেশনা

মানুষের আচরণ পরিবেশ নির্ভর। পরিবেশের প্রেক্ষাপটে বিভিন্ন ক্ষেত্রে আমরা আক্রমণাত্মক আচরণ প্রকাশ করি। এরূপ আক্রমণাত্মক আচরণের কতকগুলো কাল্পনিক পরিবেশ নিম্নে দেয়া হলো।

প্রতিটি বাক্য মনোযোগ সহকারে পড়ুন এবং এরূপ পরিবেশে আপনার আচরণ কেমন হতে পারে তা প্রতিটি বাক্যের নিচে প্রদত্ত পাঁচটি বিকল্পের যে কোন একটিতে টিক (✓) চিহ্ন দিয়ে প্রকাশ করুন। বাক্যে প্রদত্ত বিষয়টি যদি আপনার নিকট সম্পূর্ণরূপে গ্রহণযোগ্য মনে হয় তবে “সম্পূর্ণ সত্য” এর উপর টিক (✓) চিহ্ন দিন। বিষয়টি যদি আপনার নিকট শর্ত সাপেক্ষে গ্রহণযোগ্য মনে হয় তবে “সত্য” এর উপর টিক (✓) চিহ্ন দিন। বিষয়টি সম্পর্কে যদি আপনার সুনির্দিষ্ট কোন মতামত না থাকে তবে “নিরপেক্ষ” এর উপর টিক (✓) চিহ্ন দিন। বিষয়টি যদি আপনার নিকট শর্ত সাপেক্ষে গ্রহণযোগ্য মনে না হয় তবে “মিথ্যা” এর উপর টিক (✓) চিহ্ন দিন। বিষয়টি যদি আপনার নিকট কোন অবস্থাতেই গ্রহণযোগ্য মনে না হয় তবে “সম্পূর্ণ মিথ্যা” এর উপর টিক (✓) চিহ্ন দিন। মনে রাখবেন এখানে সময়ের কোন বাধ্যবাধকতা নেই। তবে যথাসম্ভব কম সময়ে উক্ত দিতে চেষ্টা করুন।

১। মনে করুন আপনি একটি যৌথ পরিবারের সদস্য। উক্ত পরিবারে শিশু, বয়ঃপ্রাপ্ত, বিবাহিত, বৃদ্ধ প্রভৃতি সকল বয়সের লোক একত্রে বাস করে। এমতবস্থায় ইহা কতটুকু সত্য যে, এ পরিবেশে পারিবারিক শৃংখলা বজায় রাখার জন্য আপনি ধমকের সুরে কথা বলবেন।

সম্পূর্ণ সত্য	সত্য	নিরপেক্ষ	মিথ্যা	সম্পূর্ণ মিথ্যা

২। মনে করুন আপনি এক আত্মীয়ের বিয়ে বাড়ীতে গিয়েছেন। বিয়ে বাড়ীতে বিভিন্ন ধরনের লোকজন উপস্থিত থাকায় গৃহ স্বামী আপনার প্রতি সঠিক আচরণ করতে পারছেন না। এমতবস্থায় পরিবেশের সঙ্গে তাল মিলিয়ে চলতে

আপনি অস্বস্তি বোধ করছেন। এরূপ পারিপার্শ্বিক অবস্থার প্রেক্ষিতে কতটুকু সত্য যে, আপনি বিভিন্ন অসঙ্গত আচরণে ফ্রেঞ্চ প্রকাশ করবেন।

সম্পূর্ণ সত্য	সত্য	নিরপেক্ষ	মিথ্যা	সম্পূর্ণ মিথ্যা

৩। মনে করুন আপনার ঘনিষ্ঠ বন্ধু আপনাকে মিথ্যা কথনের মাধ্যমে প্রতারণিত করেছেন। এ সত্যটি উৎখাটনের পর আপনি স্বাভাবিক ভাবে আবেগ প্রবণ হবেন। এমতবস্থায় ইহা কতটুকু সত্য যে, আপনার বন্ধুকে গালিগালাজের মাধ্যমে আপনি আপনার আবেগ প্রকাশ করবেন।

সম্পূর্ণ সত্য	সত্য	নিরপেক্ষ	মিথ্যা	সম্পূর্ণ মিথ্যা

৪। মনে করুন আপনি কোন একটি শিক্ষা প্রতিষ্ঠানে শিক্ষকতা করেন। উক্ত শিক্ষা প্রতিষ্ঠানের প্রধান আপনাকে অন্যায় ভাবে একজন ছাত্রের নম্বর বেশি প্রদানের জন্য নির্দেশ দিলেন। এমতবস্থায় ইহা কতটুকু সত্য যে, আপনি প্রতিষ্ঠান প্রধানের উক্ত অন্যায় নির্দেশের প্রতি রাগান্বিত স্বরে প্রতিবাদ করবেন।

সম্পূর্ণ সত্য	সত্য	নিরপেক্ষ	মিথ্যা	সম্পূর্ণ মিথ্যা

৫। মনে করুন আপনার এলাকায় একজন প্রভাবশালী ব্যক্তি কিছু জমি ভূমিহীন কৃষকদেরকে ধান চাষের জন্য চুক্তি ভিজিতে দিয়েছেন। কিন্তু অনাবৃষ্টির কারণে কৃষকেরা ধান চাষ করতে না পারলেও উক্ত ব্যক্তি জোর পূর্বক চুক্তি মোতাবেক ধান আদায়ের জন্য নিরীহ কৃষকের উপর অত্যাচার করছেন। এমতবস্থায় ইহা কতটুকু সত্য যে আপনি গরীব কৃষকদের পক্ষ অবলম্বন করে আক্রমণাত্মক আচরণের মাধ্যমে অন্যায়ের প্রতিবাদ করবেন।

সম্পূর্ণ সত্য	সত্য	নিরপেক্ষ	মিথ্যা	সম্পূর্ণ মিথ্যা

৬। মনে করুন আপনি রাস্তা দিয়ে হেঁটে আপনার কর্মস্থলে যাচ্ছেন। পথে লক্ষ্য করলেন যে, কয়েক জন বালক একত্রিত হয়ে রাস্তার ধারে লাগানো চারা গাছগুলো নষ্ট করছে। এমতবস্থায় ইহা কতটুকু সত্য যে, আপনি ঐ বালকদেরকে তিরস্কার করবেন।

সম্পূর্ণ সত্য	সত্য	নিরপেক্ষ	মিথ্যা	সম্পূর্ণ মিথ্যা

৭। মনে করুন আপনার ছেলে মেয়েরা লেখা পড়ায় অমনোযোগী। এমতবস্থায় ইহা কতটুকু সত্য যে, আপনি আপনার ছেলে মেয়েদেরকে প্রহার করবেন।

সম্পূর্ণ সত্য	সত্য	নিরপেক্ষ	মিথ্যা	সম্পূর্ণ মিথ্যা

৮। মনে করুন আপনার বাড়ীতে কয়েকজন কাজের লোক আছে। কিন্তু তারা সব সময় নিজ কর্তব্যে অবহেলা করে। এমতবস্থায় ইহা কতটুকু সত্য যে, দায়িত্ব পালনে অবহেলার জন্য আপনি রাগান্বিত হয়ে উচ্চ স্বরে কাজের লোকদেরকে ধমক দিবেন।

সম্পূর্ণ সত্য	সত্য	নিরপেক্ষ	মিথ্যা	সম্পূর্ণ মিথ্যা

৯। মনে করুন আপনার বাড়ীতে কয়েকটি পোষা বিড়াল আছে। বিড়ালগুলো আপনার রান্না করা মাছ খেয়ে ফেলেছে। এমতবস্থায় ইহা কতটুকু সত্য যে, আপনি মাছ খাওয়ার শাস্তি স্বরূপ ঐ বিড়ালগুলোকে প্রহার করবেন।

সম্পূর্ণ সত্য	সত্য	নিরপেক্ষ	মিথ্যা	সম্পূর্ণ মিথ্যা

১০। মনে করুন আপনার এলাকায় কিছু যুবক বিবাহে যৌতুক দাবি করছে এবং যৌতুক আদায়ের জন্য বিবাহিত স্ত্রীর উপর অত্যাচার করছে। এমতবস্থায় ইহা কতটুকু সত্য যে, আপনি প্রতিবাদ স্বরূপ উক্ত যুবকগণকে তিরস্কার করবেন।

সম্পূর্ণ সত্য	সত্য	নিরপেক্ষ	মিথ্যা	সম্পূর্ণ মিথ্যা

১১। মনে করুন আপনি কর্মস্থল থেকে গৃহে ফিরে লক্ষ্য করেন যে, গৃহের আসবাবপত্র কাপড়-চোপড় ও অন্যান্য প্রয়োজনীয় জিনিসপত্র অগোছালো ভাবে যেখানে সেখানে ফেলে রাখা হয়েছে। এমতবস্থায় ইহা কতটুকু সত্য যে, গৃহের এ অবস্থা দেখে আপনি রাগান্বিত হয়ে উচ্চ স্বরে চিৎকার করবেন।

সম্পূর্ণ সত্য	সত্য	নিরপেক্ষ	মিথ্যা	সম্পূর্ণ মিথ্যা

১২। মনে করুন বিভিন্ন কারণে বর্তমানে আপনি আর্থিক সংকটের মধ্যে দিন কাটাচ্ছেন। এমতবস্থায় ইহা কতটুকু সত্য যে, এ আর্থিক সংকটের জন্য আপনি পরিবারের অন্যান্য সদস্যদের সঙ্গে উগ্র মেজাজে কথা বলবেন।

সম্পূর্ণ সত্য	সত্য	নিরপেক্ষ	মিথ্যা	সম্পূর্ণ মিথ্যা

১৩। মনে করুন নিজ হাতে রান্না করা আপনার একটি অপছন্দনীয় কাজ। কোন একদিন কাজের লোক না আসায় রান্নার দায়িত্ব আপনার উপর পড়ল। এমতবস্থায় ইহা কতটুকু সত্য যে, আপনার এ অপছন্দনীয় কাজটি করার সময় আপনি অন্যকে বকাবকি করবেন।

সম্পূর্ণ সত্য	সত্য	নিরপেক্ষ	মিথ্যা	সম্পূর্ণ মিথ্যা

১৪। মনে করুন সকালে ঘুমিয়ে থাকা আপনার অভ্যাস। আপনার এ নিজস্ব জীবন ধারাটি বাড়ীর অন্যান্য সদস্যগণ পছন্দ করেন না এবং প্রকাশে আপনার সমালোচনা করেন। এমতবস্থায় ইহা কতটুকু সত্য যে, আপনি সমালোচনার জবাবে অন্যের প্রতি রূঢ় আচরণ করবেন।

সম্পূর্ণ সত্য	সত্য	নিরপেক্ষ	মিথ্যা	সম্পূর্ণ মিথ্যা

১৫। মনে করুন আপনার অতি প্রিয় টেবিল ঘড়িটি বাড়ীর কাজের মেয়েটি অসাবধানতা বশতঃ ভেঙ্গে ফেলল। এমতবস্থায় ইহা কতটুকু সত্য যে, আপনি কাজের মেয়েটিকে প্রহার করবেন।

সম্পূর্ণ সত্য	সত্য	নিরপেক্ষ	মিথ্যা	সম্পূর্ণ মিথ্যা

১৬। মনে করুন আপনার একজন ঘনিষ্ঠ বন্ধু অত্যন্ত তুচ্ছ ও গুরুত্বহীন বিষয়ে মিথ্যা কথা বললেন। পরবর্তীতে আপনি সত্য ঘটনা জানতে পারলেন। এমতবস্থায় ইহা কতটুকু সত্য যে, আপনি আপনার বন্ধুর সঙ্গে অসদাচরণ করবেন।

সম্পূর্ণ সত্য	সত্য	নিরপেক্ষ	মিথ্যা	সম্পূর্ণ মিথ্যা

১৭। মনে করুন আপনি একজন সৎ ও নিষ্ঠাবান চাকুরীজীবী। কিন্তু আপনার প্রতিবেশীগণ এ বিষয়ে সন্দেহ প্রকাশ করে এবং আপনি ঘুষ গ্রহন করেন বলে অপবাদ দেয়। এমতবস্থায় ইহা কতটুকু সত্য যে, আপনার মূল্যবোধে আঘাত করার জন্য আপনি প্রতিবেশীদের প্রতি ক্রুদ্ধ হবেন।

সম্পূর্ণ সত্য	সত্য	নিরপেক্ষ	মিথ্যা	সম্পূর্ণ মিথ্যা

১৮। মনে করুন আপনি একজন অংকের শিক্ষক। যদি এমন হয় যে, আপনার কোন এক ছাত্র একটি অংক বারবার ভুল করছে। এমতবস্থায় ইহা কতটুকু সত্য যে, আপনার ঐ ছাত্রটির খাতাপত্র ছুড়ে ফেলবেন।

সম্পূর্ণ সত্য	সত্য	নিরপেক্ষ	মিথ্যা	সম্পূর্ণ মিথ্যা

১৯। মনে করুন ছুটির দিনে দুপুরে খাওয়ার পর আপনি বিশ্রাম নিচ্ছেন। উক্ত সময়ে কোন একজন প্রতিবেশী উচ্চ শব্দে মাইক বাজালে এমতবস্থায় ইহা কতটুকু সত্য যে, আপনি ঐ প্রতিবেশীর সাথে কলহে লিপ্ত হবেন।

সম্পূর্ণ সত্য	সত্য	নিরপেক্ষ	মিথ্যা	সম্পূর্ণ মিথ্যা

২০। মনে করুন আপনার বাড়ীতে একটি টেলিফোন আছে। উক্ত টেলিফোনে জনৈক অপরিচিত ব্যক্তি বারবার বিরক্ত করে। এমতবস্থায় ইহা কতটুকু সত্য যে, আপনি টেলিফোনে উক্ত ব্যক্তিকে গালিগালাজ করবেন।

সম্পূর্ণ সত্য	সত্য	নিরপেক্ষ	মিথ্যা	সম্পূর্ণ মিথ্যা

২১। মনে করুন আপনি কেলাম খেলতে পছন্দ করেন। কোন কেলাম প্রতিযোগীতায় হেরে গেলে, এমতবস্থায় ইহা কতটুকু সত্য যে, আপনি আপনার প্রতি পক্ষের সঙ্গে বাকবিতণ্ডায় লিপ্ত হবেন।

সম্পূর্ণ সত্য	সত্য	নিরপেক্ষ	মিথ্যা	সম্পূর্ণ মিথ্যা

২২। কোন একটি কাজ নির্দিষ্ট সময়ে সমাপ্ত করতে না পারলে ইহা কতটুকু সত্য যে, আপনি আক্রমণাত্মক আচরণ প্রকাশ করবেন।

সম্পূর্ণ সত্য	সত্য	নিরপেক্ষ	মিথ্যা	সম্পূর্ণ মিথ্যা

২৩। আপনার অধীনস্থ ব্যক্তির আপনাকে অমান্য করলে ইহা কতটুকু সত্য যে, আপনি রাগান্বিত হয়ে তাদেরকে অশ্লীল ভাষায় গালি দেবেন।

সম্পূর্ণ সত্য	সত্য	নিরপেক্ষ	মিথ্যা	সম্পূর্ণ মিথ্যা

২৪। মনে করুন আপনি আপনার একজন প্রতিবেশীকে কিছু টাকা ধার দিয়েছেন। কিন্তু উক্ত প্রতিবেশী সময়মত সে ধার পরিশোধ করতে বার্থ হয়েছেন। এমতবস্থায় ইহা কতটুকু সত্য যে, আপনি উক্ত প্রতিবেশীর সঙ্গে যথাসময়ে ধার পরিশোধ না করার জন্য ঝগড়া করবেন।

সম্পূর্ণ সত্য	সত্য	নিরপেক্ষ	মিথ্যা	সম্পূর্ণ মিথ্যা

২৫। মনে করুন আপনি যৌথ পরিবারের সদস্য। এ পরিবারের কোন একজন সদস্য বাড়ীর ছোট ছেলে-মেয়েদেরকে সব সময় ভর্ৎসনা করে। এমতবস্থায় ইহা কতটুকু সত্য যে, আপনি উক্ত সদস্যের প্রতি ক্রোধ প্রকাশ করবেন।

সম্পূর্ণ সত্য	সত্য	নিরপেক্ষ	মিথ্যা	সম্পূর্ণ মিথ্যা