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Several studies have reported social class difference in hostility and aggression. McKee and Leader (1955) have reported that working class pre-schoolers displayed more aggression in an experimental situation than did their middle class peers. Sigel (1965) has provided evidence that from grade 11 to 12 at all levels, the low SES children are more aggressive than the others. However, there are some exceptions to such generalization. The working-class and middle-class mothers interviewed by Sears et al (1957) did not differ in the extent to which they described their children as behaving aggressively. Levin and Sears (1956) found no social class difference in aggression. Thus the results are not unanimous and one has to determine what kinds of hostility are socially rewarded in lower class culture. The working class culture may reward aggressive acts that seem justified, but it will punish other forms hostile behaviour. Hence social scientists must identify the situations in which particular hostile actions are likely to occur and be rewarded.

Gorden (1968) stated that socially disadvantaged children are less conscious bound and more aggressive and hostile. Hass (1966) determined whether socio-economic class position and minority group status in the United States are related to hostility among
college students. The results demonstrated that first-generation middle class students (i.e. from middle class parents) were significantly more hostile than second generation middle class students (i.e. from middle class parents). The first generation was however, less covertly hostile than the second. The second general finding was that minority group subjects such as Jews and Negroes were more hostile than Catholics or Protestants. Liaguno (1981) also found lower class subjects to manifest more aggression than middle class subjects. In an Indian study Verma (1980) studied school children, both boys and girls from 6-9 years of age using TATA cards. It was found that children from lower socio-economic status, were higher in aggression as compared to upper socio-economic status, but no significant difference was found between lower and middle class children. Some early studies, however, have indicated that while there is a tendency in lower class to express hostility in overt acts of aggression, in middle class the hostility is turned inward (Gold, 1958, Henry & short, 1954, Zigler & Philips, 1960).

Two important aspects of parent-child relation explain aggressiveness in children. The first is frequent frustration i.e. any situation, condition, relationship or experience that produce frustrations in an individual are seen to determine aggressiveness or hostility. The second notion emphasizes the parent as a model for the child. In identifying with the parent, the child models his own behaviour after the parent’s. These two aspects are clearly centred in
the environment since they stress the child's learning experience, particularly as they occur in the family setting. Moreover, there is evidence that the two aspects are interrelated. An adult who creates frustrations for the child is likely also to demonstrate aggressive behaviour. We shall, therefore, examine the two aspects of parent-child relationship separately and see the extent to which each of these determine hostility or defiance in the individual.

The question remains whether every persistently hostile person has undergone a history of frustrations. The theoretical analysis suggests that there are many avenues through which aggressive personalities can develop. We certainly cannot satisfactorily explain the development of every hostile boy merely by saying that he has been frustrated (Bandura, 1960). Frequent deprivations throughout childhood may lead to withdrawal reactions or apathy as well as to habitual aggression. Frequent frustrations are not sufficient; other factors may also be necessary for the development of extremely hostile reaction tendencies. However, in the course of this review we will see that aggressive individuals have suffered frequent frustrations from their parents arising out of their general childrearing attitude and their discipline techniques.

Parental coldness and lack of affection is undoubtedly frustrating to the child and many characteristically aggressive individuals seem to have had such a loveless relationship with their
parents. Radkle’s (1946) summary of the research literature up to the end of the world war II suggests that a variety of socialization conditions which probably can be regarded as frustrating to the child, such as parental rejection and parental disharmony, seem to be related to hostility in the child. Glueck and Glueck (1950) pointed that delinquent boys are more likely to have a history of inadequate affectinal relationship with parents than are their less aggressive, more law-abiding peers. Sears, et al (1957) have found that affectionally cold mothers tend to describe their children as highly aggressive, while the college student, offsprings of this type of mother, generally show a relatively high frequency of aggressive responses on the Rozen-weig Picture-Frustration Test (Bornston & Colemen, 1956).

The child must find the care and protection before he can function as an independent being. Being dependent upon his parents, he wants to be valued by them, and he desires their nurturance and protection. Bandura and Walters (1959) contended that the habitual antisocial aggression in boys is often the results of the thwarting of their dependency needs. Dependency strivings are not innate, these psychologists maintained, children have to learn to want help and nurturance from their parents. If they do have strong dependency, the frustration of these desires for help and emotional support, particularly “through a lack of affectional nurturance on the part of one or both .... Parents”, supposedly leads to a “continuing
instigation to aggression”, and weak internalized control against hostile behaviour (Pp. 32-41).

To return to dependency frustrations, McCord, McCord, and Howard (1961) have also obtained indications of little emotional warmth in the mothers and fathers of aggressive boys. After an intensive examination of the case histories of both aggressive (but nondelinquent) preadolescents and more “normal” youngsters, the investigators reported that the parents of the aggressive boys were more rejecting and punitive to their children than were the parents of the nonaggressive boys. Parents of assertive and occasionally aggressive children were generally given ratings between these two extremes.

In general, dimensions of childrearing attitudes viz. restrictiveness versus permissiveness and parental warmth versus hostility have been found to interact in the development of hostility. A number of studies of non-delinquent children (reviewed by Becker, 1964) have indicated that combination of parental hostility and restrictiveness fosters aggression in children while a combination of restrictiveness and warmth results in low overt aggression. Some recent studies have also been done regarding the effect of various childrearing attitudes and behaviour of parents on aggression and have found almost similar results. Bottenberg et al (1974) in a study on German youngmen (21.3 years) found that their ‘acting out aggression’ correlated with their reported rejecting and hostile parent
nal and maternal behaviours. Balswick and Macridas (1975) found that "adolescent rebellion" is the product of a home thought to be patriarchal and unhappy, patriarchal and very restrictive of patriarchal and very permissive. Su, Chein-Wen et al (1979) found that poor ratings for aggressiveness of 3rd grade school children correlated positively with severity of natural punishment, criticism, rejection and general dissatisfaction with child's behaviour. Moszozynak' (1979) found that 6-7 years old polish children's aggressiveness is related with their (a) parents failure to meet basic psychological needs (i.e. security, emotional contact and independence), (b) frequent use of physical punishment and (c) improper control of behaviour. Sen gupta (1980), however, reported low correlations between the perceived parental support and child's motivational disposition for aggressive behaviour in the case of urban as well as rural children.

The effect of early socialization on hostility has been investigated by some investigators- using projective measures. Chorost (1962) using Rosenweig Picture Frustration Test as measure of hostility among adolescents suggested that maternal and paternal authoritarian control attitudes were positively correlated with overt adolescent hostility and paternal warmth attitudes tended to be negatively related to overt hostility. Weatherly (1962) employing TAT measure of aggression concluded that mother's permissiveness was related with low thematic aggression. In a bid
to measure the relationship of maternal childrearing with Rorscharch hostility content, recently a study was made by Singh (1983) on an Indian sample of middle class Sikh school students. It was found that on paternal attitude research instruments, Mothers of high hostile subjects tended to be more strict and seclusive than the mother's of the low hostile subjects. Since dissension between the mother and father is disturbing and prevents the child from getting the nurturance he desire, We also find a history of parental disharmony in the backgrounds of many highly aggressive children conflict within the family is a frequent characteristics of the home lives of juvenile delinquents and other aggressively anti-social youngers (ef. Glueck & Clueck, 1950; Bandura & Walters). But it is by no means confined to the lawless. McCord and his collaborators (1961) have reported that the parents of the aggressive but nondelinquent boys in their sample typically had more frequent fights and less respect for each other than did the mothers and fathers of unaggressive children.

There are different ways to discipline the child. The love-oriented discipline technique is not frustrating while physical punishment is quit frustrating to the child. Parents using love-oriented technique generally rewarded their children by giving love (for example by praising them) and punish non-compliance by threatening to withdraw love (by showing they are hurt or disappointed). They usually also explain to the child how he has behaved incor-
Non love-oriented methods, on the other hand, are based on punishment: physical punishment and or deprivation of privileges. There seems to be little reason to doubt the greater efficacy of the psychological love-oriented methods for the development of conscience and internalized behaviour control. Sears et al (1957) have published data suggesting that the formation of conscience in children is associated positively with parental use of praise and reasoning and negatively with their use of physical punishment. Allinsmith's (1960) study demonstrated that seventh-to-ninth-grade boys with weak internal controls against socially disapproved behaviour — in this case, aggression tended to have parents who had favoured corporal punishment in enforcing their demands. The parents of the youngsters exhibiting habitually strong inhibitions against aggression, in contrast, were more likely to have employed psychological discipline in which they attempted to make their children feel guilty about, or ashamed of moral transgressions.

Bandura's investigations also have obtained significant relationships between parental discipline and the degree of aggressiveness customarily exhibited by the child. In Their study Bandura and Walters (1959) noted that the parents of the boys high in antisocial aggression, in comparison with the parents of the control youngsters, were more likely to resort to physically punishment and deprivation of privileges, and made less use of reasoning, in trying to get compliance with their demands. The two groups of
parents did not differ in the extent to which they explicitly threatened the child with loss of love, and the authors suggested that such a disciplinary technique is relatively ineffective for achieving control over adolescents. Finally, in his later comparison of nondelinquent but highly aggressive school children with markedly withdrawn and inhibited youngsters, Bandura (1960) observed somewhat the same pattern. The parents of the aggressive boys, as seen by the children themselves, seemed to be more punitive and made less use of reasoning than did the parents of the inhibited boys. McCord, McCord and Howard (1961) pointed out that punitive discipline was strongly associated with a high level of aggressive behaviour. Presumably this kind of parental behaviour is highly frustrating to boy's dependency needs. Parental rejection teaches him early in life that other human beings are threatening and aggressive. A significantly lower proportion of the nonaggressive boys than of the aggressive or assertive boys were raised by punitive mothers. In a later study McCord et al. (1963) confirmed their earlier findings corroborating the general findings Beacker et al. (1962) reported that son's hostility was related to mother's use of punishment.

Henry and Short (1954) found that children who were punished for their aggression through love-oriented technique tended to inhibit aggressive and manifest more self-directed aggression, whereas children who had experienced more physical punishment had directed their aggression outward. Eron (1960) reported that
third-grade school children whose parents punished their aggression, displayed more aggression than children who were less punished by their parents. In a later study Eron et. al.(1961) found aggressive boys likely to have fathers who severely punished aggressive department in the home.

Consistent with the earlier findings Sarason, Granzer and Granzer (1965) found that high hostility subjects described their parents as being more punitive than low hostility subjects. This finding subscribes to the earlier finding reported by Hoffman (1963) wherein love-oriented discipline was found to be negatively associated with expression of hostility. In a later study designed to examine moral development in the child. Hoffman and Saltzstein (1967) arrived essentially at the same conclusion. Beside the above mentioned studies large number of some other studies have also reported that power assertive and punitive child discipline techniques employed by parents give rise to aggression in children and adolescents while love-oriented discipline prevents the rise of aggression in them, (Butcher,1965;Cox,1962;Dickens & Hobart,1957;Gorden & Smith, 1965; Hatfield et al, 1967). However in a study on Indian graduate students Singh and Sowaid (1976) obtained no definite relationship between hostility and power-assertive or love oriented discipline.

There is a remarkable consistency in these findings.
The studies reviewed here agree in noting that punitive parental
disciplinary methods (such as physical punishment and depriving
children of privileges) tend to be associated with a high level of
aggression and other forms of emotional behaviour by the children.
Love-oriented disciplinary methods, on the other hand, evidently
facilitate the development of conscience and internalized restraints
against socially disapproved behaviour. Praising the child when he
complies with parental standards and reasoning with him when he
does not, apparently are among the most effective of these
love-oriented techniques.

Whether or not the child deliberately seeks to pattern
himself after his parents, the mother and father can serve as models
for him. Their actions may define the appropriate model of behaviour
in particular situation. He may love or hate his parents, but he copies
their actions in a given situation. Bandura and Huston (1961), in an
experiment have shown this type of process at work. Nursery school
children first interacted with either a nurturant or less nurturant adult
and then were given an opportunity to watch this person (the adult
model) work on a task. In some of the cases the adult model
displayed a good deal of verbal and physical aggression as well as
other forms of behaviour and in other instances did not exhibit any
aggression at all. The results indicate fairly convincing that children
can acquire hostile forms of behaviour merely by observing the
aggressive action of an adult, the children clearly imitated the adult's
reactions. Interestingly enough, although the adult model's prior nurturing affected the degree to which the children copied many of his behaviours, aggression was readily imitated regardless of the quality of the adult-child relationship. This last finding seems to have a parallel in the home lives of many highly aggressive youngsters. These children often copy their parents' habitual forms of behaviour even though they harbour a strong resentment towards them.

Quite a few studies attest to the frequency with which the parents' actions set an example for their children to follow. Allinsmith's (1960) previously mentioned investigation, for example, suggested that boy's typical modes of response to aggression-evoking stimuli were affected by their mother's characteristic way of reacting to emotion-arousing situations. Emotionally controlled mothers tended to have children with relatively strong restraints against aggression, while less controlled mothers had less inhibited boys. Similarly, Bandura and Walters (1959) found that the fathers of the aggressively antisocial youngsters in their survey could have served as aggressive models for the boys to emulate since these men were often fairly hostile and punitive. Bandura (1960) has also hypothesized that this type of modeling influence was one of the chief sources of the differences between the aggressive and inhibited children in his second study. Thus, the mothers and fathers of the inhibited boys were themselves particularly anxious and inhibited, and the aggressive children usually had aggressive parents.
Fathers can serve as aggressive models for their children without being exceptionally aggressive. Aggressive behaviour is associated with the masculine role in our society. A man must be able to display some aggression. He usually is expected to fight back when attacked, for example. This means, then, that boys can learn to exhibit some hostility merely through identifying with their fathers and taking over their roles. However, if their fathers are absent from the home during the formative years of their early childhood (because of death, divorce, or military service) and no suitable adult male substitute is present, they may not learn to act in a thoroughly masculine fashion. According to Sears, Pointlor and Sears (1946) the nursery school-age boys of such absent fathers had a reliably lower level of aggressive doll play than boys whose fathers were not away. A similar difference was not obtained between the father-present and father-absent girls. It may be that the father is particularly likely to be a frustrater to his boy during these preschool years (Perhaps because of Oedipal rivalry), and there is some evidence in the study consistent with such a thesis. However, Sears and his collaborators also suggested that the fathers absence from the home for considerable period of time resulted in an inadequate masculine identification and that this deficient identification had produced relatively strong restraints against hostile behaviour in their sons.

Sears et. al. (1957, p 266) have warned against punishment as a disciplinary technique partly because of modeling
influence. The punitive parent can actually set an aggressive example for his child to copy, they noted. A field study by Levin and Sears (1956) illustrates how such a modeling process might work. They employed the mother's descriptions of the degree of conscience development in their children to construct an index of the strength of the youngster's identification with their parents. Since the formation of a conscience theoretically presupposes identification, children seeming to have strong consciences (they often acted guilty when naughty, for example) were assumed to have identified strongly with their mothers and fathers, while the youngsters showing no or little evidence of a superego (who did not seem to be unhappy when bad and/or who appeared to be affected only by fear of punishment) were said to have little identification with parents. The investigations further assumed that the children in their sample also would be most likely to take over the qualities for their same-sex parent. If punitive parents served as aggressive models for the children who has identified strongly with them, these youngsters, the researches reasoned, should display a relatively high frequency of aggression in doll-play sessions. Their results generally confirmed this hypothesis. For the girls, those showing the greatest proportion of aggressive responses over the two doll-play sessions were the ones who were presumably strongly identified with severely punitive mothers and who lived in females having the mother as the usual punisher. It appears as if aggressive mothers had produced relatively stronger aggressiveness habits in girls strongly identifying with them. The
severity of home punishment for aggression was a relatively unimportant determinant of doll-play aggression for boys, however, perhaps because aggression is characteristic of masculine role. But acceptance of this role in the form of presumed identification with the father did seem to make a difference. In the case of boys, identification was positively related to doll-play aggression only when the father was the chief punitive agent in the family. When the father was the usual punisher, in other words high identification (probably largely with him) seemed to have resulted in strong aggressiveness habits.

However, the research, conducted by Bandura et al (1961, 10962) point to a possible limitation in modeling effects. The Levin and Sears study just reviewed suggested that girls might copy their aggressive mothers. The Bandura et al laboratory findings imply, however, that it is relatively unusual for girls to imitate an adult women's aggressive behaviour. Identification with the aggressive woman could be an important contingency condition determining whether aggressive modeling occurs. Thus, in the first of these studies (1961), as in the earlier Bandura Huston experiment, nursery school children were found to readily imitate the behaviour of an aggressive adult model. But the sex of the model and of the potential imitator made a difference. The aggressive male model was imitated more frequently than the aggressive female, particularly in the case of masculine-typed activity such as physical aggression. More
over, boys exhibited a greater imitation of physical aggression than did girls. Both of these results may have been affected by sex-typing. The adult female probably was less readily copied when she behaved aggressively because the children regarded her aggression as being inappropriate to her sex role, and similar the girls undoubtedly did less imitating of physical aggression because such activity was not consistent with their sex role.

In another study Harris, et. al. (1978) found the influence of race, gender, and contact variables on preadolescents' attitude toward the elderly. They revealed that only race was significantly related to attitudes towards the elderly. White possessed the most positive attitudes and black females the least positive. Result suggested that preadolescent attitudes toward the elderly are culturally related.

Kataev et. al. (1988) found that youth hold their elders in high esteem and evaluate themselves rather critically. One very interesting finding was that the students think that a rise in living standards can set the stage for moral degradation.

Khan (1984) conducted a study entitled 'economic status as a determinant of tension among youth'. The results suggested that the low and high income groups were relatively satisfied, but the middle income group experienced tension.
Robertson and Simons (1989) in a study entitled 'Family factors self-esteem and adolescent depression' found that parental rejection was the only family factor associated with depressive symptoms, once controls were introduced showing both a direct and indirect effect through self-esteem. Self-esteem displayed a strong concurrent association with depression, but contrary to expectation, did not predict subsequent levels of depression, once initial levels of depression were controlled. It was further suggested that this self-blaming attributional style develops in response to a perceived family environment of excessive parental criticism, shaming and belittling.

Willits and Crider (1988) during an investigation found that the transition to adulthood clearly entails changes in attitudes toward traditional morality. Results also indicated that adults expressed less permissiveness concerning youth activities and more permissiveness regarding adult's behaviour.

In a study of Silverberg and Sternberg (1987) the finding indicated that (1) parent's experience of mid-life identity concerns is positively related to the level of emotional autonomy reported by same sex children. (2) mother's but not father's well being was negatively related to the intensity of parent-adolescent conflict, and (3) SES moderates the relation between parental well-being and parent-adolescent relations.
Eckert and Williams (1986) investigated that social unrest, protest and social movement, all characterized by a high rate of youth participation, emerged in western Europe. These movements showed similarities in origins, structures and dynamics, even when concrete causes, political and legal conditions and reaction of political authorities differ greatly. An explanation of youth movements and protest was derived from theories regarding the social process of reality construction, relative deprivation, resource mobilization and value orientation. The weakening of familial control, the rise of juvenile sub-culture due to inter, individual competition and the cult of creativity were found to influence the development of youth movements.

The result of studies conducted by Majoribanks (1986), entitled "Australian Families and Adolescent's Aspiration" suggested that there were ethnic group differences in the extent to which parent aspirations and adolescent's perception of significant others acted as a regulator of the effects of other variables on adolescent's education and occupational aspirations.

Gecase and Schwalbe (1986) studied the relationship among parental behaviour as reported by parents, children's perceptions of parental behaviour, and the effect of each on various aspects of children self-evaluation. Little correspondence was found between parent's report of their behaviour and children's percep
tions of their behaviour. Further children's self-evaluations were much more strongly related to their perception of parental behaviour than to parent’s self-reported behaviour. Boy's self-esteem was found to be more sensitive to the control/autonomy aspect of parental behaviour, girls self esteem was affected more strongly by parental support and participation. In general perception of parental behaviour were somewhat more consequential for adolescent self esteem than were perception of material behaviour, and these parent-child interaction variables were found more strongly related to boys self-esteem than to that of girls.

Meeus et. al. (1986) designed a paradigm named 'administrative obedience' to study obedience in carrying out orders to use a kind of psychological administrative violence that can result in definite harm. The level of administrative obedience was found in a comparable experiment by Milgram (1974).

During the investigation of Patersin et al. (1985) entitled 'Parental Influence and Adolescent Conformity Compliance and Internalization' it was found that dimensions of parental power and parental behaviour predicted two dimensions of adolescent conformity to parents. Many of the parental power and parental behaviour variables both predicted and distinguished between the two dimensions of adolescent's conformity. Internalized conformity and external compliance appeared to be distinctive aspects of the
responsiveness of adolescents to parental influence.

Miller (1986) made a discussion of the social condition necessary for the generation of total obedience in authority relationships. However he did not attend directly to the reciprocal question of how and under what conditions disobedience is constructed. It was concluded that a fuller and pragmatic understanding of Milgram's experimental results and of authority relations in general requires an understanding of triadic interaction patterns and coalition formation process.

In a study of "The power of Obedience" Biggard et al. (1984) found that organizational roles provide actors with moral constructs for the enactment of power. Indeed, actors evaluated each other's acts of power as part of willingness to obey role prescriptions. For a person to sustain power in an organizational setting he or she must self-consciously exercise power so as to signify the awareness of role obligations, Organizational power paradoxically, stems from obedience to roles.

In an illuminating study of Giffner and Gross (1984) on Sex-role behaviour and obedience to Authority, it was found that disobedience to authority is the characteristic of male sex. Additional analysis indicated that order Ss disobeyed more often than younger ones. In another study David (1984) observed that
pressures towards obedience were highly correlated with indicators of cultural development.

In his paper entitled 'The Obedience Pattern' Gendlin (1984) described obedience as a release of self will to a spiritual source rather than to another person, the super-ego, or own's own design. The danger of detachment was also considered and a process of inward listening through which awareness and personal development can be achieved was described.

In an extensive study Chassin et. al. (1989) found constructive deviance to be associated with higher level of health-protective behaviours. Since constructive defiance was more reflective of autonomy than of anticonformity, the adolescent who was non-conventional, creative, assertive, etc. may be more at risk for substance use; however, this adolescent was not rebellious and typically engaged in higher levels of health protective behaviours.

Agnew and Hugeley (1989), in a research work entitled 'Adolescent violence toward parents' tried to analyse the possible contributing factors to the behaviours of such adolescents who assault their parents and arrived at the conclusion that such adolescents have friends who assault parents, approve of delinquency including violence, believe in violence and are weakly attached to parents.
According to Dell (2002), George Bateson's epistemological disqualification of the concept of power, is often understood to imply a corresponding systematic disqualification of the concept of the violence. It was argued that: (1) power and violence belong essentially to the domain of human experience; and (2) human experience cannot be invalidated by theory. Accordingly, it was suggested that the invalidation of power and violence in the domain of systematic explanation should probably be understood both as a deliberate choice that necessarily follows from adopting systematic perspective, and as a fundamental limitation of that perspective.

In a study by Mehta (1998) Indian sample of 50 obedient and 50 disobedient intermediate college students sorted out on the basis of ratings of the teachers according to the criteria of obediency and disobedience were administered Mittal's Adjustment Inventory and Neymann-Kohelesdtl Extraversion-Introversion Test and it was found that obedient students were significantly more adjusted than disobedient students but obedient and disobedient students did not seem to possess any definite type of personality (i.e. extroversion or introversion).