CHAPTER 1

Introduction
INTRODUCTION

Adolescence is the period of transition between childhood and adulthood. G. Stanley Hall (1904) proposed that adolescence is inherently a time of storm and stress. The period of adolescence not only brings about rapid physical changes but also psychological changes and demand for new social roles takes place, which affect the personality and adjustment in later life. Adolescence due to these changes faces a number of crises and dilemmas. Research in past two decades has highlighted the central role of genetics as a major factor contributing to the most troubling and costly outcomes of adolescence risk-taking behaviors (Jaffe et al., 2005; Taylor, Iacono & McGue, 2000). However, there is mounting evidence that genetic influence on a variety of problem outcomes reflect a complex interplay between inherited and environmental risk factors, with genetic risk leading to pathological behavior for some youth only when the primary socializing environment also is adverse (Cadoret, Winokur, Langbehn & Roughton, 1996; Reiss & Leve, 2007; Tienari et al., 2004).

And who else than the family, school, peers are the most significant immediate environment in which child interacts the most and so they definitely are the environments which need to be thoroughly examined in order to help juveniles develop into healthy personalities. So, first we really need to know about what environment means and subsequently need to know about the most primary and the most influencing environment which is, home and school.

Reber (1985) defined environment as “that which surrounds”. The term is generally taken to stand for the total physical and social surroundings of an individual. The term also carries with it the connotation of influence, i.e which is part of a given environment of an organism which has some actual or potential role to play in the life of that organism. Surrounding and everything that affects an organism during its
lifetime is collectively known as its environment. Each human environment has characteristics that affect the behavior of people in many ways. Moos et al. (1974) have described it “like people” environment have unique personalities. Just as it is possible to characterize a person’s personality, environment can be similarly portrayed with a great deal of accuracy and detail.

Home has been described as that secure inner sanctity where we can feel protected and be ourselves (Heidegger, 1996). We can say it’s a place where daily activities are carried out, which in turn provide shape to our life, it’s a place of residence, where an individual lives, rest, can hold personal property. So the concept of home has broader perspective. It is connected with security, safety, family, friends, relationship, comfort, relatives. Saegert and Evans (2003) indicated that an ideal home is not characterized by health hazard but by physical conditions that are always acceptable for both parents and children. Such ideal physical condition would include among others, a proper structure, sanitation, electricity and enough space. Apart from physical conditions, and requirements an ideal home will also provide for physiological and safety needs. Hamachek (1990) indicated that in an ideal home, physiological needs are always satisfied to about 85% whereas safety need are satisfied to about 70%. The notion of home concerns the cultural, demographic and psychological meanings we attach to this physical structure. Altman (1975) an environment psychologist distinguished between five dimensions of residence: (1) permanent vs. temporary, (2) differentiated vs. homogenous, (3) communality vs. non-communality, (4) identity vs. communality, (5) openness vs. closeness. These dimensions are assumed to vary across cultures; however, psychological effects of these variations are largely unknown.
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As we have found in literature human interaction/communication is another fundamental aspect about the ideal home environment. According to Balk (1995), functioning of an ideal home enables individuals to gain independence from and to remain connected with other family members. Parents in ideal home use Democratic and Authoritative methods of parenting. Psychological atmosphere of a home may fall into any of the four quadrants, each of which represents one of the four general combinations: acceptance-autonomy, acceptance-control, rejection-control and rejection-autonomy (Johnson and Medinnus, 1969). Jaffe (1998) indicated that parents in an ideal home are warm, firm, involved and they use reasoning and persuasion to gain compliance, they also hold discussions and encourage children to take part and think creatively. Grebow (1973) reported that “nurturance-affection” and “achievement expectation, demands and standards” constitute two dimensions of parental behavior that exert great influence on development and perpetuation of the individual’s behavior.

Fowler and Fowler (1976) defined home as a fixed residence of a family or household. Some households are headed by both or one parent; some of them include members of extended family also. Home is both a physical place, a complex system of room, space, furnishing and equipment, while as a cognitive concept, it is a center for development of the self of an individual (Weigel-Garrey, Cook, Brotherson, 1998). Weigel-Garrey et al. (1998) defined it as a place where development of the self, other and environment begins.

Bhat and Aminabhavi (2011) defined home environment as the one in which proper reward is given to strengthen the desired behavior, a keen interest in and love for the child, provision of opportunities to express views freely, where parents put less restrictions to discipline the child, not preventing the child from acting independently.
and not continuing infantile care, optimum use of physical and affective punishment, where children are not compelled to act according to parental desire and expectations, where they are neither threatened of being isolated from beloved person nor deprived of love, respect and childcare.

Family is an important part of human being's existence in this world. Family is basically a unit in which parents and children live together. It's key position rest on its multiple functions in relation to overall development of its members, their protection and wellbeing. So, home environment primarily focuses on living arrangements, household crowding and family relationship. Children need a happy and stable family environment and a conductive social network for their overall growth and development. Yet, happy families are not happy all the time. Disagreements and conflicts are a necessary part of living closely together. Both love and hate are to be expected in the intensity of family life and peers interactions, but it is the way negative emotions are handled that makes a difference to family life and social interactions (Parke and Buriel, 1998).

Home environment is widely known to influence all round development of the personality of a child (Joshi and Tomar, 2006). Parish, Dosta & Parish (1981) stated that the environment of home in which a child is reared can advance or hinder wholesome personality adjustment. Family relationships also determine in large measure young person's developing attitudes toward home and family life. It provides significant impact in regulating and integrating the behavioral patterns of an individual. Forsstrom-Cohen & Rosenbaum (1985) described that one of the most important influences upon adolescents is the emotional climate of their families. Some families evidence a prevailing mood of gaiety, joy, optimism and happiness. Other families reflect a climate of fear, depression, cynicism, and hostility, which has a
negative effect on children. Almost every known society has some type of family organization that is intermediate between individual and larger social community (Murdock, 1949).

There are several factors in home environment which are found to have significant effect on the personality of an individual like relationship between parents, parent-child relationship, child rearing practices, socio economic status, parental education, sibling order, parental discipline, family size and family structure (nuclear or joint). Gomel, Tinsley, Parke and Clark (1998) found that sometimes low-income parents tend to see themselves as incapable of fulfilling the needs of child which in turn affect the parent-child relationship and as a result holistic development of child is affected. Research by Doyle, Markiewicz, Brendgen, Lieberman and Voss (2000) indicated that marital adjustment affects the child self-concept and children may either externalize problems or internalize them by developing low self-esteem.

Mutual relationship which family members share among themselves determine overall development of the individual including the social, emotional, physical as well as psychological aspects. As infant progresses into childhood and then into adolescence, family unit remains the crucial guiding influence of his personality development, unfortunately, faulty family patterns are a fertile source of unhealthy development and maladjustment (Patterson, 1992; and Repetti et al., 2002). In every child the seed of living, affectionate interaction is present since birth, what is needed is favorable environment which can foster it and the greatest responsibility lies on the shoulders of parents. Parents are the role model in the home environment, who are supposed to provide for the physical, physiological, social and safety needs of their children. According to McIntosh (2003) adolescents (particularly boys) who come from disadvantaged home environment were more likely to express attitudes inclined
towards violence in school setting. A family environment study by Peleg-Popko and Klingman (2002) revealed that children, who come from homes with poor communication, were more anxious and stressed than those from homes with open communications. Family plays a very important role in positive development, identity formation and self-concept. As suggested by Lau and Kwok (2000) emotional support from family plays a significant effect on adjustment and positive mental health.

Through the kind of relationship family members have among themselves, affect children's personality indirectly or directly. Home acts as a backbone of children's personality, determining their over-all development in social, emotional, physical as well as psychological area. For young children home or family environment is a central influence for emotional as well as cognitive and behavioral development (Bradley, Caldwell and Rock 1988; Bradley et al., 1989). The effectiveness of family functioning in conditioning children's personality and social development has an outstanding importance (Roelfse and Middleton, 1985). Research shows that both overall family system functioning and parental behaviors are positively related to adolescent well-being (Grotevant, 1998; Karavasilis et al., 2003; Kauffman et al., 2000; Miyamoto et al., 2001; Muris et al., 2004; Wolfradt et al., 2002). When the child starts growing up, he tends to spend less time with the family, but the family environment he was raised in his formative years, the relationship he shares with family members have profound mark on adolescent personality. It is time during which his personality is shaping up, his identity is forming, and there is development of sense of independence and control. So if he has good family relationship, the adolescent develops in to well-adjusted individual. One of the causes for children being hostile, dependent, pessimistic, lacking in conscience and having generalized expectation of failure, accompanied by lack of self-confidence is because
of lack of nurturing mother. McKinney (1939); Beaven (1949) found that poorly adjusted adolescents by contrast, have poor family relationship not only in adolescence but also in childhood. Girls with unsatisfactory home environment are found to be supersensitive to have inferiority feelings, to be self-conscious, spiteful. In case of girls with good home environment/adjustment showed none of the above listed behavior patterns (Wolf, 1943).

Family relationships may also influence adolescent behavior indirectly. When strict discipline and very religious atmosphere prevails in home, adolescents are likely to show antisocial behavior. Rutter, Giller & Hagell (1998) reported that antisocial behavior is associated with hostile, critical, punitive and coercive parenting.

From several researches it has been clear that, family or home is the first and foremost socializing agency from which child starts getting his first experience of life.

Freud has also pointed out that the first five years are very crucial for the healthy development of a child. Adler too believed that existence of contradictory traits in the child is not innate; instead he attributed them to the early environment.斯塔特 (1967) found that the personality of the parents, their attitude, their emotional behavior, disposition and the climate of home environment all are crucial factors for the personality development of a child. Child typically enters a group, a social environment called the family, where mother, father (Maio, Fincham & Hyett, 2000; Rohner, 1998), grand-parents (Boon & Brussoni, 1996) and others in the family interact in a multitude of ways with infants, toddlers, young children and adolescents. To some degree, the nature of interaction depends on the personality characteristics of those interacting with youngsters (Clark, Kochanska & Reddy, 2000). O'Leary (1995) found that interaction between a mother and her infant determine how that timid individual respond to other people throughout his/her life. Parents who always
welcome children’s friends to home, who share joys and sorrow with their children and who have enjoyable time with them are more likely to have well-adjusted sons and daughters than the parents whose relationship with their children is less favorable (Stott, 1939). Reiss and Youniss (2004) found that children who involve in fight with their friends have less positive identity formation which in turn was related to relationship with their parents. Conflict between parents is likely to result in a generally unsatisfactory home environment and is related to low self-esteem, poor school performance and emotional problems in children (Ellis-Schwabe and Thornburg, 1986). Poor home environment has been reported to have long term effects on adolescent life-style (Albers et al., 1986; Olsson et al., 1999).

The second most important place beside home where a child spends most of his time is school. These two environments home and school share an influential space in child’s life. So school environment is the second variable studied here, in this research. So in the following text concepts of school environment are discussed.

Education system prepares individuals for their role in society. It shapes self-perception of adolescents, and gives them the foundation for their future participation in society, that is not limited to participation in the work place (Evans, 2006). Thus examination of school environment is necessary in order to attempt to meet and understand the socio-psychological and academic needs of such a significant group.

In early 1960's Stern was one of the first psychologists who used the concept of organizational climate to study institutions of higher education. This concept very rapidly spread to schools and industrial/business organizations. Thus, Fisher, Docker and Fraser (1986) described the history of school climate research that began with the work of Pace and Stern who developed and used college characteristics index (CCI) to study student and staff perception of college and universities in 1950's.
Adolescence is a period when relationship with non-parental adults and peers take an increased meaning because adolescents are seeking support from adults outside the home (Roser et al., 1998). School can provide this support through good quality relationship with teachers and also peer-teacher social support has been positively associated with fewer disruptive behaviors (Ryan and Patrick, 2001).

School is basically one of the important environments which help in overall growth, adjustment of adolescents. According to Sagar and Kaplan (1972), by its very nature, family is the social-biological unit that exerts greatest influence on development and perpetuation of an individual's behavior. Next to family, school provides the most important experience in the process of child development. When child enters school, he or she is presented with new opportunities in terms of socialization and cognitive development. These opportunities are provided in different measures in different schools and may have a direct impact on the cognitive and affective behaviors of students. The nature of this impact can be understood if we devote our research energies to find out environment variables that are most effective in promoting optimum development of each child's potentials. School can be defined as a place where student get-together, share instructions and social interests, attitudes and habits. It is a institution where people learn way of life, mature intellectually and enhance their capacities and skill to cope with adverse circumstances. It plays an important role in shaping individual's personality and in building career as well. School has resources as well as responsibilities that are extremely important in the growth of young members of society. It is one of the significant sources which are capable of bringing changes and producing learning in children.

Schools are likely to exert a positive influence if there is a good fit between the developmental needs of students and affordances of the school environment. Self-
determination theory guides our understanding of children's developmental needs. This theory posits that individuals have three fundamental needs: to be meaningfully connected to others, to have developmentally appropriate choice and self-direction, and thirdly to perceive themselves as competent in their endeavors (Connell & Wellborn, 1991; Deci & Ryan, 1985). Schools that provide opportunities for students to satisfy these needs are likely to be perceived as positive psychological environments.

The concept of environment as applied to education settings, refer to the atmosphere, ambience, tone or settings. School environment or climate may be said to, of all the physical, academic, social and emotional conditions prevailing in the school. It has been variously called as school climate, school atmosphere, the tone of the school or the individuality of the school (Jindal, 1984). Maehr (1991) said that school environment is sometimes referred as the school psychological environment or what others have referred as “school climate”, “school ethos”.

The National School Climate Council (2007) defines school climate in the following way: School climate is based on patterns of people's experience of school life and reflects norms, goals, values, interpersonal relationship, teaching, and learning practices and organizational structures.

School climate can be seen as the quality of school that “helps each individual feel personal worth, dignity and importance, while simultaneously helping create a sense of belonging to something beyond ourselves” (Freiberg & Stein, 1999).

According to Emmons (in Savo, 1996) school climate is quality and frequency of interaction that takes place between the educators and learners, between the learners themselves, between the principal and the educators between the principal and the learners, between the staff at the school and the parents and finally the broader
community. Freiberg (1999) said school climate is a complex construct consisting of multiple components. Various aspects include:

1. The Quality of interpersonal relations between students and teachers.
2. Extent to which students, parents, and staff are involved in collaborative decision making.
3. Extent to which school is perceived as safe and caring place.
4. Degree to which there are high expectation.

Moss (1979) described school climate as the social atmosphere of a setting or “learning environment” in which students have different experiences, depending upon the rules and procedures set up by the teachers and administrators. He divided social environment in three categories:

1. First are relationships which include involvement, affiliation with others in the classroom as well as teacher support.
2. Second is related with personal growth or goal orientation, which includes personal development and self-enhancement of all members of the environment.
3. Finally the third one is system maintenance and system change which contains the orderliness of the environment, the set of rules and strictness of teacher’s in enforcing the rules.

School environment is an umbrella term which covers a variety of aspects like environment of safety, respect, support and challenges for all school members across a wide range of domain’s i.e. physical, emotional, social, and cognitive. School environment has been acknowledged as an important and vital aspect of any school and plays central role in fostering student’s cognitive and affective outcomes.
(Brookover et al., 1978), student's values (Vyskocil & Goens, 1979) and student's personal growth and satisfaction (Bailey, 1979).

Tableman (2004) stated following categories of school environment:

A. A Physical Environment that is welcoming and conducive to learning.

B. A Social Environment which promotes healthy communication and interaction.

C. An Affective Environment that promotes a sense of belonging and self-esteem.

D. An Academic Environment that promotes learning and self-fulfillment.

Discussion of school climate generally distinguishes between two types: Custodial and Humanistic (Beane, Lipka & Ludewig, 1980). The custodial climate is characterized by concern for maintenance of order, preference for autocratic procedures, student stereotyping, punitive sanctions and impersonalness. The humanistic climate is characterized by democratic procedures, student participation in decision making, personalness, respect, fairness, self-discipline, interaction and flexibility.

There is not one commonly accepted "list" of the essential dimensions that colors and shapes school climate. Review of researches, practitioners and scholarly writings suggests that there are ten essential dimensions that colors and shapes our subjective experience in schools: environment, structural, safety, teaching and learning, relationships, sense of school community, morale, peer norms, school-home community partnership (mutual support and ongoing communication), learning community (Cohen, 2006; Freiberg, 1999).

Battistich et al., (1995) studied school climate issues on two levels: a student level within schools; and a school level between schools. Sense of community at
school was positively associated with pupil's attitude and motives, behavior and to a lesser degree academic performance. Recent research suggests that positive school climate is associated with reduced aggression and violence (Karcher, 2002; Goldstein, Young & Boyd, 2008; Brookmeyer, Fanti & Henrich, 2006). Two aspects of school climate (commitment to school and positive feedback from teachers) have been shown to affect student's self-esteem (Hoge et al., 1990). Research has also revealed a relationship between school climate and student self-concept (L.G Cairns, 1987; Heal, 1978; Reynolds et al., 1980). School environment may hinder or support children's development and achievement motivation (Esposito, 1999; Goodenow, 1993). Various aspects of schools such as teacher-student relationships, security and maintenance, administration, student academic orientation, and student behavioral value all of them affects child's personality. It has been found that adolescent’s perception of and experience in school is related to various adjustment outcomes such as self-esteem and health behaviors (Hurrelmann, Leppin and Nordlohe, 1995; Samdal, Natbeam, Wold and Kannas, 1998). Wilson and Wilson (1992) indicated that adolescent’s perceived teacher’s aspiration has a significant effect on adolescent’s aspiration. He established that the most important factors associated with children’s school adjustment and academic achievement is the teacher-student relationship, security of the school, and the parent and school relationship.

Panda, Sahoo and Sahoo (1995) and Halpin and Croft (1963) have identified six types of school climate. Characteristics of these types are given below:

1. Open Climate: An open school climate is one in which administration and faculty member’s behavior is supportive, genuine, and engaged. Here feelings of integration and group co-operation are found and most of the members are satisfied and enjoy their job.
2. Autonomous climate: It refers to an environment in which teachers and administrators use skills such as collaboration, interdependence, and problem-solving and welcome innovation as a sign of improvement and progress. In this type of environment complete freedom is given to the staff members to formulate their own structures and function for greater interactions. Here staff members enjoy a degree of job accomplishment and satisfy their social needs to great extent.

3. Controlled Climate: In the controlled school climate, independence is exhibited among the faculty and leadership is primarily provided by the educational administration. Here authority is more interested in task achievement rather than social need satisfaction. Leadership acts stem from only one side and in a dictatorial manner. Group involvement is never encouraged. Hence, hindrances always prevail in such institution.

4. Familiar Climate: A familiar school climate tends to be less formal and more flexible in response to the needs of students, families, teachers, and administrators. In this climate, both the authority and the teachers show friendly relationship. The principal exercises leadership in an indirect manner and tries to keep production satisfactory and does not hinder the social needs satisfaction on the part of the teachers.

5. Paternal Climate: Paternal climates involve little co-operation of administrators with teachers. This type of school climate has a more rigid atmosphere, faculty members have to work in the way the principal wants but at the same time the principal as a paternal guardian of the school faculty does not ignore the individual interest and hence, his behavior is perceived as
highly considerate. In this type of climate there is very little scope for faculty members to satisfy their social needs and/or derive job satisfaction.

6. Closed Climate: A closed climate is characterized by lack of genuineness, game playing and relational disengagement. A high degree of apathy is found on the part of all members of the organization. Here group members neither secure needs satisfaction nor job satisfaction with respect to their task-achievement and the principal is effective in directing the activities of teachers.

All the above components and climate types are important in creating environment of a school but the combinations of the above may vary according to be situations, hence, proper combination of these can help in developing a healthy environment for teachers as well as boasting's talents, endowment and academic performance of students.

A good school facility supports the educational enterprise. With regard to building a physical environment, Rutter et al., (1979) observed that school environment which includes good working conditions, awareness to pupil needs, and a good care and decoration of buildings, is associated with better outcomes for student.

It is a matter of fact that students, teachers and staff's feeling about their school environment may involve their own attitudes, behavior and group norms. Researchers have proposed that it is the subjective perception of the environment that influences individual student outcomes. Power, Higgins and Kohlberg (1989) suggested that, the school climate scale applied to students should recognize four factors: the normative expectations of student behavior (eg: discipline), the quality of
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student-school relationships, student-student relationships and student’s perception of
the educational opportunities provided by the school.

Boekaerts (1993) contended that supportive academic settings may be
perceived by students as extension of personal resources, and may thus serve to
reduce anxiety, and negative effect can arise in achievement settings.

It is also important to know that poor school climate is likely to generate
school stress. A good school climate has been found to predict not only superior
academic achievement but also positive behavior and high self-esteem (Rutter et al.,
1979; Ousten et al., 1980; Hoge et al., 1990). A poor school climate by contrast has
been reported to relate to pupil’s stress and even psychopathology (Kasen et al., 1990;
Havlinova & Schneidrova, 1995; Kupermine et al., 1997).

In the view of above discussion about school environment, it is essential to
note that the environment in which people live or learn, work is very important for
their survival, success, happiness and development. Thus it is supposed that a healthy
school environment is necessary for psychological, physical, social and emotional
development of the students.

Having done with the description about home and school environment, efforts
are now made to describe the two other variables in the present study which are
aggression and self-concept.

The word aggression is derived from latin word “aggredere” which hold a
variety of meanings that include to approach, to advance, to assail and to attempt.
When we think of aggression it might be seen that everybody understands what
aggression is, but the problem comes when we are supposed to define aggression and
it seems that there is lot of differences regarding its explanation. The simplest
definition of “aggression” and the one favored by those with learning theory or behaviorist approach is that, it is any behavior that hurts others.

But the problem with this definition is that, it ignores the intention of the person who is doing this act, and intention is one very important factor. So, if we ignore intentions, then some actions which are directed towards hurting other person may not be labeled as aggressive because at the end they turned out to be harmless. Suppose an angry man fires a gun at someone but the gun turned out to be not loaded. The act is harmless but still it would be considered as aggressive, because the intention of the man was to kill someone. Thus we need to distinguish between hurtful behavior and hurtful intentions.

Aggression is defined here as any action that is intended to hurt others. Often it is difficult to know someone’s intention but we will accept this limitation because we can define aggression meaningfully only by including intentions.

A second distinction is to be made between the antisocial aggression and prosocial aggression. Normally we think of aggression as bad; but not all the aggressive acts are bad, because some aggressive acts are dictated by social norms and are therefore considered as pro-social like act of law enforcement, appropriate parental discipline etc.

Some aggressive acts may also fall between pro-social and antisocial and they are labeled as sanctioned aggression. This kind of aggression includes acts that are well within their bounds and they do not violate accepted social norms, for example, a trainer who disciplines a disobedient trainee by punishing him or her is usually thought to be well within his rights.

A third useful distinction is to be made between aggressive behavior and aggressive feelings such as anger. Our overt behavior does not always show our inner
feelings. Someone may be quite angry inside but make no outward effort to hurt another person.

Aggression can be seen as a personality trait as well as behavioral act. Aggression as a personality trait can be defined as the extent to which a person acts by means of aggressive behavior in his environment, on the other hand, aggression as a behavior act is any kind of behavior of one animate individual with the goal of physical or psychological harm to another individual.

Dollard et al. (1939) defined aggressive behavior as any sequence of behavior the good response of which is the injury of the other person towards which it is directed. According to Bandura (1973) an adequate definition of aggression must include both injuries, behavior of the predator and the social judgment of the victim. Gilua and Deniels (1969) defined aggression as “the entire spectrum of assertive, intrusive and attacking behavior” and they point out that this definition includes “overt and covert attack, such as defamatory acts as sarcasm, self-directed attack and dominance behavior” as well as “such assertive behavior as forceful and determined attempts to master a task and accomplish an act”. Aggression is sometimes termed as the other side of self-control. Beginning in the late infancy all children display aggression from time to time. As interaction with the siblings and peers increase, aggressive outburst occur more often (Coie & Dodge, 1998; Tremblay, 2000). It is any form of behavior that intends to harm or injure some person, oneself or an object (Bjorkqvist & Niemala, 1992).

Hauber (1980) defined aggression on the road as actual or intended behavior, which the offender supposes will do physical or psychological harm to the victim and which the victim experience as such. So basically this definition says that the aggressors expect that his act will cause physical or psychological harm. Traditionally
aggression has been stressed as the intention to harm another living being (Baron and Richardson, 1994) and not simply, the delivery of harm, i.e. a manifest response "aimed at the injury of a target" (Berkowitz, 1989; Dollard et al., 1939; Feshbach, 1964).

There are two broad categories of aggression. These include hostile, affective or retaliatory aggression and instrumental, predatory or goal-oriented aggression (Behar et al., 1990; Bushman and Anderson, 2001; Berkowitz, 1993; McEllisken et al., 2004). In instrumental aggression, aggressive behavior is used as a means of achieving a goal i.e. the individual wants privilege or space and, in trying to get it, shouts at or otherwise attacks a person who is in the way.

The other type hostile aggression can be of three types:

1. Physical aggression: harming others through physical injury, for example pushing, hitting or punching others or destroying another's property.

2. Verbal aggression: harm others through threats of physical aggression, name calling, verbal teasing.

3. Relational aggression: damages another's peer relationships through social exclusion, malicious gossip or friendship manipulation. It is also called as covert, indirect, psychological aggression.

Although verbal aggression is always direct, physical and relational aggression can be either direct or indirect.

Both, the form of aggression and the way it is expressed changes during childhood years. By the late childhood years boys are more physically aggressive of the two sexes, more often attacking to block the dominance goals that are typical of boys- a difference evident in many cultures (Coie & Dodge, 1998).
Girls have a reputation for being more verbally and relationally aggressive than boys. In adolescence the gender gap in physical aggression widens (Chesney-Lind, 2001).

Children higher either in physical or relational aggression relative to the age-mates tends to remain same overtime (Vaillan-court et al., 2003).

Girls who consistently engage in disruptive behavior in childhood are also likely to have continuing conduct problems (Cote et al., 2001).

There are certain common threads that underlie most of the theoretical approaches to the problem of aggression. Aggression after all, is simply one form of human behavior, and all human activities do have something in common, so too, with aggression (Megargee and Hokanson, 1970).

The first factor we shall call is instigation. By instigation we mean those forces within the individual that motivate drive or impel the person towards the performance of aggressive behavior. Without such motivation it is unlikely that the individual will behave in an aggressive manner. Similarly, a group is not likely to behave aggressively unless it has some members who are instigated towards the performance of aggressive behavior. It has been found that a child having unrealistically high self-esteem paired with high exposure to violence, is a cognitive bias which attribute aggressive intent to others, and an impulsive temperamental style, is a pattern that may lead to chronic bullying (Baumeister, Bushman, & Campbell, 2000; Bernstein & Watson, 1997; Schwartz, Dodge, & Coic, 1993). It has also been seen that high parental aggression towards their children in the form of physical punishment or child abuse, which may be associated with other negative family behaviors and with a child's negative self-concept put the child at risk for becoming
aggressive (Calverley, Fischer, & Ayoub, 1994; Deater-Deckard et al., 1996; Fischer & Ayoub, 1996).

The second set of factors that we shall consider are inhibitions. Inhibitions are factors in the individual personality that oppose the overt expression of aggression. In the absence of internal inhibitions, the individual will probably act on his aggressive instigation; unless (1) there are other competing responses which are stronger, (2) there are external inhibitions present in the environment. Some researchers have argued that introverted, inhibited, and shy children are less likely to become aggressive and perhaps are more likely to be victims of aggression (e.g., Kagan, 1997; Schwartz, Snidman, & Kagan, 1996).

However, all societies have developed taboos against some form of aggressive behavior and most individuals growing up in these cultures learn inhibitions against the overt expression of at least some forms of aggressive behavior.

One's behavior is a function not only of his individual characteristics but also of the situations in which he finds himself. It is these situational factors that form the third group of variables which we must consider in the analysis of aggressive behavior. These situational factors may act either to facilitate or to inhibit the expression of aggressive behavior. The presence of the crowd cheering one might have a facilitating effect, while being confronted by an officer of the law might have an inhibiting effect.

The disagreement about the relative importance of instigation, inhibitions and situational factors pales into insignificance compared with disputes about the origins and nature of these variables.

Both Sigmund Freud and Konrad Lorenz are convinced that aggressive instigation stems from man's basic physiology.
As far as inhibition goes, Lorenz believes that inhibitions have also evolved and therefore must have a biological basis. Freud on the other hand, feels that inhibitions developed in the process of interacting with the environment. The primary inhibitory agent in the individual is according to Freud, the super ego, which develops during the resolution of child's early relationship with his immediate family. So we can notice that individual family/home plays an important role in aggression.

THEORIES OF AGGRESSION:-

1. The role of biological factors: From instincts to the evolutionary psychological perspective: the oldest and probably best known explanation for human aggression is the view that human beings are somehow “programmed” for violence by their basic nature. Such theories suggest that human violence stems from built-in tendencies to aggress against others. The most famous supporter of this theory is Sigmund Freud who believes that aggression stems mainly from powerful death wish possessed by all persons. According to Freud, this instinct is basically aimed at self-destruction, but is soon redirected outwards, towards others.

A related view was proposed by Konrad Lorenz who suggested that aggression springs mainly from an inherited fighting instinct that human beings share with many other species. Presumably this instinct developed during the course of evolution because it helped ensure that only the strongest and most vigorous individual would pass their genes on to the next generation. Though the social psychologists objected that human aggression is genetically programmed. The reasons included (1) Human beings aggress against others in many different ways-everything from ignoring target persons or spreading
false rumors about them. How could such a huge range of behaviors be determined by genetic factors? (2) The frequency of aggressive actions varies tremendously across human societies—being as much as fifty times more common in some societies than in others (Fry, 1998). So social psychologist asked, “How can aggressive behavior be determined by genetic factors if such huge differences exist”? On the basis of these and other differences they concluded that biological and genetic factors play little if any role in human aggression, even though they may influence aggression by other species.

2. Drive Theories: When social psychologists rejected the instinct view by Freud and Lorenz, they countered with an alternative of their own: the view that aggression stems mainly from an externally elicited drive to harm others. This approach is reflected in several different drive theories of aggression (e.g., Berkowitz, 1989; Feshbach, 1984). These theories basically say that external conditions—especially frustration—arouse a strong motive to harm others. This aggressive drive in turn leads to overt acts of aggression.

By far the most famous of these theories is the well-known frustration-aggression hypothesis (Dollard et al., 1939). According to this theory, frustration leads to the arousal of a drive whose primary goal is that of harming some person or objects—primarily the perceived cause of frustration (Berkowitz, 1989).

3. Social Information Processing theory: Another theory that explains aggression is social information processing theory as described by Crick and Dodge (1994). According to this theory, aggressive youth are less competent in their processing of social information than their non-aggressive peers and the
manner by which they process social information makes them more likely to behave aggressively.

Aggressive children also tend to interpret ambiguous social situation in a way that attributes hostile intent to others, even when information about another's intention is unavailable (Berkowitz, 1989; Dodge & Frame, 1982; Dodge & Somberg, 1987; Feshbach, 1989; Gouze, 1987; Yoon, Hughes, Cavell & Thompson, 2000). A child who is accidentally bumped in line may push back hard, assuming that the other child bumped her/him on purpose. This child may be hostile (also called reactive) aggressor. These children often have hostile attribution bias, or hostile attribution of intent; they see other strike out angrily in retaliation or self-defense (Crick & Dodge, 1994; De Castro, Veerman, Koops, Bosch, Moushouner, 2002; Waldman, 1996).

Rejected children and those exposed to harsh parenting also tend to have a hostile attribution bias (Coie & Dodge, 1998; Masten & Coatsworth, 1998; Weiss et al, 1992). It has been found that children who are rejected by their peers may be denied the opportunity to learn proper social skills, such as empathy and adaptive social information processing. This is associated with aggressive behavior by these children. One study found that children who are rejected in the first grade had higher levels of teacher-reported aggression in fifth grade, which was almost twice as high as their non-rejected peers (Dodge et al., 2003). Children's tendency to develop biased patterns of processing social information as a function of peer rejection accounted for a significant portion of this effect.

4. Social learning theory: Albert Bandura, one of the leading proponents of social learning theory, contends that people learn when to aggress, against whom to
aggress and how to aggress (Bandura, 1979; Bandura & Walters, 1963). It can occur through both direct and indirect means. Any behavior which is rewarded or is reinforced has more chances of it occurring in the future also. Therefore, if people act aggressively and receive rewards, they are more likely to act aggressively at some later point. The rewards could be material, such as candy or money, or they could be social, such as praise or increased status and self-esteem (Branscombe & Wann, 1994). They also viewed that observational learning requires no direct reinforcement to the learner. It generally takes place in a social situation involving a model and an imitator. The imitator observes the model and experiences the model’s behavior and its consequences vicariously; this process is called vicarious reinforcement. Bandura believed that nearly all learning that takes place through instrumental learning, can also take place vicariously through modeling. Many behaviors can be learned at least partly through modeling eg: students can watch parents read, or see someone acting bravely in a fearful situation. Aggression can be learned through models. Many researches indicates that children become more aggressive when they observed aggressive or violent models and then if a child is rewarded for being aggressive, then that behavior is positively reinforced and is more likely to be repeated. Children are most likely to pay attention to and model the behavior of those with whom they have a nurturing relationship and who also have social control over them (Bandura & Huston, 1961). Crick et al., (1999) theorized that children may learn socially aggressive behaviors through observation of their parent’s socially aggressive behavior in the marital relationship and in the parent-child dyad. The child then models the behavior in their own relationship with their peers. Grotpeter
and Crick (1997, as cited in Crick et al., 1999) provided evidence to support this theory in a study that found socially aggressive children to have parents who are both overtly and socially aggressive toward each other. Children who were both overtly and socially aggressive had parents who were socially aggressive towards their children. So, Parents are prime candidates as role models, but behavior can also be observed and modeled from television, books and other mass media sources (Basow, 1986)

FACTORS SUSTAINING AGGRESSION:

What produces an aggressive child? Why are some children more aggressive than the other ones? Recently, researchers have made lot of progress in finding out the environmental and personal factors that sustain aggression. Although some children especially who are impulsive and over reactive are at risk for aggression, but whether they becomes aggressive or not depends on the various environmental factors.

Impact of television on aggression: In today's industrialized societies exposure to television and media is becoming enormous. Children's see a great amount of violence on television even with the rise of internet, television remains the dominant youth media.

Experimental and longitudinal studies support a causal relationship between watching television violence and acting aggressively (Coie & Dodge, 1998; Geen, 1994). Children especially whose parents use harsh discipline are more vulnerable than adults, to the influence of televised violence (Coie & Dodge, 1998). Watching media violence, also leads to desensitization effect i.e. after viewing many vivid scenes of violence, individuals becomes hardened to the pain and suffering of other person; they experience less emotional reaction to such cues than was originally true
Inirp4uc1ron (Baron, 1974a), and this may lessen their own restraints against engaging in aggression.

**Influence of school and peer on aggression:** Over the past few decades researches have tried to show the link between development of aggressive behavior and school environment (Barth, Dunlap, Dane, Lochman and Wells, 2004; Warren, Schoppelrey, Moberg and McDonald, 2005). Classroom with high rates of aggressive behavior promote aggression in individual children (Barth, Dunlap, Dane, Lochman and Wells, 2004) and these effects are relatively permanent (Kellan, Ling, Merisca, Brown and Lalongo, 1998; Thomas, Bieman and The conduct problems prevention research group; 2006; Warren et al., 2005).

Similarly peer acceptance is also found to be linked with aggression. Peer acceptance refers to the extent to which a child is viewed by a group of his own age member such as classmates as worthy social partner. It has been found as a powerful predictor of current and later psychological adjustment.

Rejected children, especially, are unhappy, alienated, poorly achieving children with low self-esteem. Peer rejection in childhood is also strongly associated with poor school performance, absenteeism, dropout, substance use, antisocial behavior and delinquency in adolescence and with criminality in adulthood (Bagwell, Newcomb & Bukowski, 1998; Parker & Asher, 1987). There are aggressive children among both popular as well as rejected children. Popular antisocial children's peer acceptance offers some protection against lasting adjustment difficulties (Coie et al., 1995; Prinstein & Greca, 2004).

**Personal Causes of Aggression:** It has been seen that some persons are “primed” for aggression by their personal characteristics. There can be several traits or characteristics that seem to play an important role in aggression. Researchers have
found that people of type A behavior pattern are found to be more aggressive than type B (Baron, Russell & Arms, 1985; Carver & Glass, 1978; Berman, Gladue & Taylor, 1993). Additional findings indicate that type A are truly hostile people, they are more likely than type B to engage in what is known as hostile aggression (Strube et al., 1984).

The second important personal characteristic that influences aggression is hostile attributional bias (Dodge et al., 1986). This term refers to the tendency to perceive hostile intentions or motives in other's actions when these action are ambiguous. Results of many studies offer support for the potential impact of this to be another important personal factor in the occurrence of aggression.

Another personal factor found related to the occurrence of aggression is Narcissism. Studies by Bushman and Baumeister (1998) suggest that persons high in narcissism react with exceptionally high levels of aggression to slight feedback from others that threatens their inflated self-image.

Physiology has also found to affect aggression. Several brain structures play important roles, particularly structure of the limbic system, including the amygdala and the hypothalamus (Weiger & Bear, 1998). Another factor is the sex hormone testosterone. Violent criminals have higher levels of testosterone than do non-violent criminals (Rubin, Reinisch & Haskett, 1981).

Then it has also been seen that males are more aggressive than females. Research findings indicate that males are more likely than females to engage in various forms of direct aggression-action that are aimed at the target and that clearly stem from the aggressor (Bjorkqvist, Osterman & Hjelt-Back, 1994). However females are more likely than males to engage in various forms of indirect aggression. Research findings indicate that gender difference with respect to indirect aggression
are present among children as young as eight year old and increase through age fifteen (Bjorkqvist, Lagerspetz, and Kaukiainen, 1992, Osterman et al., 1998), and they seem to persist in adulthood as well (Bjorkqvist, Osterman & Hjelt-Back, 1994; Green, Richardson & lago, 1996).

**Impact of the home environment on aggression:** Aggressive behavior tends to be bred from early childhood by a combination of stressful home atmosphere; harsh discipline; lack of maternal warmth and social support; exposure to aggressive adults and neighborhood violence. A negative early relationship with a rejecting mother is an important factor. In longitudinal studies, lack of maternal warmth and affection in infancy has predicted aggressiveness in early childhood (Coie & Dodge, 1998; Mackinnon-Lewis, Starnes, Volling & Johnson, 1997).

The same child-rearing practices that undermine moral internalization and self-control are related to physical and relational aggression. Love withdrawal, power assertion, negative comments and emotions, physical punishment and inconsistent discipline are linked to antisocial behavior from early childhood through adolescence, in children of both sexes and in many cultures (Capaldi et al., 2002; Chen et al., 2001; Yang et al., 2003).

Negative parent-child relationships may set the stage for prolonged, destructive siblings conflicts, in which children imitate their parent’s hostile behavior. These coercive family processes may foster aggressive tendencies that are carried over to peer relations (Mackinnon-Lewis et al., 1997).

Parents of children who become antisocial often fail to reinforce good behavior and are harsh or inconsistent, or both, in stopping or punishing misbehavior (Coie & Dodge, 1998). Parents who back down when confronted with a preschooler's coercive demands (such as whining or yelling when scolded for not going to bed) may
reinforce repetition of the undesirable behavior (Patterson, 1995). On the other hand, harsh punishment, especially spanking, often backfires; children who are spanked not only suffers frustration, pain, and humiliation (which can spurs to aggression) but also see aggressive behavior in an adult model. Vitaro et al., 2000 stated that parents besides fostering aggression directly can also encourage it indirectly, through poor supervision of children. The most comprehensive study of the early determinants of aggression can be found in the work of Sears, Macoby and Levin (1957). From carefully executed interviews with 379 New England mothers (and other sources of data) these researchers concluded that aggression in small children-defined as “behavior intended to hurt or injure someone” was associated with such environmental antecedents as parental permissiveness for aggression, the use of physically punitive discipline, and maternal lack of self-esteem.

So the environment the child receives from infancy becomes very crucial factor in determining the reasons behind aggression in the later stages of his life.

Last but not the least the fourth variable of the study is self-concept. The following description helps us in understanding the concept of self-concept and its importance in today’s scenario to be studied.

Perceptions one gain over whole period of life, none has more profound importance than the perceptions we hold about our own personal existence, our concept of who we are and how we fit into the world.

The real challenge in the field of psychology is to predict individual behavior, to understand a person and to know not only how he is like with others but also in which ways he is unique and why. In order to understand this, self-concept plays a significant role. In psychology self-concept generally refers to the “composite of ideas, feelings and attitude people have about themselves” (Hilgard, Atkinson &
Atkinson, 1979). Raimy (1943) who first defined self-concept said of it: "The self-concept is more or less organized perceptual object resulting from present and past self-observation... (it is) what a person believes about himself. Self-concept is the map which each person consults in order to understand himself, especially during moments of crises or choices". He showed, how self-concept serves as an executive in that it represents for individual a way to make a variety of decisions with some consistency.

Various psychologists have tried to defined self-concept and they believed that it is a very necessary central concept in psychology, as it provides the perspective from which individual's behavior could be understood. Allport (1961) has described "self-concept as something of which we are immediately aware. We think of it as the warm, central private region of our life. As such it plays a crucial part in our consciousness (a concept broader than self), in our personality (a concept broader than consciousness) and in our organism (a concept broader than personality). Thus it is some kind of core in our being.

Baumeister (1999) defined self-concept as "the individual's belief about himself or herself, including the person's attributes and who and what the self is".

The term self-concept refers to the ordered set of attitudes and perceptions that an individual holds about him/herself (Wolffie, 2000; Woolfolk, 2001; and Tuttel & Tuttel, 2004). Self-concept is defined as the value that an individual places on his or her own characteristics, qualities, abilities and actions (Woolfolk, 2001).

According to Snygg and Combs (1949) self-concept refers to "those parts of the phenomenal field which the individual has differentiated as definite and fairly stable characteristics of himself". Thus, they viewed the self-concept as the nucleus of
a broader organization which contains incidental and changeable as well as stable personality characteristics.

Roger's (1951) thought self-concept as "an organized configuration of perception of the self which are admissible to awareness. It is composed of such elements as the perception of one's characteristics and abilities: the percepts and the concepts of the self in relation to others and the environment: the value qualities which are perceived as associated with experiences and objects, and goals and ideals which are perceived as having, positive or negative value".

Roger (1959) considered that self-concept has three different components:

1. Self-image: refers to the views a person have about oneself.
2. Self-esteem or self-worth means how much value a person place on oneself.
3. Ideal self is the self that a person would like to be.

As long as there is harmonious relationship between real self and ideal self, the individual remains happy and satisfied but as soon as individual realizes the discrepancy between his ideal-self and real-self there arises sadness, anxiety, dissatisfaction in the individual. Arai (2001) found smaller the positive ideal-real discrepancy, and the larger negative ideal-real discrepancy, the higher is the self-acceptance score. Schiffrnan et al., (2001) also described that self-concept consist of four components, actual self-concept, ideal self-concept, social self-concept and ideal social self-concept. Within his framework, actual self-concept refers to the present way in which individual perceive themselves (reality), whereas, the ideal self-concept refers to the manner in which they would like to perceive themselves. Social self-concept refers to the way individual believes others perceive them, while ideal social self-concept represents the way the individual desires to be perceived by others.

Similarly Burns (1982) said that self-concept comprises of three main elements:
1. The identity of the subject or self-image referred to as the perceptions of him/herself.

2. The self-esteem which is related to the value individual attach to a particular manner in which they see themselves.

3. A behavior component, which means how self-concept influence and formulates individual’s behavior (Machargo, 1997; McClum and Merrell, 1998; Zagol, 2001 and Tuttel & Tuttel, 2004)

Self-concept and self-esteem are related and complimentary i.e. a positive self-concept implies positive self-esteeam and vice-versa (Burns, 1982).

Purkey (1988) defined self-concept as the sum of a complex, organized, and dynamic system of learned beliefs, attitudes and opinions that each person holds to be true about his or her personal existence. It is believed that each person’s belief provide consistency and predictability in behavior. According to Klein, Loftus and Burton (1989) and Van Hook and Higgin (1988) self-concept is an organized collection of beliefs and self-perceptions about oneself, including one’s attitudes, knowledge and feelings regarding abilities, appearance and social relationships.

Epstein (1973) and Oyserman and Packer (1996) referred that self-concept is the sum total of a person’s thoughts and feelings which defines the self as an object. It is a “theory” of individual’s personal behavior, capabilities and social relationships that he/she constructs in the course of social interaction beginning with immediate family members (e.g., parents, siblings, relatives, etc.) and then broadening to interactions with those beyond the family such as peers and the general community.

Further, Kalliopuska (1984) enumerated three components which help in building self-concept of an individual. These are (1) cognitive components, which are connected with the qualities and functions of self evaluation and social interaction, (2)
affective components, which include the person's feelings towards himself/herself, (3) behavioral components, which refers to those connotations with which the individual behaves in ways, which may either underestimate or appreciate himself/herself.

Self-concept has at-least five characteristics. It is organized, dynamic, complex, consistent and learned.

1. Self-concept as an organized structure; Purkey and Stanley (1991) agree that self is characterized by internal harmony and orderliness. Each person tries to maintain an organized set of internal belief and external behavior and there must be order and harmony in the process. It is generally the stable and organized quality of self-concept that gives consistency to the personality.

2. Self-concept as a complex structure: Self-concept consists of a lot of personal beliefs and attitudes that decides how the individual will act or react to any object in its environment. Self-concept is multi-dimensional; it includes one's body image, intellectual aspirations, social goals and moral ideas. Different dimensions, which make the self-concept to be complex, integrate and form a totality in one's self-image and a person is viewed as whole.

3. Self-concept as dynamic structure: Self-concept is not inherited; it is something which is learned. Since its development is considered as continuous process, so there is constant flow of new ideas and discarding of old ideas. Purkey (1970) emphasized that self-concept is not a static entity, but a dynamic construct, constantly evolving internal state. The self as an instinctive, but developing as a process of experience, possessing infinite capacity for growth and change.

4. Self-concept as a consistent structure: Each person while growing acquires expectation about what behavior is appropriate to any particular situation. And
these reactions become quite consistent with his self. Thus self-concept is seen as consistent structure; without this consistency in behavior, it is difficult to imagine a stable personality.

5. Self-concept is learned: No one is born with a self-concept. It emerges during our early childhood and is molded overtime by our experiences as we mature.

Shavelson, Hubner and Stanton (1976) postulated that self-concept in general term is one’s perception of self. This is basically derived from interaction with significant other’s in our life, by self-attribution and the overall experience that he gains in the social environment. They identified self-concept as being hierarchical and complex. The main self-concept consists of the general self-concept. This general self-concept is broken down into academic and non-academic self-concept. The academic self-concept consists of various subjects like English, Social Science, Mathematics and Science etc. The non-academic self-concept however consists of social, physical and emotional self-concepts. The social self-concept refer to peer and significant other’s self-concept, the emotional self-concept can be seen as self-explanatory and physical self-concept consisted of physical ability and how the individual perceived physical appearance (Hattie, 1992; Waugh, 1999). Erickson (1968) suggested that it is during adolescence that the social and emotional self becomes particularly important.

As far as development of self-concept is concerned, the first and most basic concept of self (the primary self) is, as Glasner (1961) has pointed out formed “within the womb of family relationship”. Other concepts of self (secondary concepts) are acquired in other group environment outside the home. The primary self-concepts will affect selection of situations in which secondary concepts of self are formed. Child’s self-concept includes physical and psychological self-images. Physical self-images
are generally formed first: they relate to child's general appearance, its attractiveness or unattractiveness, its sex appropriateness or un-appropriateness and to the importance of the different part of his body to his behavior and the prestige they give him in the eyes of the world. Child's psychological self-images are based on his thoughts, feelings and emotions; they consist of the qualities and abilities that play a role of importance in his adjustment to life, qualities such as courage, honesty, independence, self-confidence and aspirations of different types. As he grows older, these self-concepts gradually fuse and he perceives himself as unified individual.

Lewis (1990) suggested that development of self-concept has two aspects viz., existential and categorical self. Existential self is "the most basic part of the self-schema or self-concept; the sense of being separate and distinct from others and the awareness of the constancy of the self" (Bee 1992). Children realize that they exist as a separate entity from others and they continue to exist overtime and space. It begins as young as two or three months old and arises in part due to the relation child has with the world. Second is categorical self after realizing his existence, child becomes aware that he or she is also an object in the world, which can be experienced and which has properties (eg age, skill, gender). In early childhood categories with which the children demarcate themselves are very concrete like height and color but later on in life it starts including psychological traits as well.

Self-concept, which refers to the cluster of the most private meanings a person refers to his/her "self" is not an end or accomplished product at birth. It is not a reality at birth but is open to innumerable potentialities. It is something, which continuously develops, and how it develops and what its constituent attitudes will depend upon the family and psychological environment in which the individual is brought up.
The home environment in which a child is brought up has a significant effect on child’s self-concept. Not only the parents but the experiences that child have with other members of the family has profound effect in developing his self-concept. The child self-concept develops as a result of social interaction. Essential to social interaction are the issues of “empathy, trust, nurturance and expectations” (Hattie, 1992). In early childhood child’s developing self-concept is largely influenced by parental evaluations, interests and expectations” (Hattie, 1992). Mother and father affect the self-concept differently. Messages from mothers affect different aspect of a child’s self-concept than the messages communicated by fathers (Dailey, 2009). This study suggests that challenges from mother have significant effect on the self-esteem of a late adolescent, with confirmations from the father having a greater influence on the personality of an adolescent. Still, the confirmation of father does have a significant influence on the self-esteem of the child, but father’s confirmation holds greater weight during the earlier stages of adolescents. He also offered an explanation for this change in importance from father in earlier adolescence to the growing importance of challenges offered by mother during the latter part of adolescence. This suggestion made by Dailey (2009) as to why father’s confirmation is more influential during the earlier stage of adolescence is the idea that fathers are not expected to be the primary nurturer of children, and therefore, the messages of confirmation communicated by the father are held with more weightage because they are less expected.

A healthy positive feedback by parents to children about their activity can be very helpful for developing positive self-concept and confidence in them. As Kuppuswamy (1954) explained that “the self-concept is not a finished product at birth, but is something which develops and how it develops, what its constituent
attitude are, depend upon the family in which the individual is brought up with all the social norms of the group to which his family belongs and the education and experiences of each individual”. Statements made by his parents, their praise or blame contribute to the development of a concept of self. The Family plays a very important role especially in positive development, identity formation and self-concept. In-fact it is assumed that a healthy self-concept provide the right direction to the life as it helps in making right decisions. In this regard Franken (1994) stated that there is a great deal of research which shows that self-concept is perhaps the basis of all motivated behavior. It is the self-concept that gives rise to possible selves and it is possible selves that create the motivation for behavior. Hence, it helps an individual to know about possibilities and to set goals and motivate them to behave in a way which will lead to achievement of those goals.

Child’s relationships with people outside home are equally important. How people outside the home treat him, what they say about him, and what status he achieves in the group strengthen or modify the self-concept learned in the home environment (Brandt, 1957; Brown, 1954). The various factors which affect the child’s concept of self includes school demands, school opportunities, religious affiliation, opinions of peers, parents expectations, family personal problems, family economic problems, physical state of the child, biological maturation, impact of radio, television etc (Crow and Crow, 1962). According to Gadeyne et al., (2004) to develop child’s positive self-concept, parents need to provide a harmonious household climate, full of happiness and have adequate necessities. While at school teacher’s needs to provide a conclusive learning environment and be sensitive to psychological needs of the students. According to Leung et al., (1998) school influence is very important in developing student’s personality as the process of socialization at home should be
carried out further in schools. Thus teachers have direct influence on a child’s feelings, inspirations and attitudes. Buri (1991) pointed out that teachers play an important role in developing the self-concept among children. Teacher’s judgment of a child and what they do to the child has an impact on self-concept.

In adolescent, the concept of self is further colored by psychological and social relations (Clarke- Stewart & Friedman, 1987). Young adolescents are aware of their self-awareness and they know that people can think about their own experiences. Later in adolescence, people come to understand that some mental events are beyond conscious control. The environment plays an important role in building or influencing the concept of self. So the concept is just not formed by direct influence of others, although that can take place, but through taking other’s perspectives towards ourselves (Wicklund & Eckert 1992).

From above description about self-concept it makes us pretty sure that it is an important factor in an individual’s life and is also very important in order to shape the personality of a person in the right direction helping him to make decisions which can lead him to the path of success or failure.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY:-

The researcher has opted for the present research to study home and school environment as the determinants of aggression and self-concept of advantaged and disadvantaged school children. In today’s era of cut throat competition it has largely become important to have a control, adjusted behavior to survive. As an adult, the responsible behavior can only be achieved if roots of early childhood upbringing have been good. Powell (1963) stated that many of the values, attitudes, and interests that are part of an individual’s adult behavior had their beginnings and indeed were often
fully crystallized through the early influences of home and family. So, the researcher wanted to, deeply investigate how the environment of home and school can affect various aspects of an individual's personality. In the present study researcher has categorized school as advantaged and disadvantaged. Schools which had proper infrastructure and hygiene, which focused on extra-curricular activities, a good teaching environment, where students also scored high in academic, were termed as advantaged while schools which lacked in all the above mention things were termed as disadvantaged schools.

Aggression is generally defined as any behavior that intents to harm another person who does not want to be harmed (Baron and Richardson, 1994). Early aggression has been related to a host of social problems in adolescence and adulthood, including substance abuse, unconventionality, and low achievement (Brook and Newcomb, 1995). It is found to be related to various mental health problems in children, including externalizing disorder such as oppositional defiant disorder and conduct disorder, as well as internalizing disorder like depression and anxiety (American Psychiatric Association, 1994). The family environment and the school environment have regularly been linked in the scientific literature to psychological and behavioral adjustment in the adolescent period (Estevez, Musitu and Herrero, 2005; Stevens, De Bourdeaudhuij and Van Oost, 2002). So, one of the aim of present research was to study how the most primary and important environment of home and school will affect the aggression and these environment being so wide, so what are those factors about these environments in particular which influences aggression the most.

As child moves into adolescence, he or she faces different challenges, stressors and good opportunities. An important factor that helps children to pass
through all this is positive self-concept. Self-concept of a person includes a composite of their feelings, a generalized view of their social acceptance and their personal feelings about themselves (Belmore and Cilleson, 2006). Researches have shown that higher levels of self-concept are linked to various educational outcomes such as academic effort, coursework selections, educational aspirations and academic achievement (Marsh, 1990a; Marsh and Craven, 1997; Marsh and Hau, 2003). And as Shavelson, Hubner and Stanton (1976) in defining self-concept puts that it is formed from experiences and relationships with the environment, where significant people play an important role. So the researcher wanted to find out what are those factors of these environment in particular which affects the self-concept and also during the exhaustive survey of literature, researcher did not came across any research which tried to study aggression and self-concept taking into account both home and school environment and in addition the types of school (subsamples: advantaged and disadvantaged schools). So, the researcher wanted to combinedly explore all the variables.

OBJECTIVES:-

1. To determine the influence of home environment and its dimensions (control, protectiveness, punishment, conformity, social isolation, reward, deprivation of privileges, nurturance, rejection, permissiveness) on aggression and self-concept for total sample (advantaged and disadvantaged school children).

2. To determine the influence of home environment and its dimensions (control, protectiveness, punishment, conformity, social isolation, reward, deprivation of privileges, nurturance, rejection, permissiveness) on aggression and self-concept of advantaged school children.
3. To determine the influence of home environment and its dimensions (control, protectiveness, punishment, conformity, social isolation, reward, deprivation of privileges, nurturance, rejection, permissiveness) on aggression and self-concept of disadvantaged school children.

4. To determine the influence of school environment and its dimensions (creative stimulation, cognitive encouragement, acceptance, permissiveness, rejection, control) on aggression and self-concept for total sample (advantaged and disadvantaged school children).

5. To determine the influence of school environment and its dimensions (creative stimulation, cognitive encouragement, acceptance, permissiveness, rejection, control) on aggression and self-concept of advantaged school children.

6. To determine the influence of school environment and its dimensions (creative stimulation, cognitive encouragement, acceptance, permissiveness, rejection, control) on aggression and self-concept of disadvantaged school children.

7. To determine the difference between boys and girls on self-concept and aggression for total sample (advantaged and disadvantaged school children).

8. To determine the difference between boys and girls on self-concept and aggression in advantaged school children.

9. To determine the difference between boys and girls on self-concept and aggression in disadvantaged school children.

**HYPOTHESIS:-**

Formulation of hypotheses is a very important part of the research investigation. A scientific investigation starts with statement of a solvable problem called hypothesis. A hypothesis is a presumption which provides the bases for
investigation and ensures the proper direction in which the study should proceed (Michael, 1985). Therefore, hypotheses are highly important in every scientific investigation because they work as instrument of theory, have a prediction values, and also they are powerful tools for the advancement of knowledge and in making interpretation meaningful (Kerlinger, 1983).

**H1.** Home environment and its dimensions (control, protectiveness, punishment, conformity, social isolation, reward, deprivation of privileges, nurturance, rejection, and permissiveness) will influence aggression and self-concept for total sample (advantaged and disadvantaged school children).

**H2.** Home environment and its dimensions (control, protectiveness, punishment, conformity, social isolation, reward, deprivation of privileges, nurturance, rejection, and permissiveness) will influence aggression and self-concept of advantaged school children.

**H3.** Home environment and its dimensions (control, protectiveness, punishment, conformity, social isolation, reward, deprivation of privileges, nurturance, rejection, and permissiveness) will influence aggression and self-concept of disadvantaged school children.

**H4.** School environment and its dimensions (creative stimulation, cognitive encouragement, acceptance, permissiveness, rejection, and control) will influence aggression and self-concept for total sample (advantaged and disadvantaged school children).

**H5.** School environment and its dimensions (creative stimulation, cognitive encouragement, acceptance, permissiveness, rejection, and control) will influence aggression and self-concept of advantaged school children.
H6. School environment and its dimensions (creative stimulation, cognitive encouragement, acceptance, permissiveness, rejection, and control) will influence aggression and self-concept of disadvantaged school children.

H7. There is no difference between boys and girls on self-concept and aggression for total sample (advantaged and disadvantaged school children).

H8. There is no difference between boys and girls on self-concept and aggression for advantaged school children.

H9. There is no difference between boys and girls on self-concept and aggression for disadvantaged school children.