CHAPTER-IV

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Present investigation was conducted to study the variation in aggressive behaviour and values across subcultural dimension (rural/urban) and generation. Further, contribution of values, guilt reactions and insecurity to aggression was also studied.

DESIGN:

An ex post facto design was used to study variations in aggressive behaviour among rural/urban respondents of three subsequent generations and to explore a casual link between values and aggression via mediating variables such as insecurity and guilt reactions.

SAMPLE:

Multi stage purposive sampling was used for the selection of sample. The sample of the present study was limited to Haryana and a comparison was made between rural/urban respondents in order to determine whether aggressive behaviour is subject to urban environmental and social factors. Further, the sample was stratified across three generations. Respondents for the three generations group were taken from the same families i.e., (three subsequent generations) in order to reduce within group variance. The study was restricted to male respondents, as earlier researches had reported clear cut gender differences in aggression and values (Eagly &
Steffen, 1986). In order to obtain a sample of urban/rural respondents, initially four districts i.e. Rohtak, Jind, Jhajjar and Bhiwani were selected on purposive basis. Urban area was identified as the district headquarters and rural area as a village in the respective district with a Government Senior Secondary (G.S.S.) School. Initially, male students (senior secondary classes) of G.S.S. Schools were contacted at the respective schools, and respondents who were residing with their father and grandfather were requested to participate in the study. Their fathers/grandfathers were contacted and those respondents, who along with their father and grandfather, voluntarily agreed to participate in the study were selected. The total sample was divided as follows:

Table 1 Breakdown of Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (N=300)</th>
<th>Rural (N=150)</th>
<th>Urban (N=150)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Son (n=50)</td>
<td>Son (n=50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Father (n=50)</td>
<td>Grandfather (n=50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Father (n=50)</td>
<td>Grandfather (n=50)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MATERIAL

For obtaining a measure of aggression, values, guilt reactions and security/insecurity, a number of standardized questionnaires/scales were used. These have been listed in Table 2.

Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggressive Behaviour</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Mediating variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Aggression scale</td>
<td>A. Personal value questionnaire</td>
<td>A. Fear of punishment scale*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Anger expression scale</td>
<td>B. Mechanisms of moral disengagement scale*</td>
<td>B. Need for reparation scale*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C. Security/insecurity Inventory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These scales were available in English, so Hindi translations was done by the investigator.

Rationale for selection of measure of aggression and values:

Aggressive behaviour has been considered to be a multi componential concept, which has cognitive, conative and behavioural components. Aggression is considered to be personal disposition and generally implies destructive behaviour towards other persons or objects, while anger is viewed as an emotional state which is the result of a blockage in goal achievement. Anger does not always lead to aggression, but rather requires the presence of suitable cues to instigate aggressive responses. Therefore, two measures of aggressive behaviour i.e. aggression and anger expression which measured the cognitive/behavioural aspect were considered for the present studies.
Values are internalized social norms and attitudes which regulate the behaviour of an individual. They are in ingrained within the individual as a process of socialization. However, disengagement – i.e. removal of the controlling influence of self sanctions, has powerful impact on the behaviour of the individual. Therefore, two tools were used to measure values, one which provided a measure of social/personal values. The second provided a measure of disengagement from self/social sanctions i.e. moral disengagement.

Among the various variables which have been expounded as important mediators of aggression, two variables i.e. insecurity and guilt reactions were chosen. In the present social set up insecurity is increasing as social and personal institutions are breaking down. Therefore this variable was taken up. The second variable – guilt reaction, has been found to be linked with moral disengagement and aggression proneness (Caprara et al., 1995) which in turn influence aggressive behaviour.

Among the tools chosen for the present investigation three of these namely, Moral Disengagement, Fear of Punishment and Need for Reparation scale, were in English. Therefore, these were translated into Hindi. The procedure for translation was as follows:

Each statement was translated into Hindi. The translated version was given to the experts of English language with the request to translate it into English. In the light of the differences between the meanings of English version and Hindi version, the Hindi version was further modified according to on the recommendations of the experts. The final Hindi version was then given to the experts (2 each of Hindi,
English and psychology) for evaluation in light of ambiguity, relevance and difficulty level. The final format was prepared on the basis of their recommendation. Copies of final format were prepared and used for the present study. Scoring procedure was same as for the original scale.

To measure the test-retest reliability and validity of the Hindi version, a group of 50 post-graduate students from M.D.U. Rohtak were given the Hindi version and requested to fill these three scales. Immediately after this English version were administered to these students. After a gap of 30 days the same students were again requested to fill the Hindi version of the scales. Pearson’s correlation was calculated between the test-retest of Hindi version and Hindi and English.

**Measures of Aggressive Behaviour**

Two measures of aggressive behaviour i.e. aggression and anger expression were used.

*Aggression Scale:*

Aggression scale constructed and standardised by Pal and Naqvi (1983) was used. This scale gives a measure of aggression. It contain 30 statements in Hindi. Some of these statements have been taken from Frustration Scale (Chauhan and Tiwari, 1971) in which aggression has been taken as a mode of frustration. Itmes are related with various frustrating situations. Each of the item has five alternate answers (multiple choice) graded on a five point scale, i.e four points on the positive dimension and zero on the negative dimension. The reliability co-efficient of correlation is .78 and content
validity is .74. The present scale is available in English also. The validity co-efficient of both scales is .78.

Anger Expression Scale:

This scale has been constructed by Spielberger (1988) and it is in English. For the present study a Hindi version (Promila, 2000) of this scale has been used. There are 24 statements. This scale is comprised of three, 8 items subscales, for assessing three components of anger expression i.e. anger-in, anger-out and anger-control. Anger-out (Ax/out) measures anger directed outward i.e. toward other people. Anger-in (Ax/in) refers to how often anger is experienced actively suppressed by individuals. Anger control (Ax/con) assesses the frequency with which an individual attempts to control the expression of anger. The statements are endorsed on a four point frequency scale in the form of ‘Almost never’, ‘Sometimes’, ‘Often’ and ‘Almost always’. Score one is to be given to the almost never, score 2 is to be given to sometimes, score 3 is to be given to often and score 4 is to be given to almost always. Statements are summed up to yield a general index of the frequency of anger expression regardless of the direction of the expression. Total anger expression is to be computed by adding statements of Ax/out and Ax-in and substracting Ax/con and adding 16. The formula is

\[ \text{Ax/Ex} = \text{Ax/out} + \text{Ax/in} - \text{Ax/con} + 16 \]

Measures of values:

Personal value Questionnaire (PVQ)
Personal Value Questionnaire by Sherry and Verma (1971) was used to obtain a measure of values. This questionnaire contains 40 questions in Hindi. Every question has three alternatives and the respondent has to choose only one of them. There are equal number of items (i.e. 12 items) for each value. This scale gives a measure on 10 different values.

Religious value measures faith in God and activities according to ethics prescribed in the religious books. Second value is Social value, which is defined in terms of charity, kindness, love and sympathy for the people. Third value is Democratic value, which indicate ensuring equal social, political and religious right to all. The fourth value is Aesthetic, which is related with love for beauty, dance, music etc. Economic value is the fifth value, which stands for desire for money and material gain. The sixth value is Knowledge value, which measures love of knowledge of theoretical principles of any activity and love for discovery of truth. Seventh value is Hedonistic, which shows the desirability of loving pleasure and avoiding pain. Eighth value is Power value, which is defined as the conception of desirability of ruling over others. Ninth value is Family Prestige value, which is concerned with family status. Last value is Health value, which is related with health consciousness.

For the purpose of scoring, score 2 is to be given for a check mark (✓) showing the most preferred value. Zero is to be given to the cross (x), showing the least preference for the value. One score is to be given to the blank (     ) or unmarked value, showing the intermediate preference for the value. If the number of blank
questions is 4 or more, questionnaire is to be rejected. Total score for all values is checked by summing the total for all of them on each page separately. If the ground total of each page is 24, it indicates that scoring is correct. Different reliability co-efficient have been reported for values ranging from 0.47 (social value) to 0.70 (economic value). Validity of questionnaire is 0.64.

**Mechanisms of Moral Disengagement**

Mechanisms of Moral Disengagement Scale constructed by Bandura, Barbaranelli, Caprara and Pastorelli (1996) was used to assess the proneness to moral disengagement, of different forms of detrimental conduct, in diverse contexts and interpersonal relationships. This is a multifaceted scale which contains 32 items that measure eight mechanisms of moral disengagement represented by a set of 4 items. These eight mechanisms are, moral justification, euphemistic language, advantageus, comparison, displacement of responsibility, diffusion of responsibility, distorting consequences, attribution of blame and dehumanization. Since principal component factor analysis with varimax orthogonal rotation had revealed a single factor structure which accounted for 16.2% of the variance and subfactor emerged, the use of the composite score has been recommended by the authors as a measure of moral disengagement. Scoring is to be done on a 3 point Likert type scale on 'Agree', 'Disagree', and 'Uncertain' continuum. Score 2 is to be given to agree, zero is to be given to disagree and score one is to be given to uncertain. For the original English version alpha reliability coefficient
of is .82 has been reported. For Hindi version reliability co-efficient of
correlation was 0.84 and validity 0.74.

Measures of Mediating variables:

Need for Reparation Scale

Need for Reparation Scale construction by Caprara, Manzi and
Perugini (1992) was used to obtain a measure of empathy driven guilt
reactions. It measures proneness to experiencing feeling of remorse,
embarrassment, disturbance, tension and desires for justice that are
linked to the need for reparation of negative results of guilt-eliciting
actions. There are 20 statements in this scale in which 15 statements
are effective and 5 statements are control items. Scoring is to be done
on 6 point scale ranging from 0 (completely false for me) to score 5
(completely true for me). The total score for the scale is the sum of
effective items. An alpha reliability of .86 has been reported for
English version (original scale). Test-retest reliability co-efficient of
correlation between Hindi and Hindi version was 0.80 and validity 0.75.

Fear of Punishment Scale

Fear of Punishment Scale by Caprara, Manzi and Perugini
(1992) to measured a proneness to experience feelings of persecution,
oppression and tension that are tied to the anticipation and fear of
impending punishment. These reactions are guilt driven. This scale
contain 30 statements (23 effective + 7 control) scoring is to be done
on 6 point scale ranging from 0 (completely false for me) to 5
(completely true for me). The total score for the scale was the sum of
effective statements. Alpha reliability for English version (original
scale) is 0.91. Reliability for Hindi version is 0.74 and validity is 0.80.
Security-Insecurity Inventory

Security-Insecurity inventory is constructed and standardized by Tiwari and Singh. This inventory has been used to measure inner conscious feelings. There are 70 items, which are in Hindi. Three options are given for each item. Alternative choices are given in the form of ‘Yes’, ‘No’, and ‘Indefinite’. There are two type of questions. For the questions relating to insecurity, Score 2 is to be given to yes, score 1 is to be given to indefinite and zero is to be given for no, for the questions relating to security 2 is given for no, zero is to be given to yes and score 1 is to be given to indefinite items. The total score is an index of insecurity/security where a higher score in indicant of insecurity and lower of security. The test-retest reliability of the inventory is .73 and external validity is .67.

METHODOLOGY

Before the administration of tests to the respondents, the total battery of questions was tried out on 5 subjects to compute the average time required for the administration of these tests. The mean time taken was 3 hours and 32 minutes. Therefore it was decided that the tests would be administered in 2 phases. For Phase I Personal Value Questionnaire, Aggression Scale and Security / Insecurity inventory were selected and for Phase II Anger Expression Scale, Mechanisms of Moral Disengagement scale, Need for Reparation scale and Fear of Punishment scale were selected. Initially the Principals of the G.S.S. Schools were contacted with the request for permission to contact the students of 10+1 and 10+2 standards. A lists of students who were residing with their parents and grandparents
was prepared and their addresses were obtained. Then the families of these students, were contacted and whose father and grandfather agreed to participate in the study, were finally included in the sample. The tools were administered to all the three members in a single setting.

Before starting the testing procedure, general instructions were given as follows:

"I am research scholar in the department of psychology. I wish to obtain some information which will help me to understand the root cause of aggression. Your cooperation is paramount for this study therefore you will have to give me your precious time. I will give you a number of questionnaires, one by one. For each questionnaire, I will give you the specific instructions regarding what you have to do. Nothing in these questions reflect on your ability or potential. They measure your views on a variety of aspects. Your views will be kept strictly confidential and will only be used for research purpose".

In Phase I Personal value questionnaire, Aggression scale and Security/ Insecurity inventory were administered successively to the three respondents and the respective instructions were given. In some cases where the grandfathers were illiterate/unable to read, the questions/statements were read out and the responses were recorded by the investigator.

On the next day the remaining tools i.e. Anger Expression Scale, Fear of Punishment Scale, Need for Reparation Scale, Mechanisms of Moral Disengagement Scale were administered in the same manner.

This procedure was repeated for the entire sample and sequence of presentation of questionnaires/ scales within the two phases was varied randomly. Since the procedure was lengthy, it was difficult to obtain the cooperation of some of the respondents. In
some cases, where difficulty was faced the battery was truncated and only 5 scales were administered in a single setting. Thus, finally the complete battery could be administered to 234 subjects, while the truncated version was administered to 66 subjects.

The scoring of the tools was done as per the specifications delineated earlier (while describing the tool). The raw scores on each of the measure have been tabulated in Annexure B.

The results have been presented and discussed in the next chapter.