CHAPTER-1
INTRODUCTION

Aggression has always been an important concern of mankind. Social psychologists have always tried to find out, what exactly is aggression. It is very difficult to define the term ‘Aggression’. Perhaps there is no single, generic behavior pattern that corresponds to the term aggression. Even social scientists are not unanimous in deciding when a behaviour is aggressive. There may be many behaviour patterns that we casually call aggression. However, most definitions of aggression equate it with behaviour that are intended to harm another member of the same species. It is a negative behaviour that needs to be eliminated or minimized.

Many terms have been used to describe aggressive behaviour i.e. anger, hostility and aggression. These terms are defined in different and often contradictory ways by different investigators and are some time used interchangeably (Berkowitz, 1962; Buss, 1961). Moreover, the conceptual ambiguity is reflected in a diversity of measurement operations of questionable validity (Biaggio, Supplee, & Curtis, 1981; Spielberger, Jacobs, Russel, & Crane, 1983). Anger refers to an emotional state, presumably resulting from frustration, which when congruent with a suitable cue instigates aggressive responses. Anger does not always lead to aggression, but requires the presence of appropriate cues (Berkowitz, 1964). Anger consists of feelings that vary in intensity from mild irritation or annoyance, to fury and rage. Hostility has been considered as a more complex concept than anger. Kaufmann (1965) distinguished between aggressiveness
and hostility. Hostility involves negative evaluations of people and events and may be inferred when the attack is reinforced more by injury than by attaining the extrinsic reinforcer. It may be the consequence of punishment and involves a desire to hurt other.

Aggression generally implies destructive or punitive behaviour directed towards other persons or objects. Aggression and hostility are often used interchangeably, as there is little difference between hostility and instrumental aggression, whereas hostile aggression is motivated by anger. Instrumental aggression refers to aggressive behaviour directed toward removing an obstacle that stands between an aggressor and a goal. In this way little differences have been described between hostility, anger and aggression. Hostility has been considered as a personality trait, aggression considered as destructed behaviour, whereas anger refers to the behaviour directed toward achieving the goal. Given the overlap in the conceptual definitions of anger, hostility and aggression, and the variety of operational procedures that have been used to assess these constructs, it is referred to, collectively as, the AHA syndrome.

Aggression is not a unitary phenomenon. Caprara and Postorelli (1989) focused on individual differences associated with aggression and identified a constellation of processes and structures, embodied into traits, which sustain different manifestation of aggression. The identified indicators of aggression are irritability, which is defined as a tendency to react impulsively or rudely to the slightest provocation or disagreement. Emotional susceptibility is defined as the tendency to experience feelings of discomfort, helplessness, inadequacy and
vulnerability. *Rumination* indicates the inclination toward prolonged rumination, increasing or maintaining the desire to retaliate following instigation. *Tolerance toward violence* is defined as an positive attitude toward derubrication and justification of different form of violent conduct. *Fear of Punishment and Need for Reparation* represents two different manifestations of guilt feelings. Geen (1976) also agreed that it is very difficult to formulate a unitary definition of aggression. Aggression should include three aspects: The delivery of noxious stimuli, the intent to harm, and the fact that the attack has a probability greater than zero of being successful.

The major types of measurement of aggressiveness are projective techniques such as Rosenzweig Picture Frustration Test, the Thematic Apperception Test and Rorschach Inkblot Test. Objective tests such as questionnaires, scales or inventories assessing personality characteristics, which include intuitively developed scales i.e. Iowa Hostility Inventory by Moldawsky (1953), Manifest Hostility Scale by Siegal (1956), Hostility Scale of Sarason’s Autobiographical Survey. Other than these, reaction to delivery of electric shock has frequently been evoked as a robust direct measure of experimentally produced aggression.

In an attempt to identify the genesis of aggression, researchers have identified a large number of organismic and environmental variables which have been found to play an important role in aggression.

Some biologically oriented theorists have argued that sex differences in aggression reflect innate characteristics. Some
evidence points that biological or genetic factors also play a role in the
greater tendency of males to engage in at least some form of
aggression. Perhaps, most convincing in this regard is the evidence
suggesting that among males, the higher the level of testosterons, the
higher the level of aggression. (Berman, Gladue, & Taylor 1993; Gladue, 1991). Eagly and Steffen (1986) reported in a meta- analytic
study that men are more aggressive than women and that this sex
difference is more pronounced for physical than psychological
aggression. It has been suggested that beliefs are important
mediators of sex differences in aggressive behaviour i.e. guilt and
anxiety. Osterman (1994) reported that although males show
increased use of indirect forms of aggression as they mature, females
continue to outshine them in this respect. On the basis of available
evidence, it appears that hormones may contribute to some degree to
aggressiveness. Male sex hormones, androgen, increases aggressive
behaviour (Selinger & Bermant 1967; Beeman 1974).

Personality related factors have also been reported as important
factors in aggression. It has been found that some persons are
primed for aggression by their personal characteristics. Some
individuals rarely loose their temper or engage in aggressive actions,
while others seem to be forever blowing their tops, often with serious
consequences. Type A behaviour persons who can be described as
extremely competitive, always in a hurry, are more aggressive. (Glass,
1977; Strube, 1989 ). Persons of Type B behaviour pattern who are
not highly competitive, not always fighting the clock and who do not
easily loose their temper, are less aggressive. (Baron, Russell, &
Arms, 1985). Temperament has been reported as a personality variable of aggressiveness. Buss (1961) reported some variables influencing the development of aggression such as: Impulsiveness, intensity of reaction, activity level and independence. Eysenck (1964) also described two dimensions of personality: extraversion and neuroticism, where aggression proneness is higher among the extroverts and neurotics.

Some environmental factors such as crowding, extreme cold or heat and noise have been considered as important contributing factors in aggression.

High density can make individuals act aggressively. Loo (1978) suggested that density may affect children's aggression in a curvilinear fashion. It was observed that moderately high density leads to increased aggression in males, while very low and very high-density lead to decreased aggressiveness. Cox, Paulus, and Mclain (1984) found extremely high correlation between prison density and inmate aggression.

High and cold temperature has also been reported as an important environmental factor in aggression. One laboratory evidence suggests that low temperature around 62°F (16°C) make individuals feel more affectively negative. They found moderately negative feelings associated with cold seemed to decrease aggression (Bell & Baron, 1977). Rotton (1993) found that severe sex crimes are found to be more on cold days. Carlsmith and Anderson (1979) reported a significant relationship between temperature and the riots occurring in the United State in late 1960s and early 1970s. Hot cities
have higher rates of crimes than do low temperature cities (Anderson, 1987). Robins, Dewalt and Pelto (1972) showed that countries with hotter and more humid climates are associated with higher murder rates.

Noise has also been reported as an important environmental factor in aggression. Anderson, Anderson and Deuser (1996) predict that under circumstances in which aggression is likely to occur, increasing an individual's arousal level will also increase the intensity of aggressive behaviour. Thus, to the extent that noise increases arousal, it also increases aggression in individuals already predisposed to aggress. Finding also suggest that noise increased aggressiveness only when people were angry and it served to facilitate aggression caused by anger rather than creating or causing the aggression directly (Konechi, 1975). Cohen and Spacapan (1984) argued that noise strengthens or increases aggression but does not provoke it. In order for noise to affect aggressive behaviour, the behaviour must be present for other reasons. Some demographic factors have also been reported to be correlated with aggression i.e. rural-urban differences, age and socio-economic status.

National level statistics on the crime rate is generally higher in urban areas than in rural areas (N.C.R.B. 1978). Recent trends show an overall increase. There was a 3.4% increase in I.P.C. crimes while a decrease of 6.2% in Special and local laws (SLL) during 1998 as compare to 1997. On an average 3 IPC crimes and 8 SLL crimes have been reported in a minute in our country. Violent crime rate was higher in Rajasthan, Assam and Jammu & Kashmir while a low violent
crime rate was reported in Punjab, Sikkim and W. Bengal (NCRB 1998). Buntaine, Roberta, Costenpades and Virgin (1997) also reported differences in aggression in rural/urban areas. The rate of violent crime is almost six times greater in the large metropolitan cities than in rural areas (U.S. census Bureau, 1998). These type of findings can be interpreted in terms of overload, stress or behaviour constraints. Other explanations for the higher levels of crimes in urban area include a lack of employment opportunities and greater number of antisocial models available in urban areas. Both crowding and crime and much more frequent in urban than in rural areas (Fischer, 1976).

Age is also an important demographic factor contributing to aggression. Huesmann and Guerra (1997) reported that children tend to approve more of aggression, as they grew older. Verbal aggression has been reported to increase after third year (May, 1984). Chumming, Innotti and Wayler, 1989 reported that frequency of aggression decreases as age advances. A significant increase in suicide was found during ages 14-15 and 18-19 yrs. (Haring, Biebl, Barnas & Miller, 1991). Differences between aggression in middle-aged and adult men have also been reported by Rani, Ramavani, Venkateswara, and Trupati (1989). McIntosh and John, (1991) also reported that 45 to 65 yrs old age group's suicide rates are 25% higher than those of 25 to 44 yrs old age group. Thus, aggression seems to increase with age.

Socio-economic status also influence aggression. Hass (1996) found that first generation middle class subjects scored significantly higher than second-generation middle class subjects. It has been
reported that aggressive behaviour is more prevalent and frequent among working class people. (McKee & Leader, 1955; Davis 1944; Berkowitz 1962). Trasler (1962) reported that within the working class family the socialization process is less effective because of weaker parent-child relationship and less consistently and reliably applied sanctions than in the middle class family. Aggressive behaviour of parents are more frequent in lower classes (Allinsmith 1954).

Thus, it is evident that antecedents of aggression can be either environmental or within the individual. Theorists have made an attempt to formulate theoretical models and theories in order to account for the development of aggression. Broadly speaking the theoretical postulates have been classified into biological, drive and social learning frameworks.

Biological theories have developed from psychoanalytical theories represented by Alder and Freud, though the ethological theories Ardrey (1966), Lorenz (1966) Tinbergen (1968). These theories emphasize the innateness of the aggressive stimulus-response sequence, and therefore difficulties in the control of aggression.

Sigmund Freud (1930) argued that aggression stems mainly from a powerful death wish or instinct (thanatos) possessed by all persons. People are often motivated by primitive, biologically based, aggressive impulses. Similarly, a European ethologist Lorenz (1966) also proposed that aggression springs mainly from an inherited fighting instinct that human beings share with many other species.
Drive theories assume that frustration arouses an aggressive drive that is reduced only by some form of aggressive response.

Frustration is also a major contributing factor in aggression. Dollard, Doob, Miller, Mowrer and Sears (1939) asserted that frustration occurs when something interferes with the achievement of goal at its proper time in the sequence and frustration always leads to aggression. Buss (1963) experimentally studied the link between frustration and aggression. The forms of frustration, he investigated were, task failure and interference with getting a better course grade. Berkowitz (1964) also argued that frustration leads to aggression and frustration makes people angry and aggressive.

The role of cognition and arousal in manifestation of aggression was postulated by Schachter-Singer (1962) who demonstrated that anything that increases unexplained psychological arousal may contribute to hostile aggression. Zillman (1971) also reported that fear, sexual arousal or even physical exercise may facilitate aggression, particularly if the aroused person attributes his arousal to anger.

Social learning theories emphasize the role of modeling, observational learning and reinforcement in aggression. Bandura (1973) concluded that certain parents, by behaving aggressively, provide aggressive models for their children. Some researches has examined the role of modeling on aggressive behaviour (Baron & Bell, 1975; Donnerstein & Donnerstein, 1976).

In this way social learning theory emphasize on the factors related to social set up. As per this theory two major sources of
sanction have been proposed to regulate aggressive conduct, these are social sanctions and internalized self sanctions (Bandura, 1986). Social sanctions refrain people from behaving transgressively because they feel some social censure or fear of punishment. Self sanctions make people behave prosocially because it gives self-satisfaction. People refrain from detrimental behaviour because it will give rise to self-censure. What is called disinhibition largely reflects the disengagement of controlling self sanction from detrimental conduct. Understanding of the nature of disinhibition can, therefore, be advanced by increasing knowledge of self-regulative disengagement.

Social sanctions i.e. values, norms of society and their relationship with aggression can help in furthering the understanding of development of aggression. In some societies we find that there are values that increase or decrease violence or aggression. So it is very necessary to study value in relation with aggression.

A value is an explicit or implicit distinction of an individual or characteristics of a group of the desirable, which influences the selection from available modes, means and ends of action. (Klucknon, 1976). Values concern consequences, are positive or negative, residing in satisfaction or annoyances felt by individual. They are functions of preferences. manifested in ideas, expressional symbols and the moral and aesthetic norms, evident in behaviours regularities. Values define the limits of permissible cost of an expressional gratification or an instrumental achievement by involving the
consequences of such action for other parts of the system and for the system as a whole.

Sometime values are defined in terms of attitudes also. However, values differ from attitude in two ways, one exclusively refers to the ability of the individual and the second to the absence of the imputation of the desirable (Klucknon, 1976).

Value, as a preference has justification to be so on moral, rational or aesthetic ground. Values are apprehended as part of self and are aspects of immediate tension or immediate situation. Being normative preposition, values significantly differ from attitudes, motivation or objects. The concept of value is multidimensional because it involves three essential aspects in it's origin i.e. cognitive, affective, and behavioural. Cognitive aspect is related with knowledge, affective which is related with feeling and behavioural which is related to the actions performed in achieving the desire or goal. Thus, value is the object or content of desire, which is grounded in feeling. It begins with an idea of value, which being tinged with a feeling of pleasure, arouses a desire for it and that desire by prompting in it's turn appropriate activity, culminates in the realization of the value. Hence all the three aspects of mind: cognition, feeling and will are involved in the process of value realization and they operate in succession.

Value never exist on a uniform level rather they are hierarchally ordered. This view is expressed by Geaslad (1979) according to whom 'values exist at different levels and tend to be ranked in order of importance". Values are explicit and implicit in varying degree and value often conflict with one another. Attainment of value follows an
ascending pattern where lower values are satisfied at first and then higher values. The lower values are physical or biological in nature and as the hierarchical status ascends, the nature changes to metaphysical. Thus biological and psychological values are regarded as lower and spiritual values are considered as higher values i.e. dharma and moksha being moral values are rated as higher values. However, for transcendence to higher values, initial satisfaction of the lower values is necessary. Values have been classified in a variety of ways. One mode of classification i.e. historical, adopts the division already made in society and takes as units, those values or group of values which have acquired an institutional form such as cognitive, moral, economic, political, aesthetical and religious values. On the other hand, values can also be classified in terms of function. On this basis values can been classified in to four types. **Gratification values**, which impart meaning and purpose to human existence and constitute the motivating force which directly or indirectly underlies all conscious, connective behaviour. These values are either unconditional or conditional. **Unconditional values** are those, which exert imperative or compulsive influence in that the individual feels their realization must be achieved, whatever the consequences. **Conditional gratificatory values** are inculcated by customs and rituals by ceremonial observances. **Perfunctory values** are those gratificatory values, which have lost their validity with time. Many customary social values which when put to the test and found to have become irrelevant, fall into this category. Period of rapid social change are characterized by abandonment of perfunctory values. **Instrumental values** refer to
commitment to the expenditure of time, effort and/or other resources directed toward a particular outcome which by itself is not expected to yield gratification, but which facilitates or promotes some other course of desired action. However, it's function is contributory, not primary. Interactive values emerge from the realization that experience constitutes a complex process involving things, events and consciousness; a constant flow of interrelated dynamic patterns, ever evolving and everchanging.

Another similar classification on the basic of functions of values has been proposed by Rokeach (1965) who classified values into two broad categories: *terminal values* include prosperity, active life, achievement, world peace, equality, personal and family security, freedom, happiness, inner peace, mature love, national security, pleasure, religion, self respect, friendship, wisdom and social respect. These values reflect a person's beliefs about ends to be achieved. *Instrumental values* include ambition and hard work, open-mindedness, competence, cheerfulness, cleanliness, courage, forgiving nature, helpfulness, honesty, imagination, self-reliance, intelligence, rationality, affection, obedience, courtesy, responsibility and self discipline. These values reflect a person's beliefs about goal.

A more elaborative distinction between values was proposed by Sparunger (1928) who identified six values. *Theoretical value* indicate person's love toward the discovery of truth. *Economic value* shows person's interest for material objects. An economic person is concerned with production of goods, service and accumulation of wealth. *Aesthetic value* is concern with beauty and love for music,
dance etc. Social value shows a person's unselfishness, love for other persons and kind heartness. Political value shows person's love for power. Religious values shows person's religiosity and faith in God, love for other persons and kind heartness.

The traditional Indian system also classifies values on a somewhat similar basis. Ancient Indian scriptures refer to four basic values.

Political-economic values which are related with artha or economics which indicate power, money, etc. It is based on materialistic needs. Money is a powerful factor in the satisfaction of the economic necessities of life. An economic value system needs certain social, moral control with a view to achieving maximum human goods, otherwise it lapses into exploitation and corruption. Arth, as a value of social organization, law and order belongs to the political aspect of human life. Kama value is a very important value in Hinduism. This is related with hedonistic value, which is based on sex and love. It has been described in ancient traditional Indian Literature also (Kamasastrsa). This is related with sex satisfaction. Moral value includes dharma. Dharma constitutes the principles to be observed in man's social order and the physical environment. These principles are truthfulness, forgiveness, nonviolence, good will and respect towards others. Spiritual value is also termed as moksha which ordinarily means liberation and is regarded in Indian philosophical tradition as the final destiny of man and as such it has been accorded the highest importance in the scheme of values. Moshka is taken to mean freedom from life itself. It is an absolute and ultimate value, which can
be integrated with other values of life including the economic and mental, for without their ontological basis, life and its higher realizations can not be maintained.

For the empirical study of values various tools have been developed. Values can be measure by means of psychometric methods with the help of a suitable nonphysical metric scale. Several attempts have been made to measure values. A classification has been made by Ojha (1992) in which six values has been described i.e. theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social, political and religious which are based on Allport’s (1937) ‘Study of values’. Another classification has been given by Chauhan, Aurora, Bharadwaj and Mathus (1981) in ‘the value orientation scale. This scale measures six value-orientation areas: Localism vs cosmopolitanism, fatalism vs scienticism, non-ventures omeness vs ventures omeness, traditionalism vs progressivism, autocratism vs democratism, non empathy vs empathy.

Research has indicated that values differ across gender, socio-economic status, age, religion and culture. Roscoe and Peterson (1989) reported that adolescent subjects were most tolerant of behaviours performed by individuals at varying ages while older subject most closely ascribed to age constraints. Younger subjects valued equality, freedom and honesty more than their older classmates (Sikula & Costa, 1994;) Lovinand and Prull, (1990) also found generational changes in values. Several studies have revealed that most social and religious values are observed by the females and old persons in the society and generation gap exists in personal values.
(Melby, 1968; Hoga, 1973; Duwars, 1952; Rokeach, 1979; Ghosh & Paul, 1982). Gender has also been considered as an important factor in values. It has been reported that women are at higher level of moral development (Crow, Folk, Hartman & Payne, 1991). Niles and Goodnough (1996) also reported sex differences related to the relative importance of life roles and values. Values also differ across various religious sects because values are primarily derived from the religion and philosophical heritage of the society, e.g. value of Hindus are different from Muslims (Ojha & Shailendera, 1993).

A major difference has been observed in values across culture. An individual learns and internalizes the roles and patterns of behaviour that are propagated by the culture through the process of socialization. This process is termed as enculturation by which youngsters learn and adopt the ways and manners of their own culture. The culture of every social group is based on certain implicit and explicit values although each individual has his own unique value pattern. Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) suggested that core values reflect the culture's orientation to five basic and universal problems, i.e. orientation toward human nature, man-nature orientation, time orientation, activity orientation and interpersonal relationship orientation. Since orientation of different cultures to these basic human problems vary widely and on many occasions vary within the culture from subculture to subculture, it is quite reasonable to assume that cross-cultural variations in the value pattern are inevitable.

Individuals not only learn from their own culture, but through the process of acculturation an individual adopts the values of different
culture to which he is exposed. This process takes place when an individual moves to a geographically different location or may be the result of cultural invasion. Indian value system has also been influenced by other cultures. Although Indian society was dominated by values and attitude, which originated in ancient times, but over year minor modifications have occurred due to changes in philosophy and religion. The roots of Indian culture lie deep in the past. People of different races and culture have ruled India. Indian history is said to have passed through major periods before the independence, which are characterized by the Hindu period, Muslim period and British period. Thus, modern values are a composite culture to which many different religion and traditions have contributed.

Many visible and significant cultural changes have taken place in Indian society over the last two decades, as a result of technological advancements and globalization. The social agencies have become the major manipulator of the individual. Beauxocracy and utilitarianism have reduced the individual to an organism whose behaviours are being controlled and manipulated such that there is an unsuccessful and inappropriate rush towards everchanging materialistic goals. The family as a system, has been the main victim of this societal impact. Women/mother have been drawn into the work force as there is a need to supplement the family income in order to achieve the materialistic requirements. Children are brought up by paid maternal role models and the deprivation of the parents at this stage installes a strong impression in the child that every relationship in the society is contractual. The impact of this is evident from the spurt in divorce
rate. Joint families have become non-existinct. The elderly, who were earlier the source of values and meaning to the youngsters, are being shoved to the background by the family members as they incessantly pursue their materialistic goals. This is further surmounted as even the architecture and forms of communications have undergone a drastic change. Houses have been replaced by multistoried flats and the friendly neighbourhood shopkeeper has been replaced by impersonal consumer malls. The personal contacts and letters have been replaced by telephone and internet communication. Thus, there is a overall decline in human values and wholesome relationship as people engage in a mad rush to own material objects that will fill the days and hopefully mitigate the alienation, insecurity and meaninglessness of existence which is a by product of today's social scenario. Thus, social engineering and ultra approach to the life leads to the creation of the truncated man who is less than fully human (Kendall, 1990).

Researches have emphasized that dehumanization brings out the worst in individuals. Milgram (1974) reported that good people can be made to perform cruel deeds by ordering them to act injuriously and absolving them from any responsibility for the effects for their actions. Thus, absence of self-reproof for behaviour that has been rendered acceptable or for which one professes no responsibility, helps to weaken the feeling of guilt and the need to undo the harm caused by detrimental behaviours. Bandura, Barbaranelli, Caprara, and Pastorelli (1996) have proposed that moral disengagement and aggressiveness essentially operate through the same path of
influence. High moral disengages were found to be less prosocial and less guilty over detrimental conduct both of which in turn lessen restrains over aggressive acts. These authors proposed a causal structure of the path of influence through which moral disengagement was posited to influence detrimental conduct (Figure 2). Although no direct link was found between moral disengagement and aggressiveness, the author reported that moral disengagement affects delinquent behaviour both directly and indirectly through its influence on prosocial behaviour, level of guilt and aggressive proneness. This relationship assumes importance in the present day Indian scenario where developments during the last two decades have resulted in a cultural metamorphosis. Today humanistic, familial and benevolent values are becoming obsolete and there is a mad rush towards materialistic goals. The drastic change in the socio-economic climate has resulted in a progressive crumbling of the family, which could in itself be the prime contributor to the spurt in violence (Palermo & Simpson 1994).

Further, the Indian public has been exposed to, and drawn towards social dramas, which project a glamorized version of violence, corrupt practices, breakdown of family ties and attainment of materialistic goals (Yadava, Kumar & Sharma, 2000). The projection leads to imitation, triggering aggression in predisposed individuals, desensitization of feeling of sympathy and acceptance of violent acts as socially acceptable responses to stress and frustration (Ponnell and Browne, 1999). This in turn, through its influence on anticipatory guilt reactions, prosocial orientation and cognitive and affective reactions
would be conducive of aggression (Bandura et al. 1996). Cermak and Blantany (1995) reported that various cognitive mechanisms which alleviate the experience of blame and which are linked to the violation of internalized norms (moral disengagement) are associated with cognitive sources of aggression. Although cross-cultural differences exist in values, some universal moral values have been expounded (Kinnier, Kernes & Dautheribes, 2000). However each cultural/subcultural group tends to maximize a model value pattern. The present Indian scenario, where technological advancement has sown seeds of insecurity and depersonalization, has become the breeding ground of aggression and value deficits. In line with Bandura et al.'s (1996) causal model of moral disengagement and harmful behaviour, it was felt that a strong relationship could exist between values and aggression and the effect might be mediated via a number of other variables among which, insecurity and guilt reactions appear to be of prime importance. Thus, it was felt that a study of the relationship between values, aggression, insecurity and guilt reactions could provide insight into the genesis of aggression. Therefore, a literature survey was conducted, in order to form a background for the formulation of the tentative postulates to be tested in the present study. The review of literature has been presented in Chapter II.