REVIEW OF LITERATURE
Aggressiveness is not only one of the most stable human traits from childhood onwards, especially in boys (Kagan and Moss, 1967; Lefkowitz et al., 1978; Olweus, 1979), it is also the social behaviour in which sex differences, although open to cultural influences (Rutter, 1982), are most evident (Maccoby and Jacklin, 1974). Eron and Huesman (1984) identified that the factors like child's socio-cultural environment, family interactions and personality, promote the learning of aggression.

Several attempts have been made at the empirical level to understand the phenomenon of aggression. While a few psychologists have tried to hold low I.Q. responsible for aggression, others associated age, sex and personality variables with aggression. Social psychologists opine that aggression breeds aggression. It is through upbringing, particularly when the child is subjected to punishment, that he becomes aggressive. Sociologists, on the other hand, had gone back to the social background of the aggressives and tried to identify social correlates like caste, religion, familial structure, class etc. which play important role in shaping individual's personality. A review of these studies would help to find out the gaps in the available knowledge on the causal factors of aggression.
Cognition, Personality and Aggression

Aggression has been attributed to low level of intelligence. The low I.Q. child simply has more difficulty in learning to behave in a non-aggressive manner. Such a child finds it easier to learn the direct and salient behaviour such as aggressiveness. The child with a high I.Q. has more learning options open to him so he is able to learn a wider variety of social behaviours.

Eron and Semler (1967) found that among third grade boys achievement explained the major portion of the variance in the relationship between I.Q. and aggression. Rutter et al. (1970) and Richman et al. (1982) found that aggressive behaviour was strongly associated with an I.Q. slightly below average. Swantantra (1971) and Lowenstein (1977) found the same association.

Singh (1976) and Lefkowitz et al. (1977) found a negative correlation between intelligence and aggression, which they explained on the ground that low I.Q. acts as a frustrator and instigator to aggression because the frustration of coping with a low I.Q. would lead to higher aggression.

Bhan (1984) concluded that aggressives were found to be less intelligent both at junior and senior levels. The less intelligent try to compensate for feelings of inferiority by aggressive acts.
On the other hand, when the characteristics of the non-aggressives were identified, Bhan (1984) noticed that in addition to high level of intelligence other factors like better economic condition of the family, cordial family relationships, better emotional adjustment and adjustment at home, school/college, higher educational and cultural level of the family and better teacher-pupil relations are also associated with relatively lower levels of aggression.

Psychologists have treated aggression as one of the personality traits. In other words, they have tried to find out which personality type goes with aggression. The psychologists have gathered a large wealth of data on this issue. These informations can be grouped broadly in two categories: studies pertaining to assessment of aggression, and studies on differential psychology of the aggressives. In this exercise a wide range of instruments are provided for typological classifications (Ernst and Keating, 1964 and Gibbons, 1965).

Pandey and Nagar (1980) found that truants were more inclined toward withdrawl, isolation and aggression. The other important factors were: lack of parental affection, sense of insecurity and emotional deviation in early childhood. According to Misra (1981) when delinquents were compared with normal children they suffered inadequacy of social adjustment which is indicative of paranoid
tendency, displayed ego weakness and over emphasized
the resolution of frustrating problems.

Bhaumik and Kundu (1984) indicated significantly
more aggression, frustration and anxiety among delinquents
than among the normal. Chaturvedi et al. (1984) found
that the children suffering from emotional problems like
enuresis, nail biting, etc. showed significantly more
aggression than healthy children. Ajwani (1985) indicated
that subjects with low aggression proneness and low
frustration potential were found to be more perceptually
defensed as compared to their respective counterparts.

Personality itself is influenced by the social
environment in which an individual lives, grows or
develops. In this process family plays an important role
in the personality make up of the child. When one child
of the family is less cooperative or more stubborn than
another, has fewer friends of his age, fewer admirers among
relatives and when he does not do so well at school or
win so many achievements at home or elsewhere as another
child of the family, some jealousy in him is practically
inevitable. Such child tends to grow comparatively worse
in all such ways as time goes on. But jealousy also can
harm the inner spirit and peace of mind and motivate
undesirable conduct disorder like aggression (Myers, 1987).
On the other hand, the other child makes better adjustment
and enjoys better recognition from others and becomes less
aggressive, family atmosphere also helps in the psychological
development of the child.

Aggression has also been known to be provoked by social and physical environmental factors. Frustration, provocation by physical and verbal means and exposure to aggressive model are the factors which have received more attention.

Green (1968), Wilson and Rogers (1975) indicated that laboratory experiments on man have repeatedly shown that physical and verbal provocations elicit aggressive behaviour. Environmental factors such as crowding, noise and heat have been studied to assess their possible relationship with aggression. It is believed that crowding may have both facilitatory and inhibitory effect on aggression. Koreani (1975) has shown that unpleasant noise may provoke aggressive behaviour in subjects who are already annoyed due to other reasons.

Aggression is a multidimensional phenomenon, hence, it is not advisable to limit its causal factors to either low I.Q. or personality type.

Aggression breeds aggression

It has been observed that children displaying antisocial aggression and assaultive behaviour tend to come from families where there is greater incidence of aggressive modeling in relation to disciplinary practices (Mc Cord et al, 1959). Researchers who have studied child
abuse continue to find out that children who were abused
often grow up to be abusing parents (Kempe et al. 1962;

Silver et al. (1969) in a study covering three
generations of families of abused children support the
theme that "agression breeds aggression" and that an
abused child has the potential of becoming an aggressive
member of society in the future. Hokanson (1970) and
Berkowitz (1973) concluded that "ventilating" aggression
in minor ways makes one more likely to go on to further
aggression.

Gelles (1972) compared the reported spouse hitting
of three groups of people, those who were not hit as
children, those hit infrequently and those hit frequently.
He found that the infrequently hit group was less likely
to hit their spouses than those who were frequently hit
as children.

A study of violent inmates in San Quentin prison
found that all of them had experienced extreme violence
between the ages of one and ten (Maurer, 1976). Ralph
Welsh (1976) claims that he has never examined or talked
with a violent juvenile delinquent who did not come from
an extremely violent background. The fact that, as
children, millions of husbands and wives observed violence
by their own parents toward each other, serves as a
powerful role-model for their behaviour as adults
(Steinmetz, 1977 a, b; Straus, Gelles and Steinmetz, 1981).
A number of studies have been conducted to find out association between child-rearing practices and the development of aggressive traits. A few studies even try to contend that aggression is transmitted through child-rearing practices i.e. the abused child will become abusing spouse and parent. Such a person will also have aggressive children.

**Husband and Wife Aggression**

Some studies have shown that highly aggressive boys often come from families where parents are found to be hostile, rejecting, negative or indifferent in their basic attitudes.

A somewhat similar results were found by Baruch (1937); Manis (1958) and Nye (1958) who indicated a close relationship between intraparental conflict and disturbance in child behaviour. Bandura and Walters (1959) revealed that parents, particularly fathers of aggressive boys, encouraged aggression more than parents of less aggressive boys. Becker, Peterson, Hellmer, Shoemaker and Quay (1959) have shown that the children who have conduct problems tend to come from families where both the parents are maladjusted, give vent to their emotions and are arbitrary with the children. Siegel and Kohn (1959) reported least aggressive children coming from families where aggression is disapproved and is stopped with technique other than physical punishment.
According to McCord, McCord and Howard (1961) aggressive boys were most likely to have been raised by parents who treated the boys in a rejecting, punitive fashion, failed to impose direct controls on their behaviour, and were often involved in intense conflict. Tuckman and Regan (1966) focused on the increased risks of aggressive behaviour and educational problems in fatherless boys. Robins (1966) found the parents of psychopaths are often themselves antisocial or psychopathic.

Faizunnisa and Parameshwaran (1967) found that mother's punishing and rejecting behaviour had more consistent association with children's behavioural problems of different types. Rutter et al. (1970) showed a general relationship between childhood conduct disorders and being raised in a broken home. Hertherington, Cox and Cox (1976) showed a significant increase in aggression in children in divorced families. Wahler, Leske and Rogers (1977) concluded that parents of aggressive children appear to have a disproportionate amount of family crisis. Rutter (1978) stated that instead of parental deprivation, poor home environment may be more related to delinquent behaviour.

Whitehead (1979) indicated a relationship between the marital tension or conflict between husband and wife with antisocial behaviour of the child. O'Leary and
Turkewitz (1979) also examined the relationship between parental conflict and childhood disturbance. Olweus (1980) found aggression in adolescent boys to be related to maternal negativism and rejection in the early years.

Straus et al. (1981) found that people who experienced the most punishment as teenagers have a rate of wife-beating and husband-beating that is four times greater than those whose parents did not hit them. The sons of the most violent parents have a rate of wife-beating 1000 per cent greater than that of the sons of the non violent parents (20%). They concluded that the couples who did not hit each other had the lowest rate of abusive violence toward their children. Violent husbands and wives are also likely to be child-abusing parents.

Patterson (1982) believes that specific parental failures are responsible for aggressive behaviour in children. Richman et al. (1982) stressed the contribution of maternal irritability to the genesis of childhood aggression. Dayal et al. (1986) concluded that majority of delinquents belonged to broken homes with lowest socio-economic group and have sibling rivalry and have education up to primary level.

It seems likely that because of marital discord especially when it involves physical aggression usually consists of attacks by the father on the mother, this
arouses special anxieties in boys because of their sex role-identification. The mother's part in such domestic aggression is less obvious to the children and her role usually less manifestly aggressive.

Husband-wife aggression has also been attributed to drinking behaviour of the husband. Hindman (1977) contended that the alcohol has been a prime cause of interpersonal violence in the family, especially in the more extreme forms of wife beating and child abuse. Langley and Levy (1977) and Byles (1978) found an association between drunkenness and family violence. Brown and her associates (1980) found that heavy drinkers are more likely than others to believe that drinking increases sexual and aggressive behaviour.

There are a number of general reviews of the relationship between alcohol abuse and family aggression (Critchlow, 1983; Klein, 1981; Morgan, 1982, 1983 and Room and Collins, 1983). Coleman and Straus (1983) indicated a strong positive relationship between alcohol abuse and family violence except when alcohol abuse is extreme. It is more clearly associated with spousal aggression than with parent-child aggression. Caesar (1985) and Hotaling and Sugarman (1986) found an association between drinking and marital aggression.

In the present era there is a lot of controversy going on among psychologists whether young growing children
should be given physical punishment or not. One school of thought is of the opinion that through punishment even animals learn a desired action. The other school of thought opines that punishment leads to hatred and the child gets immuned to such type of threats and punishment and his mental and social development is retarded (Varma and Sagar, 1980).

Aggression against Children

Reward and punishment play an important role in disciplining the child. Reward reinforces desirable acts whereas punishment inhibits undesirable acts. Most of the adults take good behaviour of the child as granted and do not reward it. Many more do not want to use reward as they think it will make the child conceited. But reward enhances child's ego, gives him feeling of security and self importance. It also helps him to realize that he is an accepted member of the society. Positive motivation in the form of reward is better than negative motivation in the form of punishment, yet it is impossible to bring up the child without punishment. A "good" punishment is one which suits the misdeed and follows it as soon as possible so that the child can associate the two. The reason for punishment must be explained to the child so that the child can understand his undesirable conduct behaviour (M. Kaur, 1986).
Punishment may stop undesirable conduct behaviour like aggression but it does not improve a child’s attitude and relationships nor does it teach a boy or girl the positive things he/she ought to do (Gruenberg, 1986).

Lesser (1952) found that parental behaviour characterised by punitiveness towards children’s aggression was negatively related with overt aggression. Sears et al. (1953) found that too high aggression is associated with severe punishment especially in boys. However, Sears (1961) and Lefkowitz et al. (1977) have found no basis for a link between typical physical punishment and subsequent aggression.

Children of more punitive parents are more aggressive (Becker et al. 1962 and Bandura, 1971). Eron et al. (1963) reported that the parents who severely punished their children usually had children judged to be more aggressive than less punitive parents. Lefkowitz et al. (1963) found that youngsters are provided with an aggressive model when parents employ physical punishment.

Child-rearing practices employed by the parents for boys and girls are far from similar. The parental reaction toward aggression in the two sexes would usually be different. The girls are trained not to express aggression in a direct manner and are taught that softness and gentleness are virtues whereas boys learn to eschew these characteristics and to value physical prowess and
aggressiveness (Mulvihill and Tumin, 1969). However, Sud (1975) found that parental disciplinary technique did not vary significantly for boys and girls but mothers were more love-oriented and less power-assertive with boys than with girls.

Illfeld (1970) found that physical punishment by parents does not inhibit aggression and most likely encourages it. Punishment both frustrates the child and gives him a model to imitate and learn from. Sinha and Krishna (1971) concluded that for disciplining their children older parents used an ignoring attitude significantly more frequently while younger parents were more dominating. Eron et al. (1971) found that the most aggressive boys and girls were from homes in which parental punishment was frequent. Sharda (1972) concluded that the child from a family where parents punished the child without an explanation tended to be more aggressive in pre-school play situations.

Sears, Maccoby and Levin (1974) found that the mothers who were most permissive but also most severely punitive would have the most aggressive children, those who were most non-permissive but least punitive would have the least aggressive ones. Lal (1975) found in 13-15 years old children the internal locus of control was positively related to love-oriented techniques of parents and negatively to power-assertive styles. The
father's influence was more potent for the development of internal locus of control. George and Main (1979) found that child abuse clearly leads to increased physical aggression.

It is generally believed that children who receive occasional punishment from their parents become more obstinate and, hence, indulge more in mal-adaptive type of behaviour (Varma, 1980). Sengupta (1980) found a positive but low correlation between the perceived parental behaviour and child's motivational disposition for aggressive behaviour in the case of urban as well as rural children. Olweus (1980) indicated that maternal rejection in early childhood, maternal tolerance for aggressive behaviour in the child and physically punitive child-rearing methods contributed to be aggressive. Straus et al. (1981) stated that physical punishment trains children to deal with conflicts by physical aggression.

Mothers and fathers make distinctive contributions to the rearing of young children (Lamb, 1982), fathers being more physically stimulating and presumably evoking more active, assertive behaviour in their offsprings. These findings are in accordance with the opinions of sociologists (Parsons and Bales, 1955) for whom it is the father who plays "instrumental" role in the life of the child and mother plays an "expressive" role. In other words, father is authoritarian and, hence, an object of fear, whereas mother is an object of love and affection.
Parke and Slaby (1983) concluded that physical punishment is associated with subsequent child aggression at high intensities of such punishment. Larzelere (1986) indicated a linear positive association between physical punishment and child aggression.

Children in all cultures manifest aggressive behaviour with which each society deals in terms of its own values and socialization practices. The way family and social environments are imposed on a child differ from family to family and society to society. Whiting (1963) made a detailed study of child-rearing practices and investigated the differences and similarities between six cultures. Results indicated that boys are more likely than girls to engage in physical aggression while girls have a greater tendency to act affectionately and responsibly. The parents distinguished between boys and girls in their expectations about aggression and in their handling of it. The above noted studies highlight:

i. Abused child is likely to become abusing spouse and parent.

ii. Children who often receive physical punishment are more likely to become aggressive than those who are socialized without punishment.

iii. Boys are more likely to receive physical punishment.

iv. Child-rearing practices are culture specific.
Aggression against siblings

The relationship of a brother and sister, like other family relationships, carries with it a high potential for aggression. This is not only because of the closeness and intimacy of the relationships, but also because each sibling is a real or potential rival for the care and affection of the parents. Most families are reluctant to talk about husband-wife aggression and aggression against children but they readily acknowledge sibling aggression as they treat it as a normal aspect of family relationships. Aggression between siblings often reflects what children see their parents doing to each other as well as what the child experiences in the form of discipline. Children of non-violent parents also tend to use non-violent methods to deal with their siblings and later with their spouses and children. If violence, like charity, begins at home, so does non-violence (Straus et al. 1981).

Straus et al.'(1981) showed that more often the parents had hit their children the more likely the child was to have severely attacked a brother or sister. They further highlighted that the older the child, the lower the rate of sibling aggression and sibling aggression occurs more frequently than parent-child or husband-wife aggression.
Differences between parents based on their experiences as children are over shadowed by the norms permitting or requiring parents to use physical punishment. In addition to family, the schools, the peers, friends, teachers and other members of the society are the potential agents from whom the child learns to be aggressive.

Aggression in Schools

The educational institutions not only supplement the normative pattern of the familial training but also reinforce the content and mode of training. Child's first experience with aggression is undoubtedly within the family. Such experiences are reinforced in the schools. If a child receives punishment from parents and also in the schools to instill discipline he/she learns that aggression is a desired characteristic to achieve goals.

Incongenial family and school atmosphere have also been associated with aggression among children. Leober and Dishion (1984) found that the boys who fight at home as well as at school have scored substantially higher on a variety of measures of antisocial behaviour than those boys who fight only at home or only at school when compared in terms of their behaviour and family background.

Bhan (1984) found that high intelligence level, better economic condition of the family, better emotional
adjustment, and adjustment at home and school/college, higher educational and cultural level of the family and better teacher-pupil relations are all associated with relatively lower levels of aggression.

Huggins and Straus (1979) are of the opinion that in addition to family and educational institution we should take into consideration what is happening in the society at large. They maintained that parents don't need to learn to use physical punishment by following the example of their own parents. They see it every day in the behaviours of others and in the mass media and perhaps even more in the stories they all read as children.

What role do the social factors play in making a child aggressive or non-aggressive? Is it a lower class/caste problem? The possibility that social factors such as caste, religion, family structure, number of children, income, education and occupation and other differences are related to aggression in the children was often overlooked in early studies on aggression because most of the early studies were either conducted by psychologists, psychiatrists, social psychologists or physicians. It is only during the last two decades that sociologists have started investigating the social correlates of aggression and violence.
Social Factors and Aggression
Ascribed Attributes

Caste and Aggression

Caste in the Indian society not only divides people into differential hierarchical positions but also is associated with differential customs and behaviour patterns on the part of its members. Traditionally, the people belonging to the Kshatrya varna were considered to be aggressive. A number of studies have been conducted in contemporary India where aggression has been analysed with reference to the caste affiliation of the aggressors and their victims.

Mathur (1978) is of the opinion that violence of the landed interests of the upper castes has become a constant threat not only to the peace in the rural areas but it is spreading to the urban centres as well. Kamble (1981) has traced out the cases of atrocities on schedule castes from 1947 to 1979 and asserted that caste conflicts instead of diminishing after independence have intensified. He, further, contended that most of the atrocities committed against schedule castes were of the type of assaulting them individually or in a group by an organised group of upper castes. Prasad (1985) analysed rural violence in India and concluded that initiators of violence belonged to upper and middle castes and their violence was directed against Yadavas and Harijans, the lower caste groups.
Religion and aggression

Although many social scientists have investigated many differences between religious groups, there really is not much in the research on child, wife, or husband aggression which examines the rates of aggression by religious affiliation (Carroll, 1979). Straus et al. (1981) found that lack of religious affiliation seems to have most effect on violence between husbands and wives, especially acts of violence towards women. When the mother has no religion, her children are less violent toward one another than the children of mothers who have a religious preference. Abusive violence toward children is unrelated to whether or not mother or a father has a religious preference. Hussain (1984) found that Muslims perceived the Hindus as significantly more aggressive and the latter perceived the former as significantly more affiliative.

Family structure and Aggression

An attempt has also been made to relate aggression and familial structure. Ralph Linton (1936) maintained that in Indian joint family the children are trained to be submissive and this is the reason which holds the family together but the eldest child is trained differently because he is expected to play leadership role, hence, learns to be more dominant and aggressive. Parsons (1947) has developed an analysis of the family structure of urban
industrial societies capable of explaining (i) why violence is more likely to be a masculine ideal in modern societies than in preliterate societies ? and (ii) why violence is more likely to be regarded as a masculine rather than a feminine characteristics in modern societies ? Goode (1968) clearly indicated that how structure of family in different cultures plays an important role in moulding the personality structure of its members. It is assumed that there would be less aggression in the democratic family and more in the authoritarian or autocratic family (Rummel, 1985).

**Family size, Number of children and Aggression**

Aggression among children was attributed to family size and number of children. These have also been treated as instigators of aggression. A few studies indicate that a small family provides better adjustment and also helps in the psychological development of the child.

Bossard and Sanger (1952) and Bossard and Boll (1956) found that in large families the parents to be less over-protective. Kohn (1963) found that in large families there were more parental constraints, especially for middle class boys and working class girls. Young (1964); Gil (1970) and Light (1973) have reported that the proportion of abusing families with four or more children is twice that found in the general population.
Rutter et al. (1970) showed that restlessness, destructiveness, fighting, disobedience, bullying and temper tantrums were common in boys (but not girls) from large than from small families. Gupta (1974) found a higher percentage of murderers belonging to large sized joint families of rural area. Mother with low education and a greater number of children tended to have both anxious and controlling attitudes towards their children (Husaini, 1975).

Knox and Wilson (1978) claims that having two children is more difficult than having one. Rao and Sen (1979) noticed that parental rejection, defective discipline, poverty and large family size as background factors of juvenile delinquency. Varma (1980) indicated that children of lowest sibling size differed significantly and were found to be less aggressive as compared to middle group.

Narchal and Shukla (1986) indicated that girls from large, medium and small families differ significantly on various areas of adjustment and personality, indicating that family size has an effect on the personality and adjustment of the adolescent girls.

However, Boone and Montare (1979) concluded that aggression and family size were related in a linear manner; decreasing aggression was linked to increasing family size.

Demographic variables

Demographic variables not only help to understand the nature and composition of the population of a country.
but have also important implication for social net work of relationships. Less spacing among the children would not only have adverse physiological effect on the health of the mother but would also put a greater strain and stress on the mother to provide proper training to the growing children. Hence, large number of children with less spacing and low economic base would lead to stress and this stress would be released through aggression.

**Age of the child and Aggression**

Age has also been found to have some impact on aggression. Some revealed that aggression has been found among young children while others indicated that whether the individual is five or fifty, aggressive behaviour serves some functional utility (Loeber and Patterson, 1981).

Aggressive behaviour is common in pre-school children, declines during the early school years; rises at adolescence and declines once more between the ages of 15 and 21 years (Goodenough 1931, McFarlane et al. 1954; Wolff, 1961; Masterton, 1967 and Werry and Quay, 1971). Toman (1960) found aggression in infants and children up to some particular age decreases during the passage of childhood but later develops at old age in a more intensive way.

Some researchers and clinicians propose that the most dangerous period in a child's life of being struck or punished by his parents is from 3 months to 3 years of
Further, some studies revealed that the stability pattern existed in childhood aggression. Kagan and Moss (1962) found a significant correlation of .61 for children's aggression directed towards their mother when assessed at age 6 and again at age 14. Olweus (1976) in longitudinal studies supported the contention of a stable aggressive trait. Moore, Chamberlain and Mukai (1979) demonstrated that 84% of the boys referred for treatment for high rates of stealing were involved in police reported offences by the age 14.

Patterson (1980) in a 10 year follow-up data indicated that 100% of a sample of children rated as being in the 95th percentile or above in aggressive behaviour at age three, were perceived aggressive ten years later. Kiran Simbali Bhan (1983) found the boys to be aggressive at both young and old age levels.

**Age of the parents and Aggression**

Straus et al. (1981) found that most violence erupts in the families of younger couples. The rates of each type of family violence are uniformly the highest in families where the respondent was under thirty years old. As the age of parents increases, the rate of violence decreases.

**Sex differences and Aggression**

Almost in all socio-economic groups and in urban as well as in rural areas differential treatment is given
to boys and girls. Child-rearing practices employed by
the parents for boys and girls are far from similar. The
parental reaction toward aggression in the two sexes
would usually be different. As a result one would expect
sex differences on aggressive behaviour.

McFarlane et al. (1954) and Shaffer et al. (1980)
found boys to be more active, more overtly aggressive
and combative than girls. Searle (1961) found that boys
scored higher than girls on aggression, anxiety and pro-
social aggression. Males are more aggressive than females
and the reasons for this sex difference have been
attributed to the learning of sex-role stereotypes
(Young et al. 1964; Bronson and Desjardins, 1968; Feshbach,
1970; Mark and Ervin, 1970; Mischel, 1970 and Maccoby and
Jacklin, 1971).

Devi (1967) showed that male subjects were found
to be more overtly aggressive than females. Wolff (1967)
found that boys were significantly more likely to be
referred for stealing, lying and fighting than girls.

Hood and Sparks (1970) found that boys had a much
higher tendency to report various delinquent acts than
girls. Rosenzweig and Braun (1970) found that males are
more aggressive both positively and negatively than
females, possibly as a function of their greater competiti-
veness with the older generation. Rutter, Tizard and
Whitmore (1970) reported that boys were found to be two to
three times more engaged in stealing, fighting, lying, bullying and destructiveness than girls. Rau et al. (1970) found that boys were significantly more aggressive than girls. They displayed aggression even in their mother's presence.

Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) reported that boys have consistently been found to be more aggressive than girls in all cultures. Kakkar (1974) showed that aggression occurring between members of the same sex is significantly greater than between the members of opposite sexes in India. Poorman, Donnerstein and Donnerstein (1976) indicated that aggression by and toward females was relatively stable over age while aggression by males toward other males increased markedly. Male aggression toward female targets did not vary as a function of age but female aggression also showed no tendency to change as a function of age of subject or sex of the target.

Eme (1979) suggests that it may be easier to facilitate aggression in boys because of their higher activity level and of male hormone patterns. Bhan (1983) found boys to be more aggressive than girls. Olson (1984) found that subjects expected male characters to retaliate more strongly when intervening on an attack on a friend and female characters to retaliate more strongly when being verbally or physically assaulted.
Socio-economic status and Aggression

Socio-economic status of the parents has a bearing on the behaviour pattern of the children. It is generally believed that anti-social behaviour (including aggression) is associated with "Chhote Log" low classes. Aggression has been attributed to the social class background of the family. Earlier studies indicated that middle class families suppressed impulse expression including the inhibition of aggressive behaviour whereas lower class families exercised fewer controls over their children's display of anger and aggression (Davis, 1943; 1947; 1948; Aberte and Naegele, 1952 and Bettelheim, 1952).

Griffiths (1952) reported middle class children showing greater conformity to their values than lower class youngsters and found them to be less aggressive in their behaviour, this is because the lower class families tend to be more severe in their child-rearing practices than middle class. McKee and Leader (1955) found that aggression was found to be more common among the lower middle class group. There were no sex differences or age differences among the pre-schoolers. Shanmugam's study revealed that psychosis, emotional instability, anxiety, aggression, punishment and depression seemed to be related to low socio-economic status (Shanmugam, 1957).

Subsequent researches reported that middle class parents are more warm, less restricted and employ
more of psychological punishment and less of physical
punishment than lower class parents (Miller and Swanson,
1960; Kohn, 1963). Young (1963, 1964) and Justice and
Justice (1976) found that the "reported" cases of child
abuse were more likely to involve families of the lower
class. Singh (1969) found that among individuals who
belonged to lower socio-economic group, the onset of
the illness was at an earlier age and they showed a
greater degree of extreme aggressiveness or withdrawn
behaviour.

Rutter et al. (1970) indicated that social class
was associated with conduct disorder specially aggression
because of low I.Q. Hood and Sparks (1970) suggest a
relationship between lower SES and an increased incidence
of out of control behaviour. In reference to child abuse,
Gil (1970) found higher rates among parents of low income,
low educational attainment, and among those who experienced
high rates of unemployment and dependence upon public
assistance. Zigler (1971) found relationships between
low social class and coercive child-rearing practices and
more aggression and dependence behaviour of the young
children.

Varma (1973) found that Adivasis showed a greater
degree of aggression, excitement, motor activity, ferocity
and less of inhibitions. Newson and Newson (1976) showed
that in lower class, 7 years old were more aggressive and destructive than middle class children and lower class mothers were more physically punitive than middle class mothers. Lefkowitz et al. (1978) found the same trend but in late adolescence (specially in boys). Straus (1979) reported that parents earning less than $6000 annually admitted abusing their children 62% higher than other parents. Pathak and Rastogi (1980) found the low SES adolescents show inwardly directed aggression and exhibit greater number of ego-defensive responses. Kureshi and Hussain (1980) found the significant difference between the two socio-economic groups in the direction of aggression. Varma (1980) indicated that most of the children from low socio-economic status were found to be higher in aggression.

Straus et al. (1981) found that men who held blue collar jobs had higher rates of violence than people who had white collar occupations. The association between occupation of low prestige and aggression was also found in the husband-wife network of relationship as well as in the parent-child relationship. They found that the rate of violence between husband and wife was twice as high in the families of blue collar workers than for white collar workers, the rate of severe violence toward children in blue collar homes was nearly twice as large as the rate in the families of white collar workers and the men who had blue collar jobs had children who had a higher rate of
severe aggression among themselves than the white collar workers. Bhan (1984) investigated that poor families were found to contribute more aggressives to the educational institutions than the well-to-do as reported earlier by Thompson (1962) and Swatantra (1971).

However, a few researchers concluded that aggression was not found to be the phenomenon of the lower social classes but was present in one shape or the other in different strata. Sears et al. (1957) did not find any difference between the aggressive behaviour of children of working and middle class. Feshbach (1970) found no consistent relationship between child aggression and SES. Menon (1974) and Mehre (1974) found that boys in both lower and upper classes were required to be more achieving and aggressive and the girls more dependent and responsible. Steimmetz and Straus (1974) conclude that family violence is not limited to any one particular social class or group. Olweus (1980) found no social class differences in childhood aggression and child-rearing practices in Sweden. Mahajan (1986) found that violence transgresses the boundaries of caste and class.

The above quoted studies cannot be made use of as a model for the present study because either the researchers have not specified what they meant by aggression or have adopted different definitions. Furthermore, they suffer from several drawbacks. Firstly, either
aggression among the children in the younger age group. Keeping in view these gaps in the available literature, the present study was undertaken with the following objectives and aims:

Objectives/Aims of the study

1. To measure aggression and identify aggressive and non-aggressive children among the school going children in the age range of 6-8 years.

2. To quantify the differences, if any, between the aggressive and non-aggressive children on three measures of intelligence, and

3. To identify the social correlates of aggression i.e. the factors associated with aggression among children.

On the basis of the review of literature and the objectives of the study the following hypotheses have been formulated:

i) The male children will be more aggressive than female children.

ii) Considering that low I.Q. is associated with aggression and conversely, high I.Q. is associated with non-aggression. It is expected that aggressive children will score low on intelligence.

iii) Aggression breeds aggression i.e. the aggressive parents will not only have an incongenial childhood but will also have aggressive spousal relationships.
iv) The aggressive spouses will have aggressive children.

v) The parents associating positive consequences of punishment are more likely to use physical punishment as a mode of upbringing.

vi) Greater the frequency of punishment used as a mode of child-rearing, higher the possibility a child becoming aggressive.

vii) The children of lower castes are likely to exhibit more aggressive behaviour.

viii) Aggression is dependent upon the family size i.e. larger the size the greater will be the expression of aggression.

ix) The younger parents will have more aggressive children than the older parents.

x) It is expected that lower the socio-economic status higher the frequency of aggression.