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The shape of the investigation starts becoming clear only when the data has been processed and analysed. The investigator has to derive inferences on the basis of the processed and analysed data. The inferences in any research, are essential for interpretation. Inferences and interpretations can never take a specific shape, unless, the process of "HYPOTHESIS TESTING" is done. WILHELM PALMER (1943) described his view that the success of whole study, in research, depends upon how the investigator interprets and analyses the facts. Thus the validity of "INTERPRETATION" depends more upon common sense, experience, background - knowledge and intellectual capabilities of the interpreter rather than upon conformity to any set rules that might be formulated.

The first hypothesis of this research is concerned with the differences in aggressive behaviour between the groups of "Non-deprived" and "Deprived" children. In the fourth Chapter, the table No. 2 shows that the significant difference in aggression, is not obtained between these two groups. The significance value (.71) is very much less than the table value (2.01 at .05 level). This leads the investigator to reject the research hypothesis (H1) and consequently maintain the null hypothesis (H0) "AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOUR OF CHILDREN - "DEPRIVED" and "NON-DEPRIVED" OF PARENTS DOES NOT DIFFER".
By the comparison of "mean" in aggressiveness, it is clear that "Non-deprived" children are more aggressive (X = 24.67) than the "Deprived" children (X = 25.92). Though, it has already been mentioned that the difference is very negligible and non-significant but definitely indicates some trend. It should also be noted that none of the groups is very high in aggressive behaviour when the "AVERAGES" of the scores are compared. The S.D. shows (refer table No. 2) relatively higher variance within the "Non-deprived" group (σ = 9.36) than the "Deprived" group (σ = 9.03). This variance of aggressive behaviour depends upon the individual differences of each group regarding rearing socialization and feeling of self-satisfaction.

A deeper analysis (table No. 3) of the "TOTAL DEGREE OF AGGRESSIVENESS" shows more interesting results than that have been discussed so far. Here, though total percentage of aggressive behaviour of both the groups does not differ as much as was expected still, there is such a discrepancy when the scores of aggressiveness are compared with three levels of percentages. Non-deprived children are almost three times higher on the "HIGH - AGGRESSIVENESS" whereas the "Deprived" group children are almost twice higher on the "LEAST - AGGRESSIVENESS". The middle level i.e. the level of "MEDIUM AGGRESSIVENESS" does not show such difference between the groups.
Generally, it is presumed and often established that "deprivation" of any type, increases aggression. But the results of the present study are not in agreement with this assumption because there is no significant difference in aggression between the "deprived" and "non-deprived" groups when compared on the basis of "MEAN SCORES".

The results do not confirm with the study of Harlow (1965), Sears and Pine (1946) and Santeeck and Wolferd (1970). Harlow found that parental deprivation may be the cause of maladjustments and aggressiveness including emotional apathy, mental-retardation and an inability to express their feelings. The reason of this is that due to the absence of parents, the child feels insecure and lonely. Sears and Pine (1946) also concluded that boys of father-present home demonstrated much more aggression than the boys from father-absent home. Santeeck and Wolferd (1970) compared fifth grade boys, mostly from lower class homes, whose fathers were present and boys whose fathers were absent because of death, divorce, desertion or separation. Boys in the later group (whose fathers were absent), tended to be more aggressive than the other group and were less tolerant of a delay in gratification.

The differences of the results in the present research and the above mentioned researches, might be on account of measuring the total aggression in this investigation. In fact, aggression may have different facets and any type of frustration,
including deprivation, might have a stronger impact on any particular facet in spite of showing no influence in general, while considering all the facets, together with globally.

The aggressive behaviours of children are of two types — "OVERT" and "COVERT". Overt aggression shows the behavioural aspect of aggression while the Covert aggression shows the suppressed feelings in aggression. In this dimension, to see the differences between these two types of aggression, the second hypothesis i.e. "THE DEPRIVED AND THE NON-DEPRIVED GROUPS ARE DISSIMILAR ON THE TYPES OF AGGRESSION", is formulated.

The differences have been shown in the tables No. 4 and 5 (refer Chapter IV). The tables show that both the groups have significant differences in the two types of aggression — "OVERT" as well as "COVERT". The significance value in "OVERT AGGRESSIVENESS" is 3.49, 7.02 (2.63). Similarly in "COVERT AGGRESSIVENESS", the significance value (11.62) is greater than the table value. Thus, these results are in favour of retaining the research hypothesis (H) No. 2 — leading to the conclusion that the "deprived" and "Non-deprived" groups are different in "OVERT" as well as "COVERT" aggressions.

It is also clear by the "means" (table Nos. 4 and 5) that the deprived children have a more fantasy aggression (M = 6.33) and express less Overt aggression (X = 16.95) than the "Non-deprived" children who show more Overt aggression (M = 21.51) and have a less fantasy aggression (M = 3.16). The "AVERAGE"
mentioned, in table Nos. 4 and 5 also indicates that "Non-deprived" group is reasonably higher in "OVERT - AGGRESSION" (norm = 19.18). The higher percentage (43.9%) of the obtained total scores also hint that the "Non-deprived" group is certainly higher by one decade from the "deprived" group in Overt aggression. On the other hand, this "Non-deprived" group stands lower in "Overt Aggression" (norm = 4.75). Exactly, the reverse is the situation of the "deprived" group.

Another point worth mentioning is that the differences of the percentages calculated from the "TOTAL" obtained scores show a reasonably bigger gap between the two groups in "COVERT AGGRESSION". The wider gap is clear from the differences (Significant value 11.62) which is much more in magnitude in comparison to the difference in Overt aggression (Significant value = 3.49).

One more thing which needs explanation is that the groups are not different from each other in "VARIANCE" when considered separately for "COVERT" and "OVERT" aggressions.

The extensive differences of "COVERT" and "OVERT" aggressions, between the two groups of subjects become clearer when we analyse the following curves which can be easily located even more specifically at the place (A), where the two lines are crossing each other. This makes it very clear that Overt aggression and covert aggression take on reverse paths in their development or manifestation.
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A COMPARATIVE VIEW - EXTENT OF AGGRESSION.
This particular format presented by these two lines, mentioned just now, fully support the "PREREUNIAN DYNAMIC PRINCIPLES". Here the gap of percentages between the groups is the least in the category of the "MINIMUM", maximum in the category of the "HIGH" and the average in the category of the "LEAST".

Very interestingly the reverse can be seen when we scrutinize the curves of "OVERT AGGRESSION". Here again, the minimum gap is in the category of the "MINIMUM" but very different from the curves of the "OVERT - AGGRESSION", the maximum gap is in the category of "LEAST" and the average is in the category of the "HIGH".

The curves showing the "OVERT-AGGRESSION" of the "deprived" group has acquired a slightly hyperbolic shape, while the curve depicting covert aggression of "non-deprived" group is of a perfectly upward slanting pattern. Perhaps a slight hyperbolic trend of the curve is exposing the demand of the nature because in case it becomes linear, then definitely these children - (deprived group) cannot maintain their "NORMALCY" and would have to be categorized as extreme masochistic or suicide prone children. But this is not the case with the "deprived children" included in this study. The two groups showing opposite tendencies (overt/covert) but proceeding in the same direction, can be located within the concerned lines becoming closer to each other, but this trend is not so clear when we come to the category of
the "medium" the partial logic of which can be assigned to the point discussed just now about the "HOMELINESS" of the "deprived" group.

The deeper analysis of the present data indicates that DOLLARD, MILLER AND THEIR COLLEAGUE'S "FRUSTRATION - AGGRESSION HYPOTHESIS" can be true only if "Covert aggression" exists in the case where "FRUSTRATION" is considered in the form of "PARENTAL - DEPRIVATION", at least. This has been found so in this study. Here the "deprived" (even if presumed to be frustrated, according to DOLLARD - MILLER HYPOTHESIS) children are high only in "Covert aggression". In other words, the partial truth of the "FRUSTRATION - AGGRESSION HYPOTHESIS" can be confirmed by this investigation.

The separate analysis of "overt" and "Covert" aggressions, in the present research, confirms DOLLBY, HEINZKE, STOLZ et al.'s (1939) results that the child, in a father - separated family, seems to be in a conflict about expressing his greater "feeling of hostility" in overt-aggressive acts.

When micro-analysis is done on the data of "Overt" aggressive behaviour in both the groups measured by three different inventories - BBR (rating by teachers), WBS (rating by guardians), and GWT (checking by peers), the differences, as shown in the table No. 6, are obtained "SIGNIFICANT" in the guardian's report (WBS) and the children's report (GWT). But there is no significant difference (>.09 <.01) at .05 level) when measured by teacher's report (BBR). This indicates comparatively a high validity.
in CFT and WBS at least as far as this research is concerned. The rationale for the same can be presented very genuinely. Perhaps, it is on account of a close contact between the parents and the child and the peer groups. The teachers contact with the individual child in a big class might hinder accuracy of observation or fear on the part of the children, the cause of not showing "Overt aggression" freely or there might be chance factors. But the suspicion about the reliability and validity of the scores is very much minimized when we observe table No. 7. All the tools show their discriminative ability very nicely on the conclusion of Overt aggression. This is true that over all average cannot give a point to point clarification very neatly. The investigator also admits the requirement of further investigation in this inter-comparison format.

Less validity of teacher's report as found in this investigation, cannot be taken as universal. The scholars have reported different merit levels of teacher's report used for different purposes. For e.g. Annett, M. (1981) reported the maximum validity of the teacher's report in a study where teachers were asked to evaluate the likability of boys for their peers on Pupil - Evaluation-Inventory.

In another study comparing validity self-reported anger, peer report of anger, teacher rating of anger and the actual presence of anger in emotionally disturbed children, Much, A.J.
and EMBRE, S.E. (1963) found self-report as the most perfect tool of assessment. Thus it differs from study to study and any universal conclusion cannot be given as far as any one evaluation median is concerned.

A few inferences can be expressed by investigator, here in connection with the "MBSS" of aggressive behaviour among children: (i) "Fear of Punishment" may be one of the factors inhibiting overt expression of aggression, even if the aggressive trait is existing in the child's temperament. As the scores of fear of punishment indicate the deprived children are on higher side and therefore they do not express their aggression overtly as their counterparts can. The reverse is true with the lesser fear of punishment. (ii) The parents seem encouraging aggressive behaviour to a fair extent in their children as a trait of masculinity, while, the boys in orphanages, may lack such encouragement or permissiveness. (iii) "Emotional - security" is highly correlated with non-hesitant, free and frank behaviour and certainly this "emotional - security" exists more in degree among non-deprived children.

To judge the third hypothesis "THERE IS NO DIFFERENCE IN FEAR OF PUNISHMENT BETWEEN "DEPRIVED" AND "NON-DEPRIVED" GROUPS", the table No. 8 shows that the "deprived" group has a more "fear of punishment" ($\bar{X} = 6.33$) than the "non-deprived" group ($\bar{X} = 3.09$). A significant difference is obtained between the groups. The "significant difference between the means" is higher (11.06) than the table value 2.63 at .01 level. This value indicates a fairly
high difference between the two groups. Therefore H0 no. 3 is

disproved, eventually leading to the acceptance that "deprived"
group is more afraid of punishment than their counterparts.

The significance difference scores hint that "deprived"
group is not the least close to the "non-deprived" group on this
variable. Both the groups are almost similar on the distribution
of the scores as S.D. scores are neither dissimilar nor very high.
But the ranges of scores are very different in both the groups as
shown in table no. 1.

This table shows that the "non-deprived group" has a 1 to
6 range of scores and the "deprived group" has a 2 to 9 range of
scores. The other difference about the mode is that the "non-
deprived" has its mode of 3 score while the "deprived" group has
its mode of 5. This indicates that the "deprived" group has a
bigger number of units which are suffering from the "fear of
punishment" whereas the non-deprived group has a smaller
number of units which are suffering from this sort of fear.

The main point to be noted here is that the deprived group
is fairly high (6.23) when compared with the calculated average
or norm (4.76) whereas, the "non-deprived" group is low (3.09).

These results are not in complete agreement with SIMPSON
and MURRAY's results. Their delinquent subjects were of the
lower and middle socio-economic status and a significant difference
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Range</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Score(1)</th>
<th>Score(2)</th>
<th>Score(3)</th>
<th>Score(4)</th>
<th>Score(5)</th>
<th>Score(6)</th>
<th>Score(7)</th>
<th>Score(8)</th>
<th>Score(9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of "FEAR OF PUNISHMENT" was observed between these two socio-economic status. In the present investigation, the subjects belonged to a constant range of socio-economic status, which included lower-middle/lower classes but that is interesting is that even in this single stratum (constant SES range) "FEAR of PUNISHMENT" differed when associated with the "deprived" and the "non-deprived" groups. This is on account of adding a new variable of "DEPRIVATION" in the present investigation.

These results are different from the common prevalent assumption that the "non-deprived" should have a more "FEAR OF PUNISHMENT" because they live with their parents and are kept in discipline, while, this is not exactly applicable or so is assumed, to the "Deprived children" living in orphanages.

The probable reasons of such different results might be -
(1) Type of discipline exercised in the orphanages is very different from that used in the families. The children of orphanages are always afraid of any sort of physical harm incurred on them if they go against what is expected, while in families, children are well sure of no such physical harm, (2) In families, children are very well scared of and can detect the soft corner in their parent's heart for them. In a sense, children are conscious of the associated affection for themselves from their parents and this feeling mitigates their "fear of punishment".
The fourth hypothesis is related to the differences between the "DIRECTIONS OF AGGRESSION" of both the groups. Table 9 indicates that the "EXTRAPUNITIVE" and the "IMPUNITIVE" directions of aggression have obtained significant differences (3.26 > 2.69 at .01 level) between the groups, whereas, the "INTERPUNITIVE DIRECTION OF AGGRESSION" has been found not significantly different between the groups. This difference (.79) of "INTERPUNITIVENESS" is much lesser than the table value (2.01 at .05 level). Therefore the research hypothesis no. 4 "AGGRESSION OF DEPRIVED" and "NON-DEPRIVED" GROUPS DIFFER IN DIRECTION" can be retained partially. It is also to be noted that the differences between the groups exist only in 2/3 dimensions.

By the comparison of the "means" obtained in the groups, in these three types of directions of aggression, we find that the "non-deprived" group is more "Extrapunitive" than the "deprived" group (E = "HP" \( \bar{X} = 51.00 \), "P" \( \bar{X} = 47.70 \), DIFFERENCE = 3.70). In contrast, the "deprived" group is only comparatively slightly higher in "INTERPUNITIVENESS" (the difference = .89). The differences in "EXTRAPUNITIVENESS" support the conclusion that the "Non-deprived" group expresses its anger relatively freely in overt behaviours. This point also supports that lesser "fear of Punishment" does not hinder these children's expression of anger. As far as the "INTERPUNITIVE" direction of aggression is concerned, a few points become clearer. First of all, this indicates that "COVERT AGGRESSION" is not necessarily related with "INTERPUNITIVENESS" and "COVERT AGGRESSION" can go together. Here, even DOLIARD -
Miller Hypothesis acceptance presents some doubts because when the frustration of deprivation is related with the component of "Introfunitiveness" of aggression, the correlation might be almost negligible.

In the direction of "Introfunitiveness", the "mean" of the "deprived" group is again higher (M = 29.70) than that of the "non-deprived" group (M = 26.01). The difference (3.69) is significant at .01 level (2.69). The point which should be taken care of is that in one sense, only the deprived group is "Punitive" while the "non-deprived" group is "Non-Punitive" ("P" group above norm, "NP" below norm = 26.3) when compared with the norm.

Therefore, it can be said very safely that the "deprived" group evades aggression very trickingly to gloss over the frustration relatively more than their counterparts. "Introfunitiveness" stands for indirect negatively expressed anger or "pure" expression of aggression or positively expressed anger as happens in sublimation or channelization. The scores indicate this type of behaviour occurs comparatively more in the "deprived" children which is perhaps very natural as they do not have a sufficient chance for the direct expression of their anger in their typical surrounding. Excessive "Introfunitiveness" seems to be unnatural at this tender age of 6 to 10 + years, the age range of the subjects selected for this study. Perhaps "Introfunitiveness" is a tendency of adulthood. Absence of "Introfunitiveness" in both the groups is proved by the lower scores (than the norm average of
23.10), according to the manual of P-E study. Therefore, the only exclusively major direction of aggression, highly linked with "frustration", of deprivation taken for frustration (according to DOLLARD AND MILLER (1939)), left for the "deprived" group is that of "INFERNITIVENESS".

One very important fact to be elaborated here, is that on "INFERNITIVENESS", the "deprived" group is slightly higher than the norm (refer the manual - average of the range = 30.6) indicating almost usual "INFERNITIVITIVE" behaviour and the "non-deprived" group is much higher than the norm, hinting at the "tendency of turning their aggression on to the environment" comparatively more in degree. The only rationale for explaining this type of unusual expression is that both the groups belong to the lower-middle or the lower socio-economic status where children are relatively free in expressing their aggression.

The fifth hypothesis has been partially retained leading to the conclusion that the "TYPES OF REACTIONS" may or may not differ between the "deprived" and the "non-deprived" children, depending largely upon the orientation imbied in the "type of reaction".

It is clear from the table no. 10 that significant differences are only seen in the two types of reactions RESEARCH, "OBSTACLE - DOMINANCE" and "ECO-DEFENCE" while in "NEED-PERSISTENCE". There is no significant difference.
The comparison of "mean-differences" and "mean-scores" in "OBSTACLE - DOMINANCE" reactions indicates that the "non-deprived" is higher (\( \bar{X} = 21.70 \)) than the "deprived" group (\( \bar{X} = 19.69 \)), whereas, in the "EGO - DEFENCE" type of reaction, the "D_2" group is higher (\( \bar{X} = 55.14 \)) than the "ND" group (\( \bar{X} = 51.01 \)). In the third type of reaction (NEED PERSISTENCE), the "non-deprived" group has obtained a greater mean (\( \bar{X} = 27.20 \)) than the "D_2" group (\( \bar{X} = 26.54 \)), even though, the difference of the "means" of this category is not significant.

The differences calculated for significance purpose, are the highest in the "Ego-defence" type of reaction. Though none of the group is high according to the norms (56.3), still, the existence of this tendency cannot be denied in the subjects of this study. The bigger gap between the mean-scores of the two groups, seems to be true because the "deprived" group is more on the defensive side, at least it is so presumed. The contrary is applicable to the "non-deprived" group who are highly "NEUTRALISTIC", and who can express their aggression freely and naturally; are more capable of fighting against obstacles in their environment. Therefore, the "significance difference" exists (5.93) between these two groups where "OBSTACLE - DOMINANCE" is concerned. The "Obstacle - dominance" tendency is certainly very high (\( \bar{X} = 21.72 \) in "ND" group and \( \bar{X} = 19.69 \) in the "D_2" group > norm = 11.70) in both the groups. It can not be said that that types of responses will be found in facing the barrier occasioning frustration. These two groups - the "deprived" and the "non-
"deprived" may be different in the types of responses in this category.

In the "NEED PRESENCE" type of reaction, where the solution of the frustrating problem is emphasised, nemnax seems alike in both the groups. The mean-scores (D = 26.54, ND = 27.20) of this category are found below the norm value = 31.70 in both the cases. Therefore, none of the group has a sufficient capacity for solution of the frustrating problem. Perhaps these two low scores of children, in this study, are on account of the inclusion of the lower and lower middle socio-economic status.

Through the SD's of both the groups, it can be concluded that a greater variance does not exist in the characteristics of the personalities in the scores of any of the variables because the SD's scores are neither very high nor very low.

These results directly though partially confirm the results drawn by "LEONARD, DOOB (1939) who mentioned that there are some internal conditions which push individuals towards behaving aggressively or that the aggressive reactions are the drive-effects to frustration. He assumes a universally causal relationship between frustration and aggression.

A second control group was also included only for finding out the trend in relation to different variables. It is also known that the "physical deprivation of parents" does not end up to the limit ("P" and "D") restricted in this investigation. There can
also be a "physical deprivation" of parents, where one parent is alive and the child is living in an orphanage or where both the parents are alive and the child is living in an orphanage or in a foster home and so on. It is impossible to include all the groups in the study and this is the rationale for including the second control group only for finding out the trend.

The concerned hypothesis no. 6 could not be retained as a specific trend exists in the aggressive behaviour of the three groups, eventually leading to the retention of the alternative hypothesis, "THERE IS A SPECIFIC TREND OF AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOUR - MAGNITUDE IN ACCORDANCE TO THE EXTENT OF DEPRIVATION".

The scores in total aggressive behaviour are maximum in the non-deprived group (\( \bar{X} = 1336.34, \overline{X} = 24.67 \)). Next comes the "deprived of one parent" group (\( \bar{X} = 1312.32, \overline{X} = 25.96 \)) and last of all, comes the group "deprived of both the parents" (\( \bar{X} = 1280, \overline{X} = 25.92 \)). This is a clear indication that the aggressive behaviour increases in a specific repertoire as the feeling of insecurity, absence of love, alienation, social - in recognition etc. increase separately or in conjunction. This finding is interesting sufficient enough to instigate any scholar for further probing.

A more-level analysis of the data concerned with the above mentioned fact directly or indirectly supports the investigator in the retention of the alternative hypothesis.

A detailed discussion and interpretation brings forth the following pattern on the basis of the scores and the significance-level.
(A) THE SCORES BASE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) VRC</th>
<th>Non-deprived (ND)</th>
<th>Deprived (D) of one parent</th>
<th>Deprived (D₂) of both parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2) ICR</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) GWF</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Total overt aggression</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Covert aggression</td>
<td>D₂</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Total aggression</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Fear of punishment</td>
<td>D₂</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Direction of aggression</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D₂</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Types of reaction</td>
<td>C-D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-D</td>
<td>D₂</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-P</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>D₂</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(B) - The Significance Level Test -

Position has been shown in order of the magnitude of significance level - "t" values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups Variables</th>
<th>$H_0 - H_1$</th>
<th>$H_0 - D$</th>
<th>$D_1 - D$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total overt aggression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covert aggression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total aggression</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of punishment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directions of aggression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of reactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the basis of these scores, the typical trend does not deviate anywhere. For example, if the non-deprived group (ND) is highest, deprived of both the parents (D^2) is the next and deprived of one parent (D) is the last in any category, exactly the opposite happens when the pattern of aggression becomes reverse in its nature, as can be seen in the "overt" and "covert" aggressions. Similarly the trends in 6, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 are shown also above any controversy. "DEFEENCE" scores which represent the strength or weakness of the ego, show a very interesting pattern as the non-deprived is the weakest in this area, then is the deprived of one parent and last comes the group "deprived" of both the parents. In "OBSTACLE - DOMINANCE", the "non-deprived" and the "deprived of one parent" groups are not very different, from each other though there is a definite order as mentioned in the chart (A). "NEED - PERSISTENCE" which shows adaptative adequacy of the child, seems to be automatic or acquired adjustment in the non-deprived and the deprived of both the parents groups. Perhaps "non-deprived" group develops an automatic adaptative adequacy while, the group "D^2" (deprived of both the parents), living in the orphanages, are forced to develop adjustment in the existing circumstances. The third group i.e. "D" (deprived of one parent) is in the mid-way, showing maximum fluctuations in adjustability.

The chart showing the "Position in order of the magnitude of the significance level - " t " values - scores" also supports
the previous conclusions showing minimum differences at various sex places between the "non-deprived" and the "deprived of both parents" groups. They also show average differences between "ND" and "D" groups and the lowest differences between "D1" and "D" groups. Then the investigator comes to a few secondary assumptions for which the hypotheses no. 7 onwards are formulated. These points do not need as much elaboration as the primary assumptions need. The concerned hypotheses testing, discussion and interpretation are given below.

Aggression as already elucidated, can be "overt" as well as "covert". The extent of these two types of aggressions decrease or increase in a single or opposite direction, can be known from the data organised in table no. 14. The results show a fairly high correlation between Overt and Covert aggression ($D = - .62$; $ND = - .72$; total $= .79$). A very interesting point is that the prefix of the quantity is negative at all places. This indicates an inverse relationship between the Overt and Covert aggressions. It means that the children who have a more fantasy aggression show less Overt aggression and those who possess a low fantasy aggression, express a higher Overt aggression. Thus the research hypothesis no. 7, "THERE IS AN INVERSE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN "OVERT" AND "COVERT" AGGRESSION" is confirmed.

The correlation is negative at all places in higher in the deprived group ($D = - .62 > .75$, $ND = .72 < .75$). The correlation in scores of the "deprived group" also belongs to the standard degree
of a high correlation while in "Non-deprived group" this correlation is only on the lower border of the high correlation category.

The results of the present study, differ from the results found by SANDFORD and MURRAY who got a positive correlation between the Overt and Covert aggressions. The differences of positive and negative correlations between the results may be on account of different samples, different dependent variables and cultural factors and also on account of the criterion of if taken for the selection of the subjects.

Just like "overt" and "covert" aggressions, HIGHDON, J. SUBASTAIN, MURZYNEK, M.H. and SHAN MOORE (1931) have divided aggressive behaviour into two "HOSTILE" and "INSTRUMENTAL" behaviours. They have done no effort to correlate these two types of aggressive behaviour with "overt" and "covert" aggression; instead, they have related with "ANGRY" and "NON-ANGRY" persons. The results of the present study, provide some hint that overt aggression dominated children may be more hostile than the children whose aggression is expressed or repressed as is the case with the "deprived" children in the present study. Nothing can be said with certainty in this connection and it needs further probing.

To find out the relationship between "fear of punishment" and "aggression" the hypothesis no.3 (Chapter No. XIII) was
formulated and the correlation between aggressive behaviors (all three types - Overt, Covert and total) and the fear of punishment scores of both groups, has been shown in table No. 15.

The table indicates that the correlation between "fear of punishment" and total aggression is negative (- .64) in "deprived group" (- .60) as well as in the "Non-deprived group" (- .59). The trend in the scores is a proof that if "aggression" is less, "fear of punishment" must be high or vice-versa. The same trend can also be seen in the correlation scores calculated for "Overt aggression" and "Fear of Punishment". Contrary results can be seen in the correlation between "COVERT AGGRESSION" and "FEAR OF PUNISHMENT" where the prefix is a plus sign. Whatever may be the type of correlation, negative or positive, the scores are either high or fairly high in all places (- .39 to + .89).

Therefore, the research hypothesis No. 8 i.e. "Fear of Punishment" and "Aggression are Highly Correlated", has been retained and it is certain, at least in the present study, that there is a significantly high correlation between the "fear of punishment" and "aggression".

As far as the discussion and the interpretation is concerned, the scores are a sure indication that there is an inverse relationship between "FEAR OF PUNISHMENT" and "AGGRESSION" as a whole. This means that children (deprived/non-deprived) who have a greater fear of punishment, are less aggressive in comparison
to those children who have a less fear of punishment. High scores in this category cannot be ignored when one considers these two emotions together.

The above mentioned trend of correlation is maintained when "overt aggression" and "fear of punishment" are linked. Here the scores are even higher than in the previous category, showing correlation of the "total aggression" and "fear of punishment", (table No. 15). This shows that with the increase in "fear of punishment", there occurs decrease in "overt aggression". The inter-group comparison shows higher scores of correlation in the "D1" group (−.68) than in the "US" group (−.52). This supports the results concerned with research hypothesis no. 3 that the "deprived children" have a more "fear of punishment" and therefore they show a less "overt aggression" while, the "non-deprived" children have a less "fear of punishment" and therefore, they are more free to express their aggression overtly.

The correlation scores between "COVERT AGGRESSION" and "FEAR OF PUNISHMENT" (table No. 15) show a positive prefix and this is an indication that if the "FEAR OF PUNISHMENT" is higher then the "COVERT AGGRESSION" is also high. The scores of "Deprived group" are the higher ones (+.37) even in this category and the gap between the "Deprived" and the "Non-deprived" groups is reasonably large (the gap = .20).
It is very interesting to notice that the correlation between "OVERT AGGRESSION" and "FEAR OF PUNISHMENT", "TOTAL AGGRESSION" and "FEAR OF PUNISHMENT" carry a minus sign while there is a plus sign with the correlation between "OVERT AGGRESSION" and "FEAR OF PUNISHMENT". This means that the total aggression is more related to "OVERT AGGRESSION" and this is very true when this concept is operationally defined.

"Fantasy" is the major indicator of the Covert Aggression. In the present investigation, the deprived children have more a "fear of punishment", therefore, they have a greater amount of fantasy and day-dreams. This is perhaps on account of the insecurity - feelings of the "deprived children" living in orphanages. This is the reason why they are more submissive and withdrawn in their behaviour especially when they know that they are being observed.

The results obtained through testing IA No. 8 are directly or indirectly supporting those of SANFORD and MURRAY et al. and the DOLLARD & MILLER investigations.

SANFORD and his colleagues (1954) reported that individuals who have a low "punishment ratio", express more "Overt aggression" than those with a high "punishment ratio".

DOLLARD and MILLER (FRUSTRATION AGGRESSION MODEL, 1939, P. 33) maintained that the "Strength of Inhibition" by any act of aggression varies positively with the amount of punishment.
anticipated to be the consequences of that act. It means that individuals who have a strong "fear of punishment" relative to their aggressive impulses, will manifest less overt aggression than individuals whose fear of punishment, relative to their aggressive impulse, is comparatively less.

The next hypothesis no. 9 is "FEAR OF PUNISHMENT" and "DIRECTIONS OF AGGRESSION" are RELATIVELY CORRELATED. The table no. 26, indicates negligible correlations between "Fear of punishment" and any one of the "Direction of Aggression". The range of correlation scores is from .035 to .230. On the basis of such negligible correlation scores, the H A mentioned above, cannot be retained. The important point which is to be noted here is that in the total correlation, the trend is "negative" at two places out of three.

Column-wise comparison clears a few points -

(1) The relatively higher correlation is exactly the same between "Fear of Punishment", "Extrapunitiveness", "Fear of Punishment" and "Impunitiveness" (.157). Mentioning the following points will not out of place here -

(a) Fear of punishment is high in "deprived" group only,
(b) "Extrapunitiveness" is high in both the groups but higher in the "Non-deprived" group, and
(c) Impunitiveness is high in "deprived" group only.
At both the places in the table, the correlation is negative, showing an inverse relationship between the variables.

(ii) "Fear of Punishment" and "Intropunitive"ness" are positively correlated and the scores are negligible (± .055). It means that the "Fear of Punishment" and "Intropunitive" direction of aggression both have accelerating tendency simultaneously though negligibly. The scores are so low because of the almost absolute absence of "INTROPUNITIVENESS" in children in general.

Similarly, the next hypothesis no. 10 i.e. "FEAR OF PUNISHMENT" and "TYPES OF REACTION" DO NOT HAVE ANY RELATIONSHIP also does not get any importance on account of very low scores of correlations as can be seen in table no. 17. The range of correlation scores is .021 to .211, but a trend can be detected as all the correlations are positive.

This indicates that "TYPES OF REACTION" and "FEAR OF PUNISHMENT" have the same direction though they are not related in any relevant manner. The results are in favour of retaining the H O No. 10.

The eleventh hypothesis to be tested is "TYPES OF AGGRESSION" and "DIRECTION OF AGGRESSION" HAVE NO RELATIONSHIP". To test this, the correlations between three "Directions of Aggression"
and two "TYPES OF AGGRESSION" separately (Overt and Covert) are
calculated, as shown in table No. 18 (refer Chapter IV). No
specific relationship is found, therefore, No No. 11 cannot
be retained.

First, an attempt is made to ascertain whether the
"Direction of Aggression" is related to the aspect of "OVERT-
AGGRESSION"? The table No. 13 shows that the negligible correlation
is obtained everywhere. The range of correlation scores is from
.043 to .221. This is a clear indication that there is no
relationship between any one of the directions and "Overt
aggression".

The scores of correlations obtained between any one of the
"DIRECTIONS" and "COVERT AGGRESSION" are also equally negligible.
Here the scores vary from -.073 to .245. The highest limit of
the scores i.e. .245 is restricted only to one correlation that
is between "COVERT AGGRESSION" and "EXTRAPUNITIVE"
It is in support of the general assumption that "Manifest
aggression" and "Latent aggression" are not necessarily similar
or linear and have simultaneous increment or decrement in
magnitude.

It is clear by the correlation scores that "EXTRAPUNITIVE"
direction of aggression and "OVERT" aggression have positive
relationship though the scores are low, whereas, in "INTRAP-
UNITIVE" and "IMUNITIVE" directions of aggression, the
correlation scores with the types of aggression are negative in nature though the scores are slightly higher than the scores in the previous category.

In the second row where "COVERT AGGRESSION" is related with different "DIRECTIONS OF AGGRESSION", the correlation scores in "total" are slightly higher but still no specific relationship can be diagnosed except that it is "positive" only in "IMPULSIVENESS" category and "negative" in the other two categories. Thus, presenting an overall picture of uniformity, irrespective of the type of aggression, only in the "INTERPERSONAL AGGRESSION" column and non-uniformity in the other two columns.

The twelfth hypothesis i.e. "THERE EXISTS AN IMPORTANT CORRELATION BETWEEN "TYPES OF REACTION" AND "TYPES OF AGGRESSION", was assumed so keeping in view the earlier results of this very investigation in different groups for "Types of Reaction" and "Types of Aggression". But the results are not in the favour of retaining this hypothesis as negligible correlation is found between any "Type of Reaction" and any "Type of Aggression". The correlation scores vary from .021 to .154, but a few trends can be seen through scrutinizing the data.

(1) Comparatively higher correlation exists between the "COVERT AGGRESSION and "ego-defence" type of reaction. This is an indication that "ego-defence" increases in a specific direction in accordance with the magnitude of "Covert Aggression". Though, the relationship cannot be given any emphasis because of the absence of very high scores in this column.
(ii) A specific trend can be seen where "OBSTACLE - DOMINANCE" and "TYPES OF AGGRESSION" are concerned. "Obstacle - dominance is negatively correlated with "OVERT AGGRESSION" and positively correlated with "COVERT AGGRESSION"; though the correlations are negligible at both the places.

(iii) "NEED - PERSISTENCE" scores are also very low but positively correlated with both "Types of Aggression". Thus, except giving a hint about the direction of relationship, nothing specific can be inferred from the results.

Then comes the hypothesis no. 13 stating "DIRECTION OF AGGRESSION" and "TYPES OF REACTIONS" HAVE A SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIP". In this hypothesis only nominal relationship is assumed on the basis of the absence of any sort of information of relationship in the manual itself but then the author of the test has also not given any description in favour of such relationship. Therefore, just to test this omitted part of information, the investigator formulated hypothesis on this subject matter and tried to find out whether any relationship exist or does not exist. The results show nominal correlation in any one direction of aggression and therefore, he is compelled to reject the statement mentioned above.

But, there is some indication of relationship when we consider the prefixed signs of the scores in different columns.
refer (table no. 20). An opposite trend can be seen when the correlations of "Types of Reactions" with the "OBSTACLE DOMINANCE" and "ECO - DEFENCE" are compared. In "OBSTACLE DOMINANCE" column, negative sign is in the middle row, showing inverse relationship of "INTRAPUNITIVENESS" and "OBSTACLE DOMINANCE" and "POSITIVE" signs are in the first and third rows, indicating one direction relationship "EXTRAPUNITIVENESS" and "OBSTACLE DOMINANCE" and between "INFUNITIVENESS" and "OBSTACLEDOMINANCE". Just the opposite can be noted down in the column of "ECO-DEFENCE". Here the "plus" sign is in the middle - row, showing one direction of relationship between "I" and "ED" and "minus" signs can be seen in the first and third rows indicating inverse relationship between "E" and "OF" and "I" and "OF". No specific trend can be seen in the third column, where "Need - Persistence" is related with different direction of aggression but as already mentioned the correlationship is nominal every where.

The last hypothesis "AN INTERACTIONAL EFFECT" OF "FEAR OF PUNISHMENT", "DIRECTION OF AGGRESSION" AND "TYPES OF REACTIONS" EXISTS ON AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOUR", is not the least important for any research oriented person. The interactional-effect of the three variables together (Direction of aggression, Fear of punishment and types of reactions) is "not significant" as can be seen in the table No. 21, nor any of the two variste - interactions prove to be "significant". The main effects are also "NOT SIGNIFICANT" when the effects of "TYPES OF REACTIONS" and
"DIRECTIONS OF AGGRESSION" are seen on "AGGRESSION". The only important main effect is of "FEAR OF PUNISHMENT" on aggression. The F-value (22.45) is "highly significant" at .01 (7.01) level. On the basis of the results as shown in the table no. 21, the hypothesis is disproved and no interactional effect of the variables - Direction of aggression, Fear of Punishment and types of reactions could be found.

CONCLUSIONS

The investigator reached the following primary and a few secondary conclusions after analyzing and scrutinizing the results, the scores and the critical ratios -

(i) The deprivation and non-deprivation of parents (physical) does not influence the aggressive behaviour of the children but they certainly do differ when aggression is bifurcated as "OVERT" and "COVERT". This fact thus becomes established when the correlation - scores of "FANTASY and OVERT AGGRESSION" are judged -

   Correlation = -.32 in Deprived group
   = -.72 in Non-deprived group
   = -.79 in total size of the sample.

The deprivation of parents (assumed to be a cause of frustration) makes children "COVERT" in aggressiveness, while the opposite occurs in a Non-deprivation situation.
Graph no. 2

A COMPARATIVE VIEW OF OVERT/COVERT AGGRESSIONS AND FEAR OF PUNISHMENT.
(ii) "Fear of Punishment" proved to be a highly significant variable for providing discrimination in the aggressive behaviour of children. The deprived children have a more fear of punishment in comparison to the non-deprived children. The hypothetical etiological factors are emotional and physical insecurity and lack of parental love and affection.

(iii) "Fear of Punishment" and "FANTASY (Covert) aggression are highly correlated in positive direction while "Overt Aggression" and "Fear of punishment" are inversely related though, here too, the correlation is high.

The correlation between "covert aggression" and IP = .89

The correlation between "Overt aggression and IP = .72.

The graph no. 2 also indicates that -

(a) The children (deprived) having high fear of punishment, have higher scores in "COVERT AGGRESSION". Out of 55, 43 children of "Deprived group" got scores above the midpoint score of "Covert Aggression" while only 11 "Non-deprived" children could go beyond the average - scores. The high scores
of the deprived group are mostly above 70% and went up to 100% while, the scores of 11 "non-deprived" children getting high scores on "Covert aggression" were restricted only between 52 and 95% scores. Just the y opposite occurs when "Covert aggressions" lower dimension is observed. 44 non-deprived and 9 deprived children show a lower score. It should also be mentioned here that the "non-deprived" children have less fear of punishment.

(b) The same graph presents also a picture of the "OVERT AGGRESSION". The "Overt Aggression" has got greater frequencies (41 : 30) of higher scores (compared to the mid-point in non-deprived children, while, the "deprived-children" have greater frequencies (22 : 12) in the lower scores of the overt aggression. Thus it can be said that the non-deprived group is dominantly "OVERT-AGGRESSIVE" and the "deprived" group is dominantly "COVERT-AGGRESSIVE".

(c) "FEAR OF PUNISHMENT" graph presents a very clear picture of the "non-deprived group" being on the lower side and the "deprived" group is being on higher side. The graph gives the following frequencies -
Fear of punishment frequencies on lower side — D = 7, ND = 43
Fear of punishment frequencies on higher side — D = 29, ND = 1

(d) It can be observed that wherever the points of "Fear of Punishment" are on the higher side, the points of "COVERT - AGGRESSION" are also on the higher side and the reverse is true whereas "COVERT AGGRESSION" is concerned. Obviously the deprived group have more frequencies in the "higher side" of the "COVERT - AGGRESSION" as well as "FEAR OF PUNISHMENT" and the "Non-deprived" have more frequencies on the lesser side of "FEAR OF PUNISHMENT" and high frequencies on the higher side of "COVERT AGGRESSION".

(iv) "DIRECTIONS OF AGGRESSION" and "TYPES OF REACTIONS" present an integrated pattern at least at two places —

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-deprived Group</th>
<th>Deprived Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Extrapunitiveness</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Obstacle Dominance</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Intropunitiveness</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ego-Defence</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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but no such systematic pattern can be seen in scores of the "NEED - PERSISTENCE", type of reaction and the "IMPUNITIVE" direction of aggression.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-deprived</th>
<th>Deprived</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Need Persistence</td>
<td>Low (than average)</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Impunitiveness</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In fact, "Extravunitiveness" and Obstacle - dominance, Impunitiveness and "Age-defence" are somewhat related while "Impunitiveness" and Need Persistence, are not related at all.

(v) There is a specific trend in aggressive behaviour in accordance with the magnitude of deprivation -

- In "total" aggression — $ND > D > D_2$
- In "overt" aggression — $ND > D > D_2$
- In "covert" aggression — $D_2 > D > ND$.

(vi) No relevant correlation could be seen between -

(a) Fear of punishment and direction of aggression.
(b) Fear of punishment and Types of aggression.
(c) Types of aggression and Direction of aggression.
(d) Two forms of aggression and types of reaction.
(e) Direction of aggression and Types of reaction.

(vii) No "Interactional - effect" could be explored with the variables:

\[ A \times B \quad (A = \text{Types of reaction,} \quad B = \text{Fear of Punishment}) \]
\[ A \times C \quad (C = \text{Direction of Aggression}) \]
\[ B \times C \]
\[ A \times B \times C \]

A few very important points can be mentioned on the basis of observation. The conclusions will be incomplete if the following points are not included. These are as follows:

(a) In the responses cited through CAT, the deprived group children constructed brief sentences and gave brief description (total average words 35 per story) in comparison to their counterparts (total average words 52 per story). This is an indication of relative inhibitedness in deprived children.
(b) The deprived children needed more prompting for their responses in comparison to the other groups.

c) The deprived children repeated their responses frequently.

d) The total response time in the CAT test was greater in the children of the "deprived group".

e) The tendency of identification in the responses against CAT cards was clearly visible in non-deprived children, who have identification-model in real life also.
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