CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the present study is two-fold: (a) to assess certain specific motivational variables among preadolescents, (b) to find out individual differences in the given variables in respect of certain external social variables.

The motivational variables included in the study are aggression, anxiety and certain need patterns which are conceived as being particularly relevant to the sample under investigation. This being a study of school children representing the variables of religion, sex and socio-economic status, addressed mainly to the motivational variables, it would be in place to introduce these variables in a conceptual and theoretical context.

Aggression as one motivational variable, seems to occupy a central position in the motivational make-up of the present day preadolescents. Aggression is the first and foremost problem of the present day world and a large proportion of human motivation is directly or indirectly related to the need to inflict injury to the source of frustration. To a psychologist, aggression is of prime importance because it is one of the most perva-
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Aggression as one motivational variable, seems to occupy a central position in the motivational make-up of the present day preadolescents. Aggression is the first and foremost problem of the present day world and a large proportion of human motivation is directly or indirectly related to the need to inflict injury to the source of frustration. To a psychologist, aggression is of prime importance because it is one of the most perva-
sive mainsprings of action and reaction. Not only the root of this rather undesirable but vital instigator of behaviour is of concern to psychological inquiry, but the way it can be controlled, contained, sublimated, is also of concern to a psychologist.

In ordinary usage of the term, aggression is a response of disorganized emotional nature which is evoked by intense frustrating conditions and leads to hostile and destructive behaviour. Aggression conveys different and diverse meanings but in psychological literature it connotes specific meanings which consist in an irrational hostility that may be directed against the external situation, towards some aspect of the situation or against the individual himself. At the back of every aggressive behaviour there is believed to be some kind of a frustration which causes it. A variety of acts committed by individuals that are anti-social, aimed at injuring, destroying others or one's ownself are believed to be motivated by anger, hatred, jealousy, or a generalized frustration.

Notwithstanding the presumption that aggression is the consequence of frustration to which affect a number of theories exist in psychological literature, aggression seems to bear some relationship with frustra-
Frustration means the obstruction of an organism's on-going activity towards the goal and the emotional reaction that follows this obstruction. Frustration is an experience which no one can escape in this world of conflict and turmoil. One will have to overcome obstacles and override the barriers in pursuance of goals. Psychologists have addressed themselves to find out the sources of frustration and the various strategies individuals adopt to respond to frustrating condition, by reacting to or avoiding frustration. Individuals differ in terms of their capacity to withstand frustrations and the mode of perceiving their frustration. To some individuals a minor frustration may be a disaster; to others a major one may be an ordinary event.

Besides the various kinds of obstacles existing in the external situation or within an individual, one cause of frustration may be an unrealistic level of aspiration or an individual's attempt to reach a goal beyond his resources.

People have different reactions to different frustration. One way of reacting may be in the form of adjustment and an attempt to analyse the situation and find out the best way to overcome to face or to do away
with such a frustration. Anger may be another reaction which may lead to aggression. One possible outcome may be a direct attack in order to eliminate the barrier between the individual and the goal. Displaced aggression may be another consequence of frustration in the event the individual recognizes that the approach of direct attack is not conducive to the attainment of a goal, or the possibility of retaliation from the target of attack. And in such condition the pent-up anger is directed against a safer but inappropriate target. Psychologically viewed, one possible reaction to frustration may be in the form of withdrawal, in fantasy or regression to modes of adjustment adopted in childhood. The individual may also repress the frustrating experience so that it is excluded from conscious experience.

Numerous compensatory reactions to frustration include an extra effort to succeed in a parallel area if one comes across a failure in an area of activity. A low level of frustrating experience tends to develop a tolerance for frustration with the result that in case of activity to goals is blocked the individual can deal with it successfully and without undergoing a traumatic experience.

The various theories of aggression, despite their diversity, have some common attributes. All view
aggression as one form of human behaviour, and all human activities, including aggression that have common factors must be considered towards its full explanation. Instigation is one such common factor which means the forces within the individuals that motivate, drive or impel him towards the performance of aggressive act. In the absence of such motivation the individual is not likely to be aggressive. Although the most primary form of instigation of frustration is the need to hurt or injure others, such a drive is not the sole instigator to aggressive behaviour. Often individuals of groups are aggressive to others as a means to achieve other goals. Aggression is determined by a multiplicity of factors, satisfying a number of needs. Inhibition is another factor residing within the individual's personality that does not let free expression of aggression. If internal inhibitions are absent the individual will act on his aggressive instigation, provided there are other competing responses which are stronger or there are external inhibitions present in the environment.

In the various definitions given to aggression, either of the four attributes of the behaviour-assumption about the instigators, emotional aspects and intent to injure and a chance of harm being done to the victim are generally involved. Buss's (1961, P-1) notion of aggre-
ssion "a response that delivers noxious stimuli to another organism" is acceptable. This definition does not include 'intent', an otherwise important component of aggression which Geen (1976) finds as unavoidable. Kaufmann (1970) thinks that any definition of aggression should also incorporate the notion of expectancy meaning thereby that there is a chance of harm being done to the victim. Although an all-inclusive and a unitary definition of aggression is difficult to formulate, a working basis for understanding aggression and the related notional and theoretical issues may be evolved and as Geen (1976) contemplates should include three aspects— the delivery of noxious stimuli, the intent to harm, and the fact that the attach has probability greater than nil of being successful.

On the definition of aggression massive literature is available (Bandura, 1973; Berkowitz, 1962; Buss, 1961; Geen, 1976; Kaufmann, 1970). Of these Geen's (1976, P-221), definition seems to be most acceptable which incorporates almost all the concepts of aggression, namely "the delivery of a noxious stimulus by one organism to another with intent thereby to harm and with some expectation that the stimulus will reach its target and have its intended effect." As for the presumed antecedents of aggression also, there exist a number of theoretical posi-

Wading through the literature an aggression one discerns three basic theoretical standpoints where the main issue is whether aggression is innate or acquired. So, there are biological theories, drive theories and social learning theories. Representative of the biological theories are those of Freud, Adler, Ardrey (1966), Lorenze, Storr (1968), Dollard and others (1939), Berkowitz (1962), Feshback (1964, 1970).

Dollard and others defined aggression as "any sequence of behaviour, the goal response to which is the injury of the person toward whom it is directed." According to them the behaviour may not necessarily be avert but may be expressed in thoughts and fantasies symbolic or direct attacks on inanimate as well as animate objects and also may be without a target. However, there is always an implicit tendency to attack the frustrating agent.

Sears & Others (1953), subscribe to drive reduction hypothesis and Bandura (1973) and Geen (1976) are the exponents of social learning proposition regarding aggressiveness. Whereas the biological theories
insist on innateness of aggressive stimulus response sequence, the drive theories maintain that frustration produces aggressive drive which can be reduced only by same form of aggressive response. The social learning approach (Bandura & Walters, 1963) to aggressive behaviour has emerged of late as the most acceptable one by virtue of its being an improvement over the earlier existing approaches, retaining some of the essential attributes of the frustration aggression hypothesis and the ethological theories. Therefore, there is a justification for adopting this viewpoint in the present investigation where the basic premise is that aggressive behaviour pattern are learned and maintained. Bandura & Walters find of little consequence the search for sources of aggressive instigation or drive. Rather, they concern themselves more with the reinforcement contingencies in the milieu which imply whether an aggressive response will be rewarded. Most other theorists emphasize, following Buss (1961), the "angry" component of aggressive behaviour that is rewarded by the injury of the victim. Whereas Bandura & Walters consider "instrumental" aggression also of crucial importance. They investigate aggression learned as a means to some other end such as seeking the approval of others through aggression of their aggressive behaviour. Just angry aggression, to Bandura & Walters,
offers an incomplete explanation of aggression. Responses to aggression have complex results. Aggressive behaviour followed by physical punishment may induce inhibitions but it may at the same time provide the person with an aggressive model to imitate. It is difficult to know the gross effect on aggressive potential. However, indulging in aggressive behaviour may reduce instigation, making subsequent aggression less likely. It can also decrease an inhibitions and through this increasing the probability of future aggressive behaviour. The implications of the social learning approach are distinctly different from those of other approaches. The social learning viewpoint, while agreeing with frustration aggression theories, that frustrations can be eliminated through certain strategies reducing instigation to aggression, maintaining that extrinsic rewards are also important aggressive behaviour contributing to the development and maintenance of aggressive habits. There seems to be a major differences in the outlooks of the social learning and ethological theorists, the former prescribing mild aggressive activities to reduce aggressive instigation which they believe to be innate, while the social learning theorists view that such activity only strengthens aggressive habits and decreases inhibitions against aggression. Also, the social theorists argue that mild aggressive behaviour leads to more extreme forms
of antisocial and aggressive behaviour.

Research on aggression except that anchored to social learning stance has generally ignored the crucial problem of how original responses are originally learned, the form aggressive responses initially take and the role of factors other than interference with an ongoing response sequence. In the shaping and maintaining of aggressive behaviours most research data suggest that frustration or the with-holding of positive reinforcement is associated with increase in motivation, which may be reflected in a temporary intensification of a response. But what is also to be considered in the nature of the response to frustration which will depend on the prior social learning of the frustrated subject and on the reinforcement and modelling procedure previously experienced. Social learning theories, on the other hand, emphasize observational learning, reinforcement of aggression and generalization of aggression.

The afore-mentioned has been accepted as the point of take off for the present investigation.

Anxiety:

A strong argument seemed to be in favour of selecting Anxiety as a variable that may hold promise of being relevant to aggression, emerging from observations
of certain studies and conceptual similarity between the constituents of aggression and anxiety. Aggression generally considered to be a socially undesirable behaviour has all probability of being a major source of anxiety in those who exhibit it, and possibly behind certain aggressive behaviours anxiety may be an important factor. Notwithstanding the question whether aggression is the consequence of anxiety or vice versa, the presumed concomitance between the two is to be determined here.

Variable

The other is the experience of fear and intrinsic feelings of anxiety which have always been the cotravellers of human beings but it was with the beginning of 20th century that this problem began to assume a definite and alarming proportion. May (1950) analysed the basic historical and cultural trends in western civilization that have been responsible for making anxiety explicit as the idiosyncracy of the present age. Hock and Zubin (1950) made the following statement: "although it is widely recognized that anxiety is the most pervasive psychological phenomenon of our time and that it is the chief symptom in the neuroses and in the functional psychoses, there has been little or no agreement in its definition, and very little, if any, progress in the measurement (p.v.).
Diverse views exist on the factors causing anxiety, each having its own unique theoretical perspective and research objective. It is not easy to synthesise these views. The various concepts of anxiety may be referred to: Anxiety as objective (fear) and neurotic - a psychoanalytical view - anxiety as trait and state - a view current in psychological research. Anxiety both as state and trait providing a conceptual frame of reference to research in theory and anxiety.

Freud (1894) was the first to refer to anxiety in the context of anxiety neurosis. Pavlov's (1927) phenomenon of experimental neurosis unleashed a torrent of research and a number of experimental investigations of fear, frustration and conflict were carried out which remained limited to animals till 1950 whereafter studies on humans were also conducted. But for the psychoanalytic writing, anxiety was an unfamiliar topic in psychological literature till 1930.

In philosophical, and theological treatises anxiety was referred to, but in psychological literature it got currency after Freud (1924) who regarded anxiety as something felt, an affective state or condition. Anxiety could be distinguished from other unpleasant affective states such as anger, grief or sorrow in terms of pheno-
menological and physiological qualities, thus characterizing anxiety with displeasure. Freud concerned himself mainly with identifying the sources of stimulation which precipitated anxiety rather than with analysing the properties of such states. He conceived of anxiety as a signal indicating the presence of a danger situation and differentiated between objective anxiety and neurotic anxiety largely on the basis whether the source of the danger was from the external world or from internal impulses. Freud likened objective anxiety with fear which involved a complex internal reaction to anticipated injury or harm from some external danger.

Sullivan (1953) described anxiety as an intensely unpleasant state of tension arising from experiencing disapproval in interpersonal relation. For May (1950), anxiety was "the apprehension cued off by a threat to some value which the individual holds essential to his existence as a personality" (P -191) Cattell & Scheier's (1958, 1961), analytical studies distinguished different types of anxiety concepts which included in the main the "trait anxiety" and "state anxiety"; trait anxiety was interpreted as a factor representing stable individual differences in a unitary, relatively permanent personality characteristics. The state anxiety was interpreted in a patterns of variables that covaried over occasion of
measurement, a transitory state fluctuating over time.

As a personality trait anxiety has been viewed as having characteristics of a number of constructs which Campbell (1963) calls acquired behavioural disposition, whereas Atkinson (1964) designates it as "motives". According to Campbell, acquired dispositional concepts such a social attitude involve past experiences predisposing the individual both to view the world in a particular way and also to manifest "objective consistent" response tendencies. Atkinson views motives as dispositional tendencies acquired in childhood which are latent until the cues of a situation arouse them "as an acquired behavioural disposition or motive". Trait anxiety would seem to imply on the one hand, a view of the world in which a wide range of stimulus situations are perceived as dangerous or threatening and, on the other hand, a tendency to respond to such threats with state anxiety reactions (Spielberger, 1966, P. 16).

From the point of view of a composite concept of anxiety, including anxiety state and trait anxiety, the most crucial stimuli are those which bring about differential changes in anxiety trait. Spence & Spence (1961) found differences in task performance of high and low individuals under conditions of failure or ego involvement
whereas Mandler & Sarason (1952) and Spielberger (1962) observed the difference under conditions involving risk of failure such as present in academic achievement situation. Anxiety as a trait, therefore, seems to carry "a fear of failure motive" (Atkinson, 1964).

The connotation of anxiety most acceptable and so justifiable for inclusion in our study is the one stated in the preceding paragraphs.

Another motivational variable that has been chosen to study its relatedness to aggression is a set of certain need patterns which either seem to bear conceptual resemblance to aggression or are related in terms of their manifestations in behaviour. While some of the needs such as autonomy, dominance and aggression may be possessing almost identical attributes, needs like abasement, deference, may presumably be related to aggression in some different fashion.

Need Patterns:

The different concepts of need, trends and effects are basically molar-concepts. These present an account of the general course of behaviour. In understanding personality as a hierarchical system of general trend and need complexes, one serious omission in the nature of environment along which the human personality
can be fully conceived. A method of analysis is therefore necessary as it will lead to satisfactory dynamical formulations of external environment. As observers of behaviour we have to confine ourselves to those aspects of environments with which human beings are in contact and those which make a difference in an object situation. Object situations may be viewed according to their effects upon the subject meaning thereby the factors that make the subjects response on the personalogical level which must deal the social factors which facilitate or obstruct the psychologi­cal well being of the individual.

A need is a construct which stands for a force in the brain region, a force which organizes perception, intellection, connotation and action in such a way as to transform in a certain direction an existing, unsatisfying situation.

On the basis of the following five criteria, an overt or manifest need can be distinguished (Murray, 1938) :-
(a) a typical behavioural trend or effect,
(b) a typical mode,
(c) the search for avoidance or selection of attention and response to ones of a few types of press.
(d) the exhibition of characteristic emotion or feeling,
(e) the manifestation of satisfaction with the achievement of a certain effect.

Each of these objective indices has a subjective correlate which consists in the awareness of working and striving for a certain effect. Latent needs are part of composites of factors, sub-needs, feelings and collected images embodying press. The strength of a single expressed need is measured in terms of intensity and duration. The strength of a need as a consistently ready reaction system of personality is measured by noting the frequency of its occurrence under given conditions.

Need, as it may manifest itself in a number of ways, may not be covered in a single operational definition. The best subjective basis seems to be the one when a satisfying effect is attained whereby the activity comes to a halt. The best subjective criterion is the occurrence of a wish or reservation to do a certain act, or to bring about a certain effect. It has not been possible as yet to enlist the factors that determine the establishment of a need as a ready reaction system of personality.

Of the many sources to the study of needs and their relevance to personality, Murray's need and press system in the context of his theory of personology appears to be the most relevant, which has been a ready reference
to many researches in the area of needs (Murray, 1938).

Murray's personology conceptualized reaction of individuals on a molar level and the concept of needs, trends and affect are molar concepts which describe the general course of behaviour. In Murray's system the variables of personality concern mainly with the dynamics or motivational aspects. Focussing on objective facts pertaining to trends or affects of molar and verbal action, Murray attended to correlate the observed direction of behaviour with subjective report of intention, such as wish, desire, impulsion, aim and purpose. From these facts attempt has been made to infer the operation of one of a class of hypothetical directional brain tensions (drive or need) in the classification of variable. Forty four variables were distinguished in terms of common properties of the behaviours in patterns under each variable. Of these variables twenty were manifest needs, eight were latent needs, four referred to certain inner states and twelve were general traits. The five needs taken up for the study here are the one drawn from Murray's comprehensive list of need press system. These have been described in simple terms by Edward (1954). Gough and Heilbrun (1965) have made a generous use of both the sources and the need measure used in the present study owes to them (cf. Chapter Three).
Although brief definitions of various needs are given under the test material in method and plan, it would be helpful should we present a rather explanatory account of these needs as Murray defined them. Murray has grouped dominance, autonomy, aggression, deference and abasement under one head for their shared attributes. Dominance is manifested by a desire to control the sentiments and behaviour of others. Difference indicates the willingness of the individual to follow and co-operate with a superior whom he holds in high esteem and obeying individuals superior to him. Need for autonomy refers to the wish neither to lead nor to be led and the desire to adopt one's own way without being sensitive and subservient to others. Aggression is accompanied by anger and replaces dominance when dominance alone fails to be effective and is aroused by opposition, annoyances, attacks and insults. Abasement is the opposite of aggression and comes closer to Harm avoidance, Blame avoidance or similar need.

Of the needs enlisted by Murray along with personality as a dynamic concept the ones selected here for study as need variables relevant to aggressive behaviour are dominance, deference, autonomy, aggression and abasement. For the theory of needs under study Murray has been the direct source for us and Gough's (1934) theory and methodology in the study of need patterns has been adopted
in the present investigation. The concepts have retained
the meanings as in Murray but the assessment procedure
followed by Gough is by way of checking the adjectives
believed to represent the needs in question (cf Chapter
Three). Brief explanatory notes on these needs, however,
can be presented here.

Precisely, dominance is the need "to control
one's human environment. To influence, or direct the beha-
viour of others by suggestion seduction, persuasion, or command.
To dissuade, restrain, or prohibit. To induce an individual to act
in a way which accords with one's sentiments and needs. To
get others to co-operate. To convince an individual of the 'rightness'
of one's opinion.

Deference refers to the need "to admire and
support a superior. To praise, honour, or eulogize.
To yield eagerly to the influence of an allied individual. To
emulate an exemplar. To conform to custom."

Autonomy is the need "To get free, shake off
restraint, break out of confinement. To resist coercion
and restriction. To avoid or quit activities prescribed
by domineering authorities. To be independent and free to
act according to impulse. To be unattached, unconditioned,
irresponsible. To defy conventions."
Need Aggression consists in overcome.
"opposition forcefully. To fight, to revenge an injury.
To attack, injure or kill an O. To oppose forcefully or
punish an O."

Abasement: The desire and effects that go
with this need include submission, "passively to external
force. To accept injury, blame, criticism, punishment.
To surrender. To become resigned to fate. To admit infe-
riory, error, wrong-doing or defeat. To confess and at-
one. To blame, belittle or mutilate the self. To seek
and enjoy pain, punishment, illness and misfortune."

Having introduced the personality variables
used in this investigation we may now turn to the social
variables in relation to which the main problem in the
study, i.e. aggression is to be explored. The problem
undertaken here and the objectives of the study may be
spelled out; (a) To assess aggression among preadoles-
cent SS in relation to differences of Religion, Sex
and Socio-economic Status; (b) To determine the extent
of relationship between aggression on the one hand, and
each one of the motivational variables—Anxiety and Need
pattern on the other. Although such variables as religion,
sex and socio-economic status are used as a matter of
routine in social research as external determinants of
individual differences in behaviour, these have been used here not merely as denominations or demographic differentia but as sources of variation by virtue of their social implications, that is, Hindus and Muslims or for that matter, boys and girls or high/low social status subjects are presumed to show differences in their motivational make-up not because they happen to fall in specific categories but on the assumption that these social variables presuppose certain stereotypes, beliefs, roles, perceptions, self concept, hopes and aspiration, fears and apprehensions.