

## **Comparative analysis of aggression level of rural and urban youth**

S.C. Saxena, L.M. Sharma, and A. Kishore

Division of Rural Sociology  
Institute for Development of Technology for Rural Advancement,  
Mathura INDIA

### **Abstract**

The present attempt was carried out to make a comparative analysis of the aggression level of rural youth from various social categories. A descriptive survey was adopted for collecting data using a standardized test namely the Aggression Scale from a sample of 600 teacher trainees, selected randomly, from the colleges/ institutes of Mathura District. 240 trainees were selected using Target sampling. Thus a double sampling i.e. sampling from the sample was followed. The scores were calculated using the standard method discussed in the manual test. Appropriate statistical techniques were used to draw a valid conclusion. Marital status, annual income, place, family structure, and qualification of the youth were not found capable to affect aggression but the living habits, family occupation, caste, age, and gender of youth have a significant influence on their aggression.

**Keywords:** Aggression, Mathura, Rural, Teacher trainees, Urban, Youth.

### **Introduction**

The term 'aggression' originated from the Latin word 'aggressio', applied for 'to attack'. Psychologically, the term aggression refers to a range of behaviors that can result in both physical and psychological harm to oneself, others, or objects in the environment. The expression of aggression can occur in several ways, including verbally, mentally, and physically. The term involves physical behavior, use of language, or creating a climate of abuse that causes psychological or physical injuries. Aggression is defined as any behavior that is hostile, destructive, and/or violent. In general, aggressive behavior has the potential to inflict injuries or damage to the target person or object. Examples of aggressive behavior include physical assaulting, throwing objects, destructing property, conducting self-harming behaviors, and verbal threatening.

Aggression can take a variety of forms and can be physical or communicated verbally or non-verbally (Akert et al 2010). Aggression

differs from what is commonly called assertiveness, although the terms are often used interchangeably among laypeople, e.g. an aggressive salesperson. Aggression is, typically, a means of gaining control over resources and is aggravated during times when high population densities generate resource shortages (Wilson 1978). The aggression and aggressiveness among youth is not a new issue for the theory and practice which is based on emotional volitional manifestations of the youth, deviations in the character and behavior as a display of aggressiveness (Margaritova 2006).

Aggressive behavior is an action that an individual performs to deliberate wilful violence upon another individual or, a group of people on the group of people. Decoster et al (1996) and Ferris et al (1996) reported that stimulation of the amygdala results in augmented aggressive behavior in hamsters, while lesions of an evolutionarily homologous area in the lizard greatly reduce competitive drive and aggression (Crews et al 1984). Amaral et al (2006) found out that in rhesus monkeys, neonatal lesions in the amygdala or hippocampus result in reduced expression of social dominance, related to the regulation of aggression and fear. Meta-analyses of sex differences in physical aggression toward heterosexual partners and their physical consequences are reported (Archer 2000). Women were slightly more than men to use one or more acts of physical aggression and to use such acts more frequently. Men were more to inflict an injury, on their partners being women.

Vig and Nanda (1999) found that urban adolescents were more aggressive than rural ones. Sonawat (1993) reported that aggression towards self and other children was very common among kindergarten children. The family background is found to shape the pattern of aggression in important ways. Singh and Saxena (1993) noted that the children belonging to large and low SES families were more aggressive. Tomar (1999) reported that in adolescents, humor is the constant need for aggression. Following a procedure of inquiry that is well known but seldom used in the social sciences is the best way to cope with aggression in youth (Dollard et al 1939). The problem of aggressive behavior is here advanced one step along this road which all social inquiry that aspires to become truly scientific must eventually follow. This step has consisted partly of a more systematic formulation and further elaboration of the Frustration-Aggression hypothesis.

Present investigation was carried out to make a comparative analysis of aggression level of rural youth from various social categories.

### **Materials and methods**

The descriptive survey method was adopted while conducting the present study for collecting data using a standardized test namely the Aggression Scale (Mathur and Bhatnagar 2007). The population of the study consisted of all the teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges located in both rural and urban areas in the district Mathura. Several (600) samples from different backgrounds comprised the introductory sample. For research purposes, the 240 trainees were selected using Target sampling. Thus a double sampling i.e. sampling from the sample was followed in the present study. Selection of 5 Colleges from each rural and urban area, for the study, was made following the lottery method of random sampling. Independent variables of the study were various social categories of the trainees and dependent variables of the study remained aggression. The observation schedule method was implemented to collect major primary information with the cooperation of the Head of the institution. The research worker interviewed respondent trainees individually and tried to interrogate them about their unfilled responses to the questionnaires. The investigator prepared the final lists of institutions to be covered in the study frequently as and when needed. The recorded data were tabulated as per the objectives of the study and scores were calculated using the standard method discussed in the manual of the test. Appropriate statistical techniques (Howell 1997) were used to draw a valid conclusion and possible interpretation of the analytical outcomes to reach the final destiny of the study.

### **Results and discussion**

Non-significant aggression levels are presented in Table 1. The overall level of aggression of teacher trainees was recorded to be the grade of 'High aggression'. The youth-related two categories married and unmarried significantly differed and were recorded to be of the grade 'high aggression'. Income of the family could not affect aggression level significantly and graded as 'high aggression' in three categories under study. The trainees belonging to eastern and western Uttar Pradesh (INDIA) had similar aggression status of the grade of 'high aggression'. Family structures namely joint and nuclear did not show any impact on aggression. However, aggression level is reported to be 'very high' category in senior secondary but in the present study the same did not differ and remained more or less statistically identical to the grade 'high aggression'. Thus it can be analyzed that marital status, annual income, place, family structure, and qualification of the youth were not found capable to affect aggression.

In the analysis of Table 2, it was reflected that living habits are one of the factors to influence the aggression level of youth which was observed to be high in urban in comparison to that rural youth. Similarly, the major

family occupation of the respondent trainees was effective to affect aggression levels. Aggression in youth having family occupation 'agriculture' was lowest i.e. average aggression. The highest aggression was seen in youth from families having their occupation labor, service, and teaching followed by those from families having their occupation business. Among different social classes, respondents belonging to the general class were most aggressive followed by those belonging to OBC and SC. As far as the age of the trainees was concerned the aggression level increased with the increase in age. Female respondents were found more aggressive in comparison to those males. Thus it can result that living habits, occupation, caste age, and gender of youth have a significant influence on their aggression.

Table 1: Non-significant Aggression level				
Parameter/ Variable	N	Mean±SEM	SD	Aggression level
Overall				
Total	240	208.59±1.74	25.51	High aggression
Marital Status				
Married	108	209.21±2.68	27.90	High aggression
Unmarried	132	206.26±2.26	23.53	High aggression
Annual income				
Below 1 lac	174	205.48±1.92	25.36	High aggression
1-2 lac	24	224.00±5.16	25.30	High aggression
Above 2 lac	18	214.33±3.86	16.39	High aggression
Place				
East UP	94	207.94±2.57	24.97	High aggression
West UP	122	209.59±2.32	25.68	High aggression
Family structure				
Joint	94	207.94±2.57	24.97	High aggression
Nuclear	122	209.59±2.32	25.68	High aggression
Qualification				
Graduates	116	209.00±2.34	25.21	High aggression

Postgraduates	100	207.63±2.52	25.23	High aggression
* - Values differed significantly within the groups, i.e. p >0.05.				

### Conclusion

It can be concluded that marital status, annual income, place, family structure, and qualification of the youth were not found capable to affect aggression but the living habits, family occupation, caste, age, and gender of youth has a significant influence on their aggression.

Table 2: Significant Aggression level				
Parameter/ Variable	N	Mean±SEM	SD	Aggression level
Overall				
Total	216	208.59±1.74	25.51	High aggression
Living habits				
Rural	134	201.70±2.20*	25.48	Average aggression
Urban	82	220.02±2.24*	20.31	High aggression
Occupation				
Agriculture	120	198.96±2.14*	23.43	Average aggression
Business	42	211.57±4.08*	26.44	High aggression
Labour	18	230.67±1.98*	8.42	High aggression
Service	12	229.50±0.45*	1.57	High aggression
Teaching	24	223.50±5.02*	24.61	High aggression
Caste				
General	108	212.80±2.07*	21.49	High aggression
OBC	60	206.70±3.32*	25.73	High aggression
SC	48	198.63±4.32*	29.95	Average aggression
Age (y)				

20-22	52	207.92±2.96*	21.33	High aggression
23-25	81	218.70±2.84*	25.54	High aggression
26-28	47	197.38±3.23*	22.11	Average aggression
29-31	24	204.75±5.34*	26.17	Average aggression
32-34	12	190.00±6.93*	24.02	Average aggression
Gender				
Female	72	229.50±1.55*	13.17	High aggression
Male	144	198.40±1.96*	23.57	Average aggression
* - Values differed significantly within the groups, i.e. P >0.05.				

## References

- Akert R M, Aronson E and Wilson T D. 2010. Social Psychology. 7<sup>th</sup> edition. Upper Saddle River, Prentice Hall.
- Amaral D G, Bauman M D, Lavenex P, Mason W A and Toscano J E. 2006. The Expression of Social Dominance Following Neonatal Lesions of the Amygdala or Hippocampus in Rhesus Monkeys (*Macaca Mulatta*). Behavioral Neuroscience 120 (4): 749–760.
- Archer J. 2000. Sex differences in aggression between heterosexual partners: A meta-analytic review. Psychological Bulletin 126 (5): 651-680.
- Crews D, Greenberg N and Scott M. 1984. Role of the Amygdala in the Reproductive and Aggressive Behavior of the Lizard, *Anolis Carolinensis*. Physiology & Behavior 32 (1): 147–151.
- Decoster M, Herbert M, Meyerhoff J L and Potegal M. 1996. Brief, High-Frequency Stimulation of the Corticomedial Amygdala Induces a Delayed and Prolonged Increase of Aggressiveness in Male Syrian Golden Hamsters. Behavioral Neuroscience 110 (2): 401–412.
- Dollard J, Miller N E, Doob L W, Mowrer O H and Sears R R. 1939. Frustration and aggression. New Haven, Yale University Press, pp. 213.

- Ferris C F, Herbert M, Meyerhoff J, Potegal M and Skaredoff L. 1996. Attack Priming in Female Syrian Golden Hamsters is Associated with a C-Fos-Coupled Process Within the Corticomедial Amygdala. *Neuroscience* 75 (3): 869–880.
- Howell D C. 1997. *Statistical methods for psychology*. Belmont, Duxbury Press.
- Margaritova S. 2006. Aggression and depression of adolescents. *Trakia Journal of Sciences* 4 (2): 7-10.
- Mathur G P and Bhatnagar R K. 2007. *Manual for Aggression Scale*. Rakhi Prakashan, Agra.
- Singh S and Saxena R R. 1993. Achievement difference and school effects. *Indian Educational Review* 30: 1-20.
- Sonawat R, 1993. Aggression in kindergarten children. *Journal of Indian Education* 18: 46-51.
- Tomar V. 1999. Aggression: as a function of humour, economic status and gender. *Journal of Personality and Clinical Studies* 15: 52-55.
- Vig D and Nanda P. 1999. Aggressive behaviour of adolescent boys. *Praachi Journal of Psycho-cultural Dimensions* 15: 125-128.
- Wilson E O. 1978. *On Human Nature*. Harvard, University Press, pp. 101-107.

