



SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS AND AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOR AMONG YOUTHS

Sameeta Ng*

Assistant Professor, Department of Clinical Psychology, RIMS, Imphal
*Corresponding Author

Ng Zevina Chanu

Ex- M.Phil Trainee, Department of Clinical Psychology, RIMS, Imphal

L Roshan Singh

Assistant Professor, Department of Clinical Psychology, RIMS, Imphal

R.K. Lenin Singh

Professor & HOD, Psychiatry, RIMS, Imphal

ABSTRACT

Background and Objectives: The aim of the present study was to find out the relationship between aggression and socio demographic profiles of the study sample.

Methods: The sample consists of 300 college students from Imphal East and West districts of Manipur of which 150 cases were males and the other 150 cases were females. Students within the age group of 18-29 years, graduate and above and who were will to give consent for participating in the study were selected through convenient sampling technique. Semi-structure Proforma was used for collecting the socio-demographic profiles of the participants and Buss Perry Aggression Questionnaire was used for measuring aggression.

Results: The finding of the study showed no significant difference between overall aggression and the socio demographic factors of the study samples. However, aggressive subscales like hostility were found significant difference with respect to age range (p -value = 0.026) and education (p -value = 0.000). Physical aggression was also found to have significant difference with gender (p -value = 0.015) indicating that male were more involved in physical aggression. The findings also showed that verbal aggression has significant difference with respect to residence (p -value = 0.024).

Conclusion: The present study concluded that aggressive subscales like hostility were found more prominent among younger age college going students. Physical aggression was involved more among male gender than their female counterpart. The study also concluded that youth inhabited in rural area were more involved of verbal aggression than the urban inhabitants. In spite of the limitations, the present findings of the study could be useful for management to lessen aggressive behavior among youths.

KEYWORDS : Youth, aggression, socio demographic factors

Introduction

Youth is a period between childhoods to adulthood¹. Youth are defined as those aged 15 to 29 in the national youth policy. This age-group constitutes 27.5% of India's population. The 2011 Census counted 563 million young people from 10 to 35, according to the 12th Five-year Plan Vol.II².

Aggression is defined as any forms of behavior directed towards the goal of harming or injuring another living being who is motivated to avoid such treatment³. Aggression has also been defined as a behavior whose primary or sole purpose or function is to injure another person or organism, whether physically or psychologically⁴. Aggression can be expressed directly or indirectly⁵. For example, physical aggression can be direct (e.g., hitting a person in the face) or indirect (e.g., destroying another person's property when he or she isn't looking). Likewise, verbal aggression can be direct (e.g., screaming in a person's face) or indirect (e.g., spreading rumors behind a person's back). Youths plays an important role in restructuring our nation. Thus, this study will throw some lights for the researcher in this area and help the educators, families, caregivers and the youths themselves to have knowledge of how aggression is related among youths.

Society has seen an increase in the incidents of aggression among youth. It includes behaviors such as slapping, hitting, rape, recklessness, driving and shooting in school, truancy, road rage and other high-risk behaviors. Nearly 18.6% of females aged 12-17 got into a serious fight at school or work. 14.1% participated in a group-against-group fight and 5.7% attacked another person with an intent to seriously harm him/her.⁶ In India, researchers have focused on factors such as perceived popularity among the peer group,⁷ romantic relations,⁸ the risk factors such as family system, environment, aggressive parents and academic performance,⁹ peer aggression, victimization and social relationships,¹⁰ Prevalence and Gender difference.¹¹ The increasing crime rates and violent activities of youth in India have made the researchers to focus on aggression

among youth.

Objectives

- 1) To study the relationship between aggression and socio demographic profiles of the study sample.
- 2) To study the relationship between youths living with both parent and single parent and aggression.

Materials and Methods

A cross sectional study design was used in the present study. The study was conducted in the Department of Clinical Psychology, RIMS, Imphal. The data was collected from four colleges situated in Imphal East and Imphal West through convenient sampling technique. The sample consists of 300 college students of which 150 cases were males and the other 150 cases were females. Students within the age group of 18-29 years, and who were willing to give consent for participating in the study was selected for the present study. Semi-structure Proforma was used for collecting the socio-demographic profiles of the participants and Buss Perry Aggression Questionnaire¹² was used for measuring aggression.

Procedures: In the present study, the researcher approached the colleges situated in Imphal East and West, districts of Manipur. Necessary permissions were taken from the concerned authorities and thoroughly explained about the purpose of the study. After this, the students were again informed about the purpose of the study. An informed consent was also taken from each of the participants. Once this procedure was carried out, a semi structure Performa scale consisting of questions on socio-demographic details and questionnaire on Aggression were administered.

Result

The present study was based on the primary sample of 300 cases of youths who were studying in four colleges of Imphal east and west districts of Manipur. Parameters such as age range, gender, education, residence, type of family, family annual income, and

youths living with both parent and single parent were analyzed statistically with the aggression subscale.

Table 1 Comparison of Mean and S.D. of aggression subscales with Age Range

Aggression Subscales	Age Range		f-value	p-value	Remark
	18-23	24-29			
	Mean±S.D.	Mean±S.D.			
Physical Aggression	23.61±5.17	24.24±5.39	0.608	0.436	Insignificant
Verbal Aggression	14.70±3.48	14.04±3.76	1.491	0.223	Insignificant
Anger	19.24±4.30	18.88±4.40	0.285	0.594	Insignificant
Hostility	22.07±5.28	20.25±5.10	5.037	0.026	Significant
Total	79.50±13.78	76.82±14.48	1.571	0.211	Insignificant

Table 1:It was observed from the table that aggression subscale such as physical aggression (p-value = 0.436), verbal aggression (p-value = 0.223) and anger (p-value = 0.594) were found to be insignificant with respect to age range however, hostility was found to be significant relationship with respect to age range as manifest by p-value = 0.026. This finding revealed that hostility was more involved among 18 – 23 years of youth than the 24 – 29 years of youth. Regarding total aggression and age range it was found to be no significant relationship as manifest by p-value=0.211.

Table 2 Comparison of Mean and S.D. of aggression subscales with Gender

Aggression Subtypes	Gender		f-value	p-value	Remark
	Male	Female			
	Mean±S.D.	Mean±S.D.			
Physical Aggression	24.45±4.78	22.99±5.53	5.984	0.015	Significant
Verbal Aggression	14.81±3.50	14.37±3.56	1.125	0.290	Insignificant
Anger	18.91±4.27	19.44±4.35	1.118	0.291	Insignificant
Hostility	21.86±4.85	21.66±5.712	0.107	0.744	Insignificant
Total	80.03±12.27	78.07±15.35	1.490	0.223	Insignificant

Table 2:There were no significant relationship found between gender and total aggression as evident by p-value = 0.223 however, physical aggression was found to be significant relationship with respect to gender as manifest by p-value = 0.015. This finding revealed that physical aggression was more involved among male than their female counterpart.

Table 3 Comparison of Mean and S.D. of aggression subscales with Education

Aggression Subscales	Education		f-value	p-value	Remark
	Graduate	Postgraduate			
	Mean±S.D.	Mean±S.D.			
Physical Aggression	23.81±5.03	23.41±5.78	0.318	0.573	Insignificant
Verbal Aggression	14.63±3.43	14.46±3.87	0.114	0.736	Insignificant
Anger	19.26±4.26	18.90±4.49	0.371	0.543	Insignificant
Hostility	22.38±4.85	19.70±6.15	14.238	0.000	Significant
Total	79.86±13.01	76.32±16.38	3.472	0.63	Insignificant

Table 3:There were no significant relationship found between education and total aggression as evident by p-value = 0.63 however, hostility was found to be significant relationship with respect to education as manifest by p-value = 0.000. This finding

revealed that hostility was more involved among graduate students than the post graduate students.

Table 4 Comparison of Mean and S.D. of aggression subscales with residence

Aggression Subscales	Residence		f-value	p-value	Remark
	Rural	Urban			
	Mean±S.D.	Mean±S.D.			
Physical Aggression	23.83±5.24	23.63±5.20	0.113	0.738	Insignificant
Verbal Aggression	15.13±3.73	14.20±3.34	5.122	0.024	Significant
Anger	19.03±4.08	19.28±4.83	0.249	0.618	Insignificant
Hostility	22.03±5.34	21.56±5.26	0.579	0.447	Insignificant
Total	79.65±14.24	78.61±13.69	0.407	0.524	Insignificant

Table 4:There were no significant relationship found between residence and total aggression as evident by p-value = 0.524 however, verbal aggression was found to be significant relationship with respect to residence as manifest by p-value = 0.024. This finding revealed that verbal aggression was more involved among youth resided in rural area than the youth resided in urban area.

Table 5 Comparison of Mean and S.D. of aggression subscales with family types

Aggression Subtypes	Family Types		f-value	p-value	Remark
	Joint	Nuclear			
	Mean±S.D.	Mean±S.D.			
Physical Aggression	23.97±4.95	23.50±5.43	0.617	0.433	Insignificant
Verbal Aggression	14.26±3.38	14.88±3.65	2.276	0.132	Insignificant
Anger	19.17±4.38	19.18±4.26	0.000	0.988	Insignificant
Hostility	22.02±5.32	21.53±5.27	0.632	0.427	Insignificant
Total	79.43±13.88	78.71±13.97	0.198	0.657	Insignificant

Table 5: This table showed the relationship between aggression subscales and over the two categories of family type such as joint family and nuclear family. Statistically when applied ANOVA test it was found to be no significant relationship between the total aggression and family type as evident by p-value=0.657.

Table 6 Comparison of Mean and S.D. of aggression subscales with family annual income

Aggression Subscales	Family Annual Income			f-value	p-value	Remark
	30000-100000	100001-200000	Above 200000			
	Mean±S.D.	Mean±S.D.	Mean±S.D.			
Physical Aggression	24.15±4.89	23.83±6.06	22.65±5.37	2.274	0.105	Insignificant
Verbal Aggression	14.64±3.51	14.65±3.38	14.44±3.71	0.099	0.905	Insignificant
Anger	19.04±4.28	18.78±4.34	19.71±4.39	0.851	0.428	Insignificant
Hostility	21.91±5.32	22.03±5.40	21.27±5.19	0.459	0.632	Insignificant
Total	79.75±13.66	78.85±13.57	77.51±14.69	0.707	0.494	Insignificant

Table 6: This table showed the relationship between aggression subscales and over the three categories of family annual income. Statistically when applied ANOVA test it was found to be

nosignificant relationship between the total aggression and family annual income as evident by p-value=0.494.

Table 7 Comparison of Mean and S.D. of aggression subscales with youths living with both parent and single parent

Aggression Subscales	Living with		f-value	p-value	Remark
	Both parents	Single parent			
	Mean±S.D.	Mean±S.D.			
Physical Aggression	23.65±5.24	24.12±5.05	0.294	0.588	Insignifca nt
Verbal Aggression	14.49±3.46	15.21±3.94	1.540	0.216	Insignifca nt
Anger	19.02±4.38	20.14±3.77	2.512	0.114	Insignifca nt
Hostility	21.64±5.27	22.47±5.43	0.891	0.346	Insignifca nt
Total	78.60±13.93	81.70±13.65	1.827	0.178	Insignifca nt

Table 7: This table showed the relationship between aggression and living with both and single parents. Statistically when applied ANOVA test it was found to be no significant relationship between the total aggression and youth living with both and single parents as evident by p-value=0.178.

Discussion

The present study was carried out to find out the relationship between aggression and socio demographic profiles of the study sample. On statistical findings, no significant difference was found between age and four subscales of aggression except that of hostility. Younger age group of youth was found to have more hostile in nature than the older youth. A study that supports the findings showed significant association between delinquent behavior with age. The study states that the young age group exhibit high levels of aggressive and delinquency behavior than the older age group.¹³ On analysis with gender and aggression, physical aggression was found to have significant differences with gender indicating that male were used more physical aggression as compared to female counterpart. However, aggression as a whole was found to have no difference with gender. A study which supports the present findings revealed that there no difference among the gender and aggression.¹⁴ Another study that contradicts the findings showed that level of aggressive behavior was associated with gender.¹³ On analysis with education and aggression, hostility was found to have significant difference with the level of education indicating that hostile behavior were used mostly by graduate youth than the post graduate youth. A study that supports the present findings revealed that the level of education and the youth's aggressive behavior did not show any relationship.¹⁵ With regards to the relationship between residence and aggression, verbal aggression was found to have significant relationship with the residence indicating that youth inhabited in rural area were more involved of verbal aggression than the urban inhabitants. However, the overall findings of aggression and residence revealed no relationship. A study which supports the findings showed that there were no significant differences between aggression level among rural and urban youth.¹⁶ In case of relationship between aggression and family annual income, no significant relationship was found between the two. The present finding was supported by another study that showed no relationship between family socioeconomic statuses with delinquent behavior indirectly.¹⁷ The present study also discussed on the relationship between aggression and youth living with both parents and single parent and no relation was found.

Conclusion

The present study concluded that no differences were found between overall aggression and the socio demographic factors of

the study. However, aggressive subscales like hostility were found more prominent among younger age college going students. Physical aggression was involved more among male gender than their female counterpart. The study also concluded that youth inhabited in rural area were more involved of verbal aggression than the urban inhabitants. In spite of the limitations, the present findings of the study could be useful for management to lessen aggressive behavior among youths. The same study may be carried out in a wider youth population using standardized tools for generalization.

REFERENCES

- 1) Little Oxford English Dictionary. 9th ed. New Delhi: Oxford University Press; 2006. Youth, P.816.
- 2) National Youth Policy. Definition of Youth. India; 2014. Available from: URL:www. Youthpolicy.org/factsheets/country/india. Accessed on September 5, 2015.
- 3) Baron RA, Richardson DR. Human aggression. 2nd ed. New York, NY: Plenum Press; 1994.
- 4) Oxford Dictionary of Psychology. New York: Oxford University Press Inc; 2006. P.18.
- 5) Lagerspetz KM, Bjorkqvist K, Peltonen T. Is indirect aggression typical of females? Gender differences in aggressiveness in 11 to 12 years old children. *Aggress Behav* 1988 Jan; 14(6):403-14.
- 6) Rockville, MD: US Department of Health and Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Office of Applied Studies; 2009. [Last accessed on 2012 Mar 12]. The NSDUH Report: Violent Behaviors among Adolescent Females. Available from: http://www.oas.samhsa.gov/2k9/171/171_Female_ViolenceHTML.pdf.
- 7) Bowker JC, Ostrovl JM, Raja R. Relational and overt aggression in urban India. *Int J Behav Dev*. 2012;36:107-16.
- 8) Saini S, Singh J. Gender differences in relational aggression and psychosocial problems in romantic relationships among youths. *J Indian AcadAppl Psychol*. 2008;34:279-86.
- 9) Deb S, Modak S. Prevalence of violence against children in families in Tripura and its relationship with socio-economic factors. *J Inj Violence Res*. 2010;2:5-18. [PMC free article][PubMed]
- 10) Khatri P, Kupersmidt JB. Aggression, peer victimisation, and social relationships among Indian youth. *Int J Behav Dev*. 2003;27:87-95.
- 11) Khatri P. Aggression, peer victimization, and social relationships among rural Indian youth. *DissAbstrInt*. 1997;57:6652B.
- 12) Buss AH, Perry M. The aggression questionnaire. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 1992;63(3):452-59.
- 13) Abdullah H, Adriana O, Nobaya A, Ghazali S. Aggressive and delinquent behavior among high risk youth in Malaysia *Asian Social Science* 2015 Jun; 11(6):62-72.
- 14) Okon MO, Momoh SO, Imhonde HO, Idiakheus Eo. Aggressive tendencies among undergraduates: The role of personal and family characteristics. *Revista Espanola de Orientacion Psicopedagogia* 2011;22(1):3-14.
- 15) Alami A, Shahghasemi Z, Ghochan ADM, Baratpour F. Students' aggression and its relevance to personal, family and social factors. *Iran Red Crescent Med J* 2015 Dec; 17(12):1-6.
- 16) Sawalkar SV. A comparative study on aggression and emotional intelligence among college students of rural and urban area. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology* 2015 Mar; 2(2):13-18.
- 17) Ling MO. The relationship between family socioeconomic status and lifestyle among youth in Hong Kong. *SS Student E-Journal* 2013;2:135-68. Ssweb. cityu. edu.hk/download/RS/E-Journal/Vol2/Journal8.pdf