



ORIGINAL RESEARCH PAPER

Clinical Psychology

“UNDERSTANDING AGGRESSION AND DEFIANT BEHAVIOR IN COLLEGE STUDENTS”

KEY WORDS:

Rose Mary

Department of Psychology, Kristu Jayanti College (Autonomous), Bangalore - 560077

Dr. Deepthi D P

Department of Psychology, Kristu Jayanti College (Autonomous), Bangalore - 560077

ABSTRACT

The study sought to investigate violence and defiant behavior among college students in India, with a particular emphasis on gender differences. There were 64 participants in this study. The scales used were Aggression scale (Buss and Perry, 1992) and Defiant Behavior Assessment Scale (David 1973). The findings revealed that there is no significant association between the two factors among students, but males outperformed girls on both exams. The findings show that exposure and treatment, as well as personal choices, could be variables. The study has significance for understanding the elements that influence children and may inform future research. However, drawbacks include a small sample size and an unbalanced gender distribution; future research should look at the precise behaviours that contribute to aggression and disobedience.

CHAPTER 1- INTRODUCTION

Aggression

The term "aggression" in psychology refers to a variety of actions that might cause bodily and psychological harm to you, other people, or inanimate objects in the environment.

Goals of aggression

- Expressing hatred or rage
- Asserting one's power
- Frightening or intimidating
- Getting a goal done
- Possession expression in response to fear
- In response to pain
- Rivalry with others

Signs of Aggression

Aggressive behaviors must require action since it is meant to hurt someone who doesn't want to be hurt; just having an aggressive thought or mood is insufficient, and accidentally hurting someone is not considered aggressive behaviors.

Aggressive actions include:

- Physical, such as punching, kicking, beating, or stabbing another individual. Physical aggression might also take the shape of property damage.
- Verbal, which includes yelling, calling names, and mocking.
- Relational, which aims to ruin someone else's connections. This can involve spreading untruths and fabricating information about other people.
- Passive-aggressive behaviors include ignoring someone at a social gathering or giving unintentional compliments. Instead of physically harming someone, passive-aggressive behaviors frequently has the intention of allowing harm to occur.

Types of aggression

- **Impulsive Violence**
Impulsive aggressiveness, also referred to as emotional or reactive violence, is characterised by intense emotions. Impulsive aggression, especially when brought on by anger, activates the brain's acute danger response system, which involves the periaqueductal grey, amygdala, and hypothalamus. This type of violence is unintentional and frequently occurs in the heat of the moment. You are acting impulsively aggressively if a car cuts you off in traffic and you start cursing and berating the other driver.

- **Instrumental violence**
Instrumental aggression, also referred to as predatory aggression, is characterised by actions meant to further a

wider objective. A means to an aim, instrumental hostility is frequently meticulously planned. This kind of aggressiveness includes hurting a victim during a robbery. The aggressor's objective is to acquire money, and hurting another person is the means to that end.

Causes of aggression

We're not sure what creates excessive or inappropriate aggressiveness. Several elements, including someone's biology, environment, and psychological history, are most likely at work.

Biological Factors
Aggression is influenced by genetic and hormonal variables. Certain hormone imbalances, such as testosterone and cortisol, and neurotransmitter imbalances, such as serotonin and dopamine, may be connected to aggressiveness. These abnormalities can develop due to a variety of factors, including heredity. Aggression can also be influenced by brain shape. People with structural amygdala anomalies are more aggressive than their counterparts. Other changes in the brain may also lead to aggressive behaviors.

Environmental Factors

One's upbringing may influence whether or not you participate in aggressive conduct. People who encounter aggressiveness as children may assume that violence and hatred are socially acceptable. Trauma experienced as a kid might lead to violent conduct as an adult. Albert Bandura's renowned Bobo doll experiment proved that observational learning may also play a role in the development of violence. In this study, youngsters who saw a video clip of an adult model acting violently toward a Bobo doll were more inclined to emulate same behaviors when given the chance.

Psychological Factors

A number of mental health problems have been linked to aggressive conduct, including:

- ADHD (attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder) (ADHD)
- Bipolar illness
- Personality disorder with borderline characteristics (BPD)
- Narcissism
- Post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) (PTSD)
- Aggression can be influenced by epilepsy, dementia, psychosis, substance use disorder, and brain traumas or abnormalities.

Impact of Aggression

Aggression may have a negative impact on your health and relationships. According to research, there is a correlation between rage and chronic inflammation, which can lead to

secondary health concerns such as cardiovascular disorders. Anger and hostility are often linked to mental health issues. However, it is unclear if such disorders are caused by uncontrolled anger or if the conditions themselves make it difficult to handle extreme emotions like anger and violence. Aggression from a lover, acquaintance, or family member has the same negative consequences. Victims of physical or psychological violence perceive their experiences as damaging, even though their assailant does not. These types of aggressiveness might lead to the breakup of a relationship. Aggression that goes unchecked can also make things more difficult at work and disrupt friendships. This might increase the aggressor's tension and feelings of isolation, thereby exacerbating the situation.

Management of aggression

If you are experiencing aggressive sentiments, you may learn to regulate your anger and deal in a more productive manner. Creating an anger management strategy ahead of time might provide you with a road map to follow when your emotions go out of control. This strategy should contain stress-reduction strategies such as:

- Being aware of your angry warning signs, such as clenching your jaw, a racing heart, or sweating
- Deep breathing, meditation, or gradual muscular relaxation are all examples of relaxation techniques (PMR)
- Using your senses by concentrating on items you can see, smell, hear, touch, or taste
- Removing oneself from the situation
- Exercising to expend surplus energy
- Seeking social assistance from a trustworthy friend or family member
- Diverting your attention with another activity

Conflicting behaviors

Behavior that occurs from simultaneously experiencing two conflicting motivating states. It is most typically caused by an approach-avoidance conflict, such as when a hungry animal must leave its shelter to feed in the company of a predator (feeding vs. fear) or when a territorial male is in the proximity of a possible mate (aggression vs. sex). Conflict behaviors might take the form of approach and retreat patterns or unrelated activity.

Causes of conflict

Conflict is caused by five major factors: information conflicts, values conflicts, interest conflicts, interpersonal conflicts, and structural conflicts.

- When people have different or insufficient knowledge, or disagree about what data is significant, information conflicts emerge. Allowing enough time to be heard in a polite setting provided by a neutral person can help parties resolve information discrepancies.
- When people have perceived or real contradictory belief systems, they cause value conflicts.

Disputes happen when one individual or group attempts to impose its ideals on another or claims exclusive ownership of a set of values. While ideals are non-negotiable, they can be debated and individuals may learn to coexist happily and logically.

- Competition over perceived or actual contradictory needs causes interest conflicts. Such disagreements might arise over money, resources, or time. Parties frequently assume that in order to meet their own demands, the needs of their opponent must be sacrificed. A mediator can assist in identifying methods to align interests and generate chances for mutual benefit.
- When there are misperceptions, strong negative emotions, or inadequate communication, relationship problems arise. One person may have mistrust for the other and assume that the other's actions are motivated by malice or an attempt to hurt the other. Allowing each

individual undisturbed time to go through difficulties and respond to the other person's concerns can help resolve relationship disputes.

- Oppressive behaviours directed towards others produce structural tensions. Conflict behaviour is frequently encouraged by a lack of resources or opportunities, as well as by organisational structures. The parties may profit from mediation since the forum will help to balance the power.

Need and significance for the study

To understand the levels of aggression and defiant behavior among college students. This can help shed light on the wrong doings of the youth and can help with better help for students who choose wrong paths.

Chapter 2- Review Of Literature

A study was conducted by Shaban and Kumar (2016) which involves 100 participants (N = 100, 50 Males & 50 Females) from Lovely Professional University in Punjab to investigate the level and gender differences in aggression. The participants' ages vary from 18 to 25 (Mean = 22.44). The Aggression Scale was used to collect data from both genders over a two-month period. The study's findings reveal some intriguing numbers, indicating that female participants are more aggressive (30%) than male participants (22%). The findings also indicate that 26% of individuals had significant aggressiveness, meaning that one-fourth of the participants are aggressive. Furthermore, the results show that, while the percentage of female participants is substantial, they do not vary significantly ($t = -.568, p > .05$) from their male counterparts on aggressiveness. The findings also contradict the widely held belief that males are more violent than females. The findings indicate that the pattern of violence is shifting and that, in modern times, males and females feel nearly equal aggression.

A study was conducted by Liu and Kaplan (2004) and it investigated whether gender and a history of aggressiveness as a teenager affect an individual's aggressive response to significant role stress throughout early adulthood. Data were collected from a panel of non-Hispanic white respondents. These conclusions came from a logit regression analysis: In contrast to men who did not exhibit aggression during early adolescence, who did not exhibit an increase in aggression under similar circumstances, men who did exhibit aggression during early adolescence were significantly more likely to respond to severe role stress with aggression during young adulthood. However, only those young women who did not express aggressiveness in early adolescence were more aggressive after experiencing role stress. The effect was favourable but marginal for individuals who reported hostility throughout adolescence. Using socialization theory, gender norms, and societal structural restrictions on men and women, researchers interpret these findings. In support of this perspective, researchers present the results of a study that examined the relationships between role stress, past aggressiveness, and heavy drug use in both males and females.

In another study conducted the biological, social, and environmental risk factors that are said to contribute to violent behaviour are briefly reviewed in this essay. More particular, aggressive conduct throughout adolescence and adulthood has drawn the attention of several studies. Understanding the causes of this behaviour in young children and older individuals has received less attention. The specific risk factors for violent behaviour are highlighted in this research conducted by Liu, Lewis, and Evans across the developmental range, encompassing childhood, adolescence, maturity, and late life. Appreciation of the risk factors of aggressive behaviour, and, in particular, how they relate to age-specific manifestations, can benefit nurses in better design and implementation of preventative and

treatment programmes.

In this study, conducted by Knight, Broome, Cross & Simpson (2009) a sample of drug-dependent people were asked about their impressions of parent-child relationships in their family of origin and antisocial behaviour. Data included self-reported hostility and risk-taking before starting therapy, as well as retrospective reports of childhood family variables, teenage antisocial propensity, and childhood family factors. The association between childhood parenting characteristics and adult antisocial propensity was explored using a developmental model that incorporated teenage antisocial tendency as a mediator. It was discovered that teenage measures are the main channel via which the impacts of parental support and conflict work. More specifically, higher levels of parental conflict and lower levels of parental support were associated with higher levels of teenage antisocial propensity, which in turn was associated with higher levels of hostility and risk-taking in adulthood. Therefore, it seems that parental involvement protects children against risky conduct and drug use.

Young kids in America are exposed to a lot of violence both at home and in the community, according to accumulating evidence. The relationship between exposure to community violence and criminal activity in a sample of young adults is being investigated for the first time in this study conducted in 2009. The authors David Eitle and R. Jay Turner also examine the possibility that distressing news, seeing domestic violence, having an accident, and being a direct victim of household and community-based violence are all independently linked to young adult criminality. The findings show that current community exposure to violence, past exposure to traumatic news, direct community victimisations, recent life events, and affiliations with criminal peers all raise the chance of young adults committing crimes. These results' ramifications are examined.

The interplay of personality, family context, and media violence as predictor factors for aggressiveness is still up for debate. The current study conducted by Ferguson et al. in 2008 investigated the effects of gender and personality, physical abuse and domestic violence exposure, as well as media violence exposure from both television and video games, on violent criminal behaviour. According to data from young people (n = 355), personality traits and direct physical maltreatment were strong predictors of violent crime. Violence in video games and on television did not significantly predict violent crime. These findings provide light on the intricate interplay between several variables that contribute to the genesis of violent crime. These findings also cast doubt on the notion that media violence contributes to the causes of violent crime.

The National Incident-Based Reporting System data, which included information on almost 300,000 sexual assaults, revealed that the median age of victims was 15, independent of the gender, age, or age of the perpetrator. The researchers Richard B. Felson and

Patrick R. Cundiff in 2014 contend that because of their sexual appeal, susceptibility, and exposure to motivated perpetrators, teenagers are most likely to be victims. These reasons make sexual assault against young people just as illegal as it is against women. Regarding the age of offenders, young people's sexual appeal also matters. Given the association between age and distance from the law, older men commit crimes at considerably greater rates than one might anticipate. As a result, the researchers discovered that sexual assault against elderly males occurs at substantially greater rates than physical assault. Finally, research indicated that gay males were at least equally prone to perpetrate sexual assault as heterosexual men. The trend shows that rather than views toward women, the propensity for sexual assaults to include

male perpetrators and female victims is caused by male desire.

The effect of empathy in predicting recidivism among young adult criminals was investigated in this longitudinal research conducted by Eva M. Bock and Daniela Hosser in 2011. 748 male offenders between the ages of 15 and 28 were given the interpersonal reactivity index while they were incarcerated (IRI; Davis, 1980). Both general and violent recidivism during the (on average) five years after release from jail were assessed using official criminal records. IRI scales were used as explanatory variables in Cox regression models of reoffense rates, adjusting for age, socioeconomic status, length of incarceration, and intellect. The subscales of perspective taking and empathetic fantasy as well as the overall empathy score all helped predict recidivism, but neither empathic worry nor personal distress did. Additionally, empathy had no effect on the likelihood of violent reoffending. Additionally, empathy had no effect on the likelihood of violent reoffending. However, when comparing offenders with violent and nonviolent index crimes, violent offenders performed worse on the IRI and committed violent offences more frequently than nonviolent offenders.

The examination of cognitive rigidity in adolescence with a predisposition to autoregressive behaviour model is the goal of the study. The study included 65 secondary school students aged 14-15 years. In addition to statistical methodologies, the following procedures were used: The Stroop Color and Word Test, and descriptive statistics, Mann Whitney U test, Spearman rank correlation coefficient. According to the findings of the study, teenagers who are prone to autoaggressive conduct have a greater degree of cognitive rigidity than adolescents who are not prone to self-destructive behaviour. A favourable association was also established between the degree of tendency for autoaggressive behaviour model and the level of cognitive rigidity. The research potential include the study of children's and parents' personal qualities, family education approaches that contribute to the establishment and development of cognitive rigidity, and the inclination to auto-aggressive conduct. The findings of the study can be utilised to organise psychological and pedagogical assistance for teenagers and their families.

This study looked at the links between two types of peer victimisation, physical and relational, and externalising behaviours including drug use, violence, and delinquency in a sample of 276 mostly African American eighth graders in an urban public school system. Regression studies revealed that physical victimisation was strongly associated to cigarette and alcohol use but not to advanced alcohol and marijuana use; after adjusting for physical victimisation, relational victimisation contributed specifically to all categories of drug use. Physical victimisation was also found to be highly associated to physical and relational aggressiveness and delinquent conduct, with relational victimisation playing a unique role in the concurrent prediction of these behaviours. Physical victimisation was shown to be more significantly associated with both types of alcohol use, hostility, and delinquent conduct in boys than in girls. Relational victimisation, on the other hand, was more strongly connected to physical aggressiveness and marijuana use in females than in boys, but less strongly related to relational aggression in boys than in girls. These findings shed light on the generalizability of previous studies and have significant implications for therapeutic efforts. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention provided funding for this study via Cooperative Agreement U81/CCU309966 (CDC). The authors' findings and interpretations are solely their own and are not necessarily approved by the CDC or represent the views, opinions, or policies of the CDC or its personnel.

The majority of alcohol and drug usage happens among nonviolent individuals. However, in many violent occurrences, both perpetrators and victims are under the influence of alcohol and, to a lesser extent, illegal narcotics. The linkages between psychoactive drugs and violence entail broad societal and economic dynamics, the environments in which the substance is obtained and used, and the biological mechanisms that underpin all human behaviour. In the case of alcohol, data from laboratory and empirical investigations suggests that it may have a causal role in aggressive conduct. Similarly, the psychopharmacodynamics of stimulants like amphetamines and cocaine show that these drugs may have a role in aggressive conduct.

The drug-violence association exists for a variety of reasons, some of which are direct (drugs pharmacologically induce aggression) and others of which are indirect (violence occurring in order to attain drugs). Furthermore, the nature of that interaction is frequently complicated, with intoxication, neurotoxic, and withdrawal effects sometimes confused and/or confounded. This research examines the current evidence to determine the extent to which various substances of abuse are directly linked to increased interpersonal violence. The substance with the greatest evidence to establish a direct intoxication-violence association is definitely alcohol. The literatures on benzodiazepines, opiates, psychostimulants, and phencyclidine (PCP) are varied, but they imply that personality variables may be as (or more) relevant as pharmacological factors. While cannabis lessens the chance of violence while intoxicated, emerging research links withdrawal to aggressivity. The data on steroids and aggressiveness is mainly contradictory, and the literature on 3,4-methylenedioxymethamphetamine (MDMA) and aggression is insufficient to make any sensible conclusions. The conclusions and policy implications are presented briefly.

The 1-year prevalence and location of viewing and experiencing threat and aggressiveness among two random samples of young adults were calculated in this study. A phone survey was administered to a community and a college sample to determine how frequently they had witnessed physical aggressiveness, experienced a verbal argument, or been the victim or initiate of hostility. In the previous year, around 25% of women and 33% of males had experienced aggression. One of the most common venues was at or near a pub. For men, the most severe incident occurred at or near a bar, whereas for women, it occurred in or near their own house. Young adults frequently encounter threats and hostility. Understanding criminal violence and people's fear of violence demands addressing our society's epidemic level of hostility.

The purpose of this study was to look at the link between middle-school aggressive behaviours and young adults' experiences as victims and perpetrators of intimate partner physical violence. Surveys were done with 977 8th graders who were resurveyed as young adults as part of the Reach for Health longitudinal research, when lifetime partner violence was examined. Middle-school hostility and eventual relationship violence are common among both boys and girls in this economically disadvantaged population. In middle school, 32% of girls and 42% of boys reported being involved in a recent fight, while 12% of girls and 17% of boys threatened someone with a weapon. By the age of 19-20, around 35% of females and 35% of males reported being victims of one or more kinds of relationship violence; 35% of females and 22% of men reported perpetration. When socio-demographic indicators are taken into account, middle-school violence is a major risk factor for partner victimisation and perpetration. When additional middle-school risk behaviours and exposures to physical aggression in the childhood home are included, early aggressiveness remained an independent predictor of partner violence

perpetration and victimisation for men and victimisation for females. The findings show that early treatments that assist adolescents adopt nonviolent conflict resolution skills in cross-gender relationships are important for reducing partner violence through young adulthood.

To determine the prevalence of verbally and physically aggressive dating practises in a sample of Spanish teenagers. The Modified Conflict Tactics Scale (MCTS) was used to collect cross-sectional self-report data from a representative sample of 2416 adolescents and young adults of both genders aged 16 to 20 years. The findings revealed that a significantly higher percentage of women engaged in verbal aggression (95.3% vs. 92.8%), whereas males engaged in more severe physical aggression (4.6% vs. 2.0%) and caused worse consequences for the health of their female partners (especially minor cuts/bruises, broken nose, black eye, broken bone, and requiring medical treatment/hospitalization). Differential outcomes were also demonstrated by justification for aggressiveness. The examination of group differences by age revealed that verbal aggressiveness was quite high and did not differ across age groups. Physical aggressiveness, on the other hand, reduced considerably across age groups, although health repercussions got more severe with age. These differences in aggressiveness typology for men and women assist doctors in developing preventative therapies for all ages, with the goal of reducing their continuity in future relationships.

The current study looked at the effects of a unidimensional aggressiveness scale (which includes verbal aggression, anger with resentment, physical violence, and suspicion) on students' current academic achievement score (GPA) and cumulative academic achievement score (CAAS) (CGPA). The current study included undergraduate students (n=1481) from a university in Northern Cyprus. The study looked at how aggressiveness affected students' GPA and CGPA. Demographic characteristics including age, gender, and class size were also included in the analysis and handled as control variables. To evaluate the hypothesised association, multiple regression analyses were used. Aggression had a substantial detrimental influence on students' present academic accomplishment (GPA) and cumulative academic achievement score, according to the findings (CGPA). The addition of control variables to the regression equation had no influence on the effect of aggressiveness on both achievement scores. Furthermore, the variance inflation factor (VIF) was regulated to keep track of the issue of multicollinearity. All VIF values were lower than the benchmark value, according to the findings. The report also discusses the study's implications, limitations, and future research directions.

Despite the fact that various theories contend that self-control is adversely associated to aggressiveness, investigations yield contradictory results. As a result, our meta-analysis established the general relationship between self-control and aggressiveness (or measures linked to them) and moderating effects. Our data is comprised of 58 research including 39,116 students from mainland China who did not have any medical or psychological problems (effect sizes measured via r or equivalent). Self-control and aggressiveness have a moderately unfavourable relationship. This correlation was stronger (a) among middle-school students and university undergraduates than among primary school students, (b) in samples with more males (rather than females), and (c) when the Aggression Questionnaire was used rather than other aggression measures, according to moderator analysis. The self-control scale and publication type had no effect on the relationship between self-control and violence.

Youth engage in a variety of aggressive behaviours, resulting in serious psychological dysfunctions. The current study examines the prevalence of violence in youth as well as the

risk factors for aggression in youth. Anger and Materials Using a survey methodology, 5476 participants were given a data sheet, the Resilience Scale, and the Buss-Perry Aggression Scale. Data was gathered from various communities (colleges, residential areas, flats, and workplaces) in Bangalore, Jammu, Indore, Kerala, Rajasthan, Sikkim, and Delhi. 47% of the participants were female, whereas 53% were male. The sample's average age was 20.2 years. Pearson correlation coefficient and Chi-square were used to perform comparative analysis. On the Buss-Perry Aggressiveness Scale, 17.7% of youth had a high mean aggression score. Males have a higher mean aggressiveness score than females. Males had higher levels of verbal violence, physical aggression, and fury than females. Aggression was higher in the younger age group (16- 19 years) than in the older age group (20-26 years). Physical abuse in childhood, substance abuse such as alcohol and tobacco, negative peer influence, family violence, academic disturbance, psychological problems attention deficit-hyperactivity disorder, suspicious, loneliness, mood disturbance, negative childhood experience, and TV and media were identified as risk factors for youth aggression. The study demonstrates the presence of correlations of risk factors for aggressiveness among children and suggests the use of management measures to assist them in dealing with aggression.

Anger and its expression are serious public health issues for today's children and adolescents. Anger-related issues, including as oppositional behaviour, verbal and physical aggressiveness, and violence, are among the most prevalent reasons children are referred for mental health care, according to prevalence studies. The following internet search engines were used to perform a thorough evaluation of the literature: Cochrane, MEDLINE, PsychINFO, and PubMed. The review includes both published and unpublished publications that matched the following criteria:

(a) experimental or quasi-experimental research designs; (b) nonpharmacologic, therapy-based therapies; and (c) study participants ranging in age from 5 to 17 years. The most thoroughly studied and empirically supported therapies for rage and aggressiveness in kids are cognitive- behavioral and skills-based methods. Affective education, relaxation training, cognitive restructuring, problem-solving skills, social skills training, and conflict resolution are all common therapeutic strategies. These strategies, when customised to the requirements of the individual kid and/or family, can promote the development of more adaptable and prosocial behaviour.

A telephone interview was conducted with a randomly selected sample of 549 women aged 55 and older and 2,669 women aged 18-34 years to establish the prevalences of physical and sexual assault, PTSD symptomatology, and depression. Sexual and physical attacks were more common in older women than in younger women. Furthermore, after a trauma, the incidence and proportional risk of posttraumatic psychopathology and depression were lower in older women compared to younger women.

CHAPTER 3- RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study is to understand the level of Aggression and Defiant Behavior among college students.

OBJECTIVES

1. To understand the relationship between Aggression and Defiant Behavior among college students.
2. To understand the gender difference in Aggression among college students.
3. To understand the gender difference in Defiant Behavior among college students.

Hypothesis

1. H01 There is a significant relationship between

- Aggression and Defiant Behavior among college students.
2. H02 There is a significant gender difference in Aggression among college students.
 3. H03 There is a significant gender difference in Defiant Behavior among college students.

Research Design

Correlational research design used in the current study.

Sampling and Sampling Technique

64 college students from India are selected using convenience sampling method

Inclusion Criteria

1. College students of age 18-26 were included in the study.
2. Participants who know English language are included in the study.

Exclusion Criteria

- People with psychological disorders are excluded.

Tools for the study

1. Aggression Questionnaire

This is a 28 item scale by authored by Buss & Perry in 1992. Several studies have found that the Buss and Perry Aggression Scale has high reliability and validity coefficients.

Internal consistency measurements such as Cronbach's alpha have ranged from 0.84 to 0.94 in various studies for reliability. In terms of construct validity, the Buss and Perry Aggression Scale has demonstrated good evidence of construct validity by distinguishing between aggressive and non-aggressive persons and predicting violent behaviour in particular contexts. Furthermore, high correlation values ranging from 0.66 to 0.87 for distinct AQ subscales have been developed, demonstrating constancy over time.

2. Defiant Behavior Assessment scale

The Defiant Behaviour Assessment (DBA) scale is a tool designed by David P. Farrington to evaluate defiance in children and adolescents. There is a very high internal consistency coefficient (.89)

Procedure

The Google form was made and circulated after receiving consent from the participants and they were instructed on filling the form. They were also informed regarding the confidentiality of the data that was collected.

Statistical Techniques

Spearman rank Correlation analysis was done to find the relationship between Aggression and Defiant Behavior.

Mann-whitney U- test was used to find the gender of Aggression and Defiant Behavior among college students.

Ethical Considerations

- An informed consent was taken from the participants
- Confidentiality on their responses were assured

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1: Descriptive statistics on the relationship between Aggression and Defiant behavior.

Variables	N	Mean	SD	ρ	Sig
Defiant	64	44.4	9.1		
Behavior					
Aggression	64	68.4	19	.203	.107

Descriptive statistics were conducted to understand the, and

the obtained results showed that the mean score of Defiant Behavior is 44.4 with a standard deviation of 9.1, Spearman correlation score of .203, for Aggression the mean score is 68.4 and the standard deviation is 19 with a Spearman correlation score of .203 (p=.107). The result indicates that there is no significant relationship between Aggression and Defiant Behavior, hence the null hypothesis is accepted here.

Table 2: Mann -Whitney U- test to understand gender differences in Aggression among college students.

Variables	Gender	N	Mean Rank	Sum of rank	Mann - Whitney U	Z	Sig.
Aggression	Male	37	35.46	1312	390	-1.49	.136
	Female	27	28.44	768			

Table 2 shows the mean rank score for aggression among male students was 35.46 and the mean rank score for aggression among female students was 28.44. the Mann -Whitney U Score is 390 (p=.136). the result indicates that there is no significant difference in aggression among male and female college students.

Table 3: Mann -Whitney U-test to understand gender differences in Defiant Behavior among college students

Variables	Gender	N	Mean Rank	Sum of rank	Mann - Whitney U	Z	Sig.
Defiant Behavior	Male	37	37.84	1400	302	-2.73	.006
	Female	27	25.19	680			

Table 3 shows the mean rank score for Defiant Behavior among male students was 37.84 and the mean rank score for aggression among female students was 25.19 the Mann -Whitney U Score is 302 (p=.006). the result indicates that there is a significant difference in Defiant Behavior among male and female college students. Compared to female students male students showing more Defiant Behavior.

It is also important to note that this study only looked at college students, so the results may not apply to other demographics or circumstances. Overall, this table suggests that there may be gender differences in defiant behaviour among college students, but further study is needed to completely understand the nature and extent of these disparities. In a study conducted by Eitle and Jay in 2009 explained that children of the USA were exposed to a considerable amount of violence both publicly and domestically.

The study found that current community exposure to violence, past exposure to traumatic news, direct community victimizations, recent life events, and affiliations with criminal peers all raise the chance of young adults committing crimes. These results' ramifications are examined.

CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Summary

In this study we try to understand aggression and defiant behavior among college students in India. There seems to be no relation between the two variables regarding college students. However, in regard to aggression and defiant behavior males have scored higher than females, although it was noted that there were responses in females that were higher in score than men. The results were analyzed using Pearson correlation and independent sample t-test.

CONCLUSION

The present study aimed to examine the aggression and defiant behavior among college students in India. In regards with results, it can be concluded that there is no significant relationship between the aggression and defiant behavior among students. This also reveals that men have scored

higher on both variable assessments than women. This can be resulting from the treatment and exposure these individuals. As in most cultures boys and girls are raised differently. Although the lifestyle these individuals choose for themselves can also be a contributing factor. Introducing students to understand the implications of bad decisions, teaching about drugs, law and other aggressive behaviors can help them lead a better life.

Implications

This study will help understand the aggression and defiant behavior among students. This is necessary as the youth of today is involved in many illegal habits. The results of the current study will help shed light to widen the areas of studies conducted on the factors affecting the youth.

Limitations and further direction

The main drawback of the current study was that there was a small population although the desired sample was that of 300 participants. Even with this there was a huge difference in the population of men and women who took part in the study. As a suggestion for further research in this area, the researcher might want to understand what behavior led to a person being considered aggressive and or defiant.

Acknowledgement

My primary responsibility is to extend my genuine appreciation and respect to everyone who provided invaluable assistance and direction for the successful completion of my research. First and foremost, I would like to express my sincere thanks to the principal of Kristu Jayanti College, Dr. (Fr.) Augustine George, for giving me this crucial opportunity to undertake this study. I owe a huge debt of gratitude to Dr. Molly Joy, Head, Department of Psychology at Kristu Jayanti College, Bangalore for enlightening us during the research work. Furthermore, I am extremely grateful to my guide, Prof. Dr. Deepthi D P for her invaluable advice, continuous support, and patience during my research. Her immense knowledge and plentiful experience have encouraged me in all the time of my academic research and daily hassles. I also want to thank the professors in the psychology department for their consistent support with my research. Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to my parents and my friends. Without their tremendous understanding and encouragement during my research, it would have been impossible for me to complete my study.

APPENDICES

Section 1

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

I, Rose Mary currently pursuing M.Sc. Psychology from Kristu Jayanti College, Autonomous, Bengaluru. I am researching to understand aggression and defiant behavior in college students. You can fill this form if you are above 18 years of age and currently are a college student.

Your participation and time are valued and appreciated. Read the statements carefully and select the option that best represents your opinion. Please note there are no right or wrong answers, respond to the questions honestly. The coded information will be confidential and used solely for research purposes. This information will be reviewed only by me and the college supervisor.

Please feel free to mail your concerns to 21mpsy46@kristujayanti.com

Age

<input type="radio"/>	18
<input type="radio"/>	19
<input type="radio"/>	20
<input type="radio"/>	21
<input type="radio"/>	22

<input type="radio"/>	23
<input type="radio"/>	24
<input type="radio"/>	25
<input type="radio"/>	26

Course (Kindly name your full course name)

Are you studying an undergraduate course or postgraduate course?

- Undergraduate
- Postgraduate

Gender

Male

Female

Other

I understand the responses will be kept confidential and will only be used for research purposes. My participation is voluntary and I can choose to withdraw my participation anytime.

Do you give you consent to participate in this study?

- I have read everything above and understood.

Appendices-I Self-Reported Deviant Acts and Admission Rates

1. Riding a bicycle without lights (or with no rear light) after dark.

- No
- Yes

2. Driving a car, motor bike or motor scooter under the age of 16.

- No
- Yes

3. Belonging to a group (of ten or more people) who go around together, making a row, and sometimes get into fights or cause a disturbance.

- No
- Yes

4. Playing truant from school.

- No
- Yes

5. Deliberately traveling without a ticket or paying the wrong fare.

- No
- Yes

6. Letting off fireworks in the street.

- No
- Yes

7. Taking money from home--with no intention of returning it.

- No
- Yes

8. Taking an unknown person's car or motor bike for joyriding (with no intention of keeping it for good).

- No
- Yes

9. Smashing, slashing or damaging things in public places-in streets, cinemas, dance halls, railway carriages, buses.

- No
- Yes

10. Annoying, insulting or fighting other people (strangers) in the street.

- No
- Yes

11. Breaking into a big store, garage, warehouse, pavilion, etc.

- No
- Yes

12. Breaking into a small shop (private tradesman), whether or not anything was stolen.

- No
- Yes

13. Stealing things out of cars.

- No
- Yes

14. Carrying some kind of weapon (knife or cosh) in case it is needed in a fight.

- No
- Yes

15. Attacking an enemy or someone in a rival gang (without using any sort of weapon) in a public place.

- No
- Yes

16. Breaking the windows of empty houses.

- No
- Yes

17. Using any kind of weapon in a fight-knife, cosh, razor, broken bottle, etc.

- No
- Yes

18. Drinking alcoholic drinks in pubs under the age of 18.

- No
- Yes

19. Going into pub bars under the age of 16.

- No
- Yes

20. Stealing things from big stores, supermarkets, multiple shops (while shop open).

- No
- Yes

21. Stealing things from small shops or private tradesmen (shop open).

- No
- Yes

22. Deliberately littering the streets or pavement by smashing bottles, tipping dustbins, etc.

- No
- Yes

23. Buying cheap, or accepting as a present, anything known or suspected of being stolen.

- No
- Yes

24. Planning well in advance to get into a house, flat, etc., and steal valuables (and carrying the plan through).

- No
- Yes

25. Getting into a house, flat, etc., and stealing things (Don't count cases where stealing results from planning well in advance).

- No
- Yes

26. Taking a pedal cycle belonging to an unknown person, and keeping it.

- No
- Yes

27. Struggling or fighting to get away from a policeman.
 - No
 - Yes
28. Attacking or fighting a policeman who is trying to arrest someone else.
 - No
 - Yes
29. Stealing school property worth more than about 5p.
 - No
 - Yes
30. Stealing tools, materials or any other goods worth more than 50p. from employers (all in one go in working hours-don't count breaking-in here).
 - No
 - Yes
31. Trespassing (e.g. railway lines, goods yards, private gardens, empty houses).
 - No
 - Yes
32. Going to "X" films under age
 - No
 - Yes
33. Often spending £1 or more a week on gambling under the age of 16.
 - No
 - Yes
34. Regularly smoking cigarettes under the age of 15.
 - No
 - Yes
35. Stealing goods or money from slot machines, juke boxes, telephones, etc.
 - No
 - Yes
36. Stealing from people's clothes hanging up anywhere.
 - No
 - Yes
37. Obtaining money by false pretences.
 - No
 - Yes
38. Taking illegal drugs (purple hearts, etc.) or smoking marijuana.
 - No
 - Yes

Appendices-II Aggression Questionnaire
Answer all questions

- 1 = extremely uncharacteristic of me
- 2 = somewhat uncharacteristic of me
- 3 = neither uncharacteristic nor characteristic of me
- 4 = somewhat characteristic of me
- 5 = extremely characteristic of me

1. Some of my friends think I am a hothead
2. If I have to resort to violence to protect my rights, I will.
3. When people are especially nice to me, I wonder what they want.
4. I tell my friends openly when I disagree with them.
5. I have become so mad that I have broken things.
6. I can't help getting into arguments when people disagree with me.
7. I wonder why sometimes I feel so bitter about things.
8. Once in a while, I can't control the urge to strike another person.

- VIII
9. I am an even-tempered person.
10. I am suspicious of overly friendly strangers.
11. I have threatened people I know.
12. I flare up quickly but get over it quickly.
13. Given enough provocation, I may hit another person.
14. When people annoy me, I may tell them what I think of them.
15. I am sometimes eaten up with jealousy.
16. I can think of no good reason for ever hitting a person.
17. At times I feel I have gotten a raw deal out of life.
18. I have trouble controlling my temper.
19. When frustrated, I let my irritation show.
20. I sometimes feel that people are laughing at me behind my back.
21. I often find myself disagreeing with people.
22. If somebody hits me, I hit back.
23. I sometimes feel like a powder keg ready to explode.
24. Other people always seem to get the breaks.
25. There are people who pushed me so far that we came to blows.
26. I know that "friends" talk about me behind my back.
27. My friends say that I'm somewhat argumentative.
28. Sometimes I fly off the handle for no good reason.

REFERENCES

1. Acierno, R., Brady, K., Gray, M. et al. *Psychopathology Following Interpersonal Violence: A Comparison of Risk Factors in Older and Younger Adults*. *Journal of Clinical Geropsychology* 8, 13–23 (2002). <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1013041907018>
2. *Antisocial Tendency Among Drug-Addicted Adults: Potential Long-Term Effects of Parental Absence, Support, and Conflict During Childhood*. (n.d.). Taylor & Francis. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.3109/009529989089016903>
3. *APA Dictionary of Psychology*. (n.d.). <https://dictionary.apa.org/conflict-behavior>
4. *Are There Different Types Of Aggression?* (2022, August 19). <https://www.mind-diagnostics.org/blog/aggression/are-there-different-types-of-aggression>
5. Azarova, E. (2021). *Cognitive Rigidity in Adolescence with a Tendency to Autoregressive Behavior Model* | *E3S Web of Conferences*. https://www.e3s-conferences.org/articles/e3sconf/abs/2021/34/e3sconf_uesf2021_07074/e3sconf_uesf2021_07074.html
6. Blake, C. S., & Hamrin, V. (2007). Current Approaches to the Assessment and Management of Anger and Aggression in Youth: A Review. *Journal of Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Nursing*, 20(4), 209–221. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6171.2007.00102.x>
7. Bock, E. M., & Hosser, D. (2013). Empathy as a predictor of recidivism among young adult offenders. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 20(2), 101–115. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1068316x.2012.749472>
8. Boles, S. M., & Miotto, K. (2003). Substance abuse and violence. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 8(2), 155–174. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s1359-1789\(01\)00057-x](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1359-1789(01)00057-x)
9. Eitle, D., & Turner, R. J. (2002). Exposure to Community Violence and Young Adult Crime: The Effects of Witnessing Violence, Traumatic Victimization, and Other Stressful Life Events. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 39(2), 214–237. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002242780203900204>
10. *Factors That Lead to Aggression*. (2022, November 14). Verywell Mind. <https://www.verywellmind.com/what-is-aggression-2794818>
11. Felson, R. B., & Cundiff, P. R. (2013). Sexual Assault as a Crime Against Young People. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 43(2), 273–284. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-013-0127-8>
12. Ferguson, C. J., Cruz, A. M., Martinez, D., Rueda, S. M., Ferguson, D. E., & Negy, C. (2008). Personality, Parental, and Media Influences on Aggressive Personality and Violent Crime in Young Adults. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 17(4), 395–414. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10926770802471522>
13. Hoaken, P. N., & Stewart, S. H. (2003). Drugs of abuse and the elicitation of human aggressive behavior. *Addictive Behaviors*, 28(9), 1533–1554. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2003.08.033>
14. *Just a moment*. . . (n.d.). https://www.researchgate.net/publication/305386853_Young_Adults_and_Aggression_A_a_Comparative_Study_of_Gender_Differences
15. Lei, H., Chiu, M. M., Quan, J., & Zhou, W. (2020). Effect of self-control on aggression among students in China: A meta-analysis. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 116, 105107. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.105107>
16. Leonard, K. E., Quigley, B. M., & Collins, R. L. (2002). Physical Aggression in the Lives of Young Adults. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 17(5), 533–550. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260502017005004>
17. Muñoz-Rivas, M. J., Graña, J. L., O'Leary, K. D., & González, M. P. (2007). Aggression in Adolescent Dating Relationships: Prevalence, Justification, and Health Consequences. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 40(4), 298–304. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2006.11.137>
18. *NCBI - WWW Error Blocked Diagnostic*. (n.d.). <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3411865/>
19. O'Donnell, L. (2006, August 10). *Middle School Aggression and Subsequent Intimate Partner Physical Violence*. SpringerLink. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10964-006-9086-x?error=cookies_not_supported&code=3965cce0-9db5-4cb4-9eba-cc347388dc86

20. *Role Stress and Aggression among Young Adults: The Moderating Influences of Gender and Adolescent Aggression on JSTOR.* (n.d.). <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3649105>
21. Sharma, M. K., & Marimuthu, P. (2014). Prevalence and Psychosocial Factors of Aggression Among Youth. *Indian Journal of Psychological Medicine*, 36(1), 48–53. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0253-7176.127249>
22. Sullivan, T. N. (n.d.). Peer victimization in early adolescence: Association between physical and relational victimization and drug use, aggression, and delinquent behaviors among urban middle school students | Development and Psychopathology. In *Cambridge Core*. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/development-and-psychopathology/article/abs/peer-victimization-in-early-adolescence-association-between-physical-and-relational-victimization-and-drug-use-aggression-and-delinquent-behaviors-among-urban-middle-school-students/1B7E9E053BF683E02CD187ECC4825A0E>
23. Uludag, O. (2013). The Influence of Aggression on Students' Achievement: Evidence from Higher Education. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 89, 954–958. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.08.963>
24. Vilendrer, E. K. (2020, April 22). *The Five Main Causes of Conflict and How Mediation Can Resolve Them*. Vilendrer Law, PC. <https://www.vilendrerlaw.com/five-main-causes-a-conflict-mediation-can-resolve/>
25. (n.d.). Psychopathology Following Interpersonal Violence: A Comparison of Risk Factors in Older and Younger Adults. *Springer Link*.