



A Comparative Study of Aggression Between Tribal and Non-Tribal School Students

Dr. Sushmita kumari

Guest lecturer

J.J College, Jhumri Telaiya, koderma

Ashok Malhotra

Research Scholar

University Department of Psychology

Ranchi University, Ranchi

Abstract

In fact, ethnicity denotes different cultural groups. On the basis of ethnicity, the Indian population can be divided into two parts: tribal and non-tribal. These tribal and non-tribal people differ in several respects—beliefs, dress, food, and even psychological traits. Taking these facts into account, it was decided to compare ethnicity and gender on aggression. Children were chosen for this sample and divided into boys and girls. Two scales, a Personal Data Sheet and an Aggression Scale developed by Mathur and Bhatnager were administered on them. These scales were administered to a sample drawn from the Ranchi and Koderma districts. The data was analysed with the help of the mean, SD, and t ratio. It was found that tribal and non-tribal groups did not differ on aggression. Furthermore, it was also found that boys who were tribal and non-tribal were different on aggression, while girls who were tribal and non-tribal were not different on aggression.

Keywords: Aggression, Non-tribal and Tribal

Introduction:

Generally, ethnicity is used for a race, people and nation. It indicates different cultural groups. It is a category of people who identify with each other based on similarities such as common ancestry, language, history, society, culture or nation (Oxford Dictionary, 2013; People and Bailey, 2010). Cohen (1978) had opined that ethnicity had been used in place of cultural or tribal when referring to smaller groups with shared cultural system.

and shared hostage, but that ethnicity has added values of being to describe the commonalities between system of groups identified in both tribal and modern societies. But some social scientists believe that ethnic boundary is of mercurial character. It is of two points character -inclusiveness and exclusiveness. Ethnicity can also be narrowed or broadened in terms of boundary in relation to the specific need of political mobilization. It is a large group. It is the product of specific kinds of inter groups interaction rather than an assumed quality inherited to human groups.

Roughly, aggression is an abnormal behavior whereas abnormal psychologist considers it as defense mechanism. Aggression is found in each and every individual. Dollard et al. (1939) have said that aggression is an act whose sole response is to injure an organism or organism surrogate. It may be defined operationally in terms of mode of answering to Enders, frequent quarrelling, broken engagement, impulse to take revenge, reactionary attitude to traditions and beliefs. It is said that aggression asserts the occurrence of aggression always presupposes the existence of frustration and leads to some forms of aggression. But some scholars think that not all behaviors are due to frustration. It is well tested fact that frustration leads to aggression.

Aggression is a behavior directed toward another individual that is carried out with proximate intent to cause harm (Baron and Richardson, 1994; Bushman, 2001). Aggression is any behavior directed toward any object or person with the intent to cause harm of injury directly physically, verbally, psychologically and socially, it would refer acts like kicking, hitting, etc. Verbally it would refer to verbal attract, sarcastic remarks, shouting, etc. Psychologically, it would include distract, incision, etc, socially it would involve giving wrong public statements, tempering a person's image, deferring a person, etc.

When aggression in adult is not a response to mental disorder, it is sometimes considered as (Hadjins and Grunau, 1988; Brennan, et al., 2000) faulty discipline such as over permissiveness in term of total freedom to children develop a feeling of insecurity, antisocial aggressiveness, anxiety, friction in behavior and frustration (Coleman,1987). parental substance use and alcoholism are also related to aggression (Gabel and Shindlededecler,1993).

Objectives

This work was done with following objectives.

- To compare the level of aggression between tribal and non-tribal among total sample of school students.
- To compare the level of aggression between tribal and non-tribal among boy school students.
- To compare the level of aggression between tribal and non-tribal among girl school students.

Hypotheses

- There is no significant difference in the level of aggression between tribal and non-tribal among total sample of school students.

- There is no significant difference in aggression levels between tribal and non-tribal high school boys.
- There is no significant difference in aggression levels between tribal and non-tribal high school girls.

Methods

Sample

80 students were selected through Purposive sampling technique from Ranchi and Koderma districts of Jharkhand. The sample was divided into two parts-40 tribal students and 40 non-tribal students.

Tools

Keeping above aims in mind, following tools were used.

Personal Data Questionnaire (PDQ)

This (PDQ) was used to get some demographic information like name, age, sex, name of school, ethnicity, etc.

Aggression Scale

This aggression scale was used to measure the level of aggression of the school students. It was developed by B.P Mathur and R.K Bhatnagar and published RakhiPrakshan, Agra.

Results

The effect of ethnicity on the aggression level among total sample

After establishing rapport with proposed sample both scales were administered scale in single session and procured data were arranged in table no.01.

Table: 01

N, Mean, SD and t-ratio of aggression of tribal and non-tribal among total sample

Ethnicity	N	Mean	SD	t-ratio	P
Tribal	40	190.5	39.38	1.63	$p>0.05$
Non-tribal	40	209.8	26.19		

Above table no. 01, it is observed that N, Mean, SD of tribal sample are 40, 190.5 and 39.38 respectively, while N, M, SD of non-tribal sample are 40, 209.9 and 26.19. the t-ratio between these sub-groups is 1.63 with $df=78$, which is not significant on any level. It means tribal and non-tribal school students are not different on aggression. It can be concluded that ethnicity had no impact on aggression of school students.

The effect of ethnicity on the aggression level of high school boys

For testing this fact, the students were divided into tribal and boys non-tribal on the basis of personal Data Questionnaire Aggression Scale were administered on them, procured data were arranged in table no 2.

Table: 02*N, M, SD, and t-ratio of aggression of boys tribal and non-tribal school students*

Boys	N	M	SD	t-ratio	P
Tribal	20	175.9	10.44	8.96	$p < .01$
Non-tribal	20	213.8	8.37		

Considering above table no 02 it is observed that N, M, SD of boys tribal students are 20, 175.9 and 10.44, while N, M, SD of non-tribal students are 20, 213.8 and 8.37. the t-ratio between these two sub-groups is 8.96 with $df=38$, which is significant on 0.01 level. It means boys tribal and non-tribal are different on .01 level. So, boys tribal and non-tribal students are different on level of aggression.

The effect of ethnicity on the aggression level of high school girls

The last aims of this work was to assess the level of aggression of girl tribal and non-tribal school students. For this, the sample was divided into two parts-20 girl tribal and 20 girl no-tribal school students. After administering aggression scale, the obtained data was arranged in table no 03.

Table: 03*N, M, SD and t-ratio of aggression of girl tribal and non-tribal school students*

Girl	N	M	SD	t-ratio	P
Tribal	20	206.9	13.11	0.19	$p > 0.05$
Non-tribal	20	207.01	9.77		

Considering above table no. 03, it is observed that girl tribal and non-tribal are not different on aggression, because 0.19 with $df=38$, which is not significant on any level. It means girl tribal and non-tribal are not significantly different on aggression. So, it can be concluded that ethnicity had no impact on aggression level of girl subjects.

Discussion

It is observed that tribal and non-tribal school children are not different on the level of aggression. Aggression is in fact physiologically determined. Human being is pre-programmed to aggressively defend their own family and territory from intruders. Lorenz (1966) opined that people who are frustrated, thwarted, annoyed will behave aggressively. Considering demographic variables, it was observed that both tribal and non-tribal students were similar in psychological makeup. Students were from similar background, sex, family relationship. They had to face similar frustrating circumstances. That is why, they are not different on aggression. It has been supported by work of researcher Raine (2002) and Staff and Cairns (1996) search the cause neglect, TV violence structural and functional brain abnormality hormones and neurotransmitters are responsible for aggression.

According to social learning theory, the family plays an important role due to its sub-culture and symbolic models provide by the mass media produces conditions in which the child learns aggression. Bandura (1977) have said that the child

not only learn how to aggress, but also when to aggress and against whom to aggress.

The second finding indicates that girl tribal and non-tribal do not vary on aggression. Needless to say that boys and girl differ in aggressive tendencies especially in the most violent behaviour of homicide and aggravated assault. According to report by FBI (19991) the ratio of boys to girl murder is about 10:1 but the girl of both groups possess similar traits which are not to violence. Girl of both groups are similar in several respects like frustration, anxiety, etc. the cause of violence were similar in both groups tribal and non-tribal. Girl in both groups are very submissive, satisfied with what they have. It indicates the fact that boys non-tribal were more ambitious and their achievement level was less. This created much frustration among non-tribal. That is why, they were more aggression than boy tribal. Despite these factors, the cause of aggressive in interpersonal provocation (Berkowitz, 1993; Green, 1968). Provocations include insults, fights and other forms of verbal aggression, and physical aggression.

Their provocations are different in both groups-tribals and non-tribals.

Main findings

- Tribal and non-tribal samples are not different on aggression among total sample.
- Boy tribal and boys non-tribal sample are different on aggression.
- Girl tribal and non-tribal are not different on aggression.

Reference

- Bandura, A. (1977). Self efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioural change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191–215. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0033-295x.84.2.191>
- Baron, R. A., & Richardson, D. R. (1994). *Human aggression* (2nd ed). Plenum Press.
- Berkowitz, L. (1993). *Aggression: Its cause, consequences and control*. McGraw-Hill.
- Brennan, P. A., Mednick, S. A., & Hodgins, S. (2000). Major mental disorder and criminal violence in Danish birth chart. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 57(5), 494–500. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.57.5.494>
- Bushman, B. J. (2001). Baumeister, R. F. and Phillips, C. M.. Do people aggress to improve their mood? Catharsis, beliefs affect regulation, opportunity and aggression responding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(1), 17–32.
- Cohen, R. (1978). Ethnicity problems and focus in anthropology. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 7(1), 379–403. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.an.07.100178.002115>
- Coleman, J. S. (1987). Microfoundation and microsocial behaviour. In J. C. Alexander, B. Giesen, R., Munch & N. J. Sinelser (Eds.), *The micro-macro link* (pp. 153–173). Los Angeles, C.A: University of California press.
- Dollard, J. L. W., Miller, N., Mowrer, O. H., & Sears, R. R. (1939). *Frustration and aggression* New Haven Conn: Yale.
- Gabel, S., & Shindledecker, R. (1993). Characteristics of children whose parents have been incarcerated. *Hospital and Community Psychiatry*, 44(7), 656–660. <https://doi.org/10.1176/ps.44.7.656>
- Green, R. G. (1968). Effect of frustration, attack and prior training in aggression upon aggressive behaviour. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 9(4), 316–321. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0026054>
- Hodgins, S., & Grunau, M. (1988). *Biology, mental disorder, aggression and violence*. What do we know? In Moffitt, T. E., Mednick, S. A. (Editors). *Biological contribution to crime causation*. Dordrecht, Netherland: Martinus Nijhoff publishing 161-182.

Larenz, K. G. (1966). *The psychological approach*. Methods and Resultzecolution of Situaltization in the Biological and Cultural Spheres. <https://dio.org/1.1098/resb1966.E.0011>

Oxford dictionary. (2013). *Definition of ethnicity*. <http://www.oxfordistionaries.com/definition/English/ethncity?Retrieved>
Retrieved December 28. Oxford University Press.

People, j., &Baliey, G. (2010). *Humanity: An introduction to cultural anthropology* (9th ed) p. 389. Cengage Learning.

Raine, A. (2002). Annotation: The role of prefrontal deficits, low autonomic arousal and early health factors in the development of antisocial and aggressive behaviour in children. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, and Allied Disciplines*, 43(4), 417–434. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-7610.00034>

Staff, D. M. E., &Carirns, R. B. (1996). Aggression and violence: Genetic neurobiological and bio social perspective. *Mehwah. Lawrence Erlbaum*.

