



AGGRESSION IN RELATION TO SELF-ESTEEM, PEER PRESSURE, FAMILY ENVIRONMENT AND MEDIA VIOLENCE IN SCHOOL CHILDREN

Poonam

M.Phil(Psychology) Research Scholar, Department of Psychology, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra
(Haryana), India; mail2psychologist@gmail.com

Abstract :

World health organization (2002) defines, “Aggression, such as kicking, fighting and biting is a major concern for modern societies as the physical, emotional, cognitive and societal consequences of violent acts are serious, far reaching and long terms.” There are individual and environmental and situational characteristics might leads to aggressive behavior. Many factors may contribute to aggression including situations, Self-esteem, Peer Pressure, exposure to Media Violence and Family environment. The family environment is influenced by a number of factors like the nature of family constellation; number of children in the family; marital relationship between husband and wife; maternal (parent) employment; and socio-economic and religious background of the family. The present study (N=300) was conducted to examine the aggression in relation to family environment, peer pressure, self-esteem and media violence. Participant completed a questionnaire comprising Aggression scale, Self esteem scale, Peer pressure scale, Tv attitude scale and Family environment scale. The obtained data was analyzed for means comparison, Pearson’s product moment correlations and stepwise multiple Regression analyses. The study is useful to judge the Aggression of the School students which is an indicator of mental health. It evaluates Self-esteem, peer pressure, media violence and family environment will contribute substantially to the aggression.

Keywords: Self esteem; Family environment; Peer pressure; Aggression; Tv attitude; Media violence;

1. Introduction:

Aggression is a word that we use every day to characterize the behavior of others and perhaps even of ourselves. We say that people are aggressive if they yell at or hit each other, if they cut off other cars in traffic, or even when they smash their fists on the table in frustration. Human aggression is explained in many ways by psychologists, with any given explanation depending on the particular orientation of the individual. Even within the subspecialty of social psychology, variation in viewpoint can be found, with some stressing cognitive factors, others pinpointing emotional and affective determinants, and still others dealing with aggression as a part of broader social interaction system. Social psychologists agree that aggression is a response to specific conditions in the environment. Definition of aggression varies widely, because the term is taken from everyday speech and is used to refer to behavior ranging from verbal insult, social snubs to first degree murders. A precise scientific definition which is universally accepted, yet to be devised. However, a formulation that serves as a good working definition is offered by Baron and Richardson (1994) “Aggression is any form of behavior directed toward the goal of harming or injuring another living being who is motivated to avoid such treatments.” World health organization (2002) defines Aggression as kicking, fighting and biting is a major concern for modern societies as the physical, emotional, cognitive and societal consequences of violent acts are serious, far reaching and long terms.

In humans, psychologists label the two types “hostile” and “instrumental” aggression. Hostile aggression springs from anger, its goal is to injure. Instrumental aggression aims to hurt only as a means to some other end. Most terrorism is instrumental aggression. “What nearly all suicide terrorist campaigns have in common is a specific secular and strategic goal,” concluded by Robert Pape



(2003) after studying all suicide bombings from 1980 to 2001. Hostile aggression has historically been conceived as being impulsive, thoughtless, unplanned, driven by anger, having the ultimate motive of harming the target, and occurring as a reaction to some perceived provocation. It is sometimes called affective, impulsive, or reactive aggression. Instrumental aggression is conceived as a premeditated means of obtaining some goal other than harming the victim, and being proactive rather than reactive (Berkowitz 1993, Geen 2001). In recent analysis (Bushman & Anderson 2001) modified the definitions in two ways. First, they distinguish between proximate and ultimate goals. We view intention to harm as a necessary feature of all aggression but it is necessary only as a proximate goal. Second, they distinguish between different types of aggression at the level of ultimate goal. Thus, both robbery and physical assault are acts of aggression because both include intention to harm the victim at a proximate level. However, they typically differ in ultimate goals, with robbery serving primarily profit-based goals and assault serving primarily harm-based goals. In short, this description allows us to discuss the commonalities in and distinctions between affective and instrumental aggression, while including aggression that has mixed motives. In United States, more than 16,000 murders occur each year, more than 95,000 rapes and more than 11 million acts of violence overall-in reported crimes alone (U.S. Department of justice, 2002).

Scientists have long debate on the origins of aggression. Freud (1930) assumed that we have an instinct to aggress. From his theory of the death instincts (thanatos), he argued that aggression may be turned inward self destructively or directed outward, towards others. Although Fried recognized that aggression can be controlled, he mentioned that it could never be eliminated, because aggression is natural to human being. Evolutionary biologists have developed the field of sociobiology, drawing on biological bases of behavior. Sociobiologists argue that many aspects of social behavior, including aggression, can be understood in term of evolution (Buss, 1996; Buss & Kenrick, 1998). Because aggression aids males in obtaining desirable mates and aids female in protecting their young, principles of natural selection should operate over time to favor certain forms of aggression.

Many social psychologists accept the sociobiological viewpoint (e.g., Buss, 1996; Buss & Kenrick, 1998), others believe that the perspective may shed only limited light on human aggression. Human aggression is more complex and takes different forms from animal aggression, and it often occurs in quite different social context that are governed by different social norms. Consequently, although the sociobiological perspective may provide an understanding of the underpinnings of human aggression, it is not, in itself, a sufficient theory to explain aggressive behavior in human beings. This is not to say, however, that biological plays only a modest role in human aggression (Geen, 1998). Physical aggression is influenced by the other male sex hormone testosterone (Dabbs, 1998), and it may also be influenced by other biochemical factors, including the neurotransmitter serotonin. Violence-prone individuals also have different patterns of brain activation (Harmon- Jones & Sigelman, 2001). There appears to be a genetic component in human aggression (Miles & Carey, 1997) and in criminality (DiLala & Gottesman, 1991; Stolberg, 1993), because certain types of aggressive, antisocial behavior clearly run in families (Miles & Carey, 1997). Aggression tends to be quite stable over the life span; relatively unaggressive people tend to stay that way, and highly aggressive individuals remain so into adulthood (Huesmann & Moise, 2000).

Five main theories of aggression guide most current research. The theories themselves overlap considerably, which is what instigated early attempts to integrate them into a broader framework (Anderson et al. 1995, 1996).

Cognitive Neoassociation Theory



Berkowitz (1989, 1990, 1993) has proposed that aversive events such as frustrations, provocations, loud noises, uncomfortable temperatures, and unpleasant odors produce negative affect. Negative affect produced by unpleasant experiences automatically stimulates various thoughts, memories, expressive motor reactions, and physiological responses associated with both fight and flight tendencies.

Social Learning Theory

According to social learning theories (Bandura 1983, 2001; Mischel 1973, 1999; Mischel & Shoda 1995), people acquire aggressive responses the same way they acquire other complex forms of social behavior—either by direct experience or by observing others. Social learning theory explains the acquisition of aggressive behaviors, via observational learning processes, and provides a useful set of concepts for understanding and describing the beliefs and expectations that guide social behavior

Script Theory

Huesmann (1986, 1998) proposed that when children observe violence in the mass media, they learn aggressive scripts. Scripts define situations and guide behavior: The person first selects a script to represent the situation and then assumes a role in the script. Once a script has been learned, it may be retrieved at some later time and used as a guide for behavior.

Excitation Transfer Theory

Excitation transfer theory (Zillmann 1983) notes that physiological arousal dissipates slowly. If two arousing events are separated by a short amount of time, arousal from the first event may be misattributed to the second event. If the second event is related to anger, then the additional arousal should make the person even angrier. The notion of excitation transfer also suggests that anger may be extended over long periods of time if a person has consciously attributed his or her heightened arousal to anger.

Social Interaction Theory

Social interaction theory (Tedeschi & Felson 1994) interprets aggressive behavior (or coercive actions) as social influence behavior, i.e., an actor uses coercive actions to produce some change in the target's behavior. Coercive actions can be used by an actor to obtain something of value (e.g., information, money, goods, sex, services, safety), to exact retributive justice for perceived wrongs, or to bring about desired social and self-identities (e.g., toughness, competence). According to this theory, the actor is a decision-maker whose choices are directed by the expected rewards, costs, and probabilities of obtaining different outcomes. Social interaction theory provides an explanation of aggressive acts motivated by higher level (or ultimate) goals.

2. Hypotheses:

1. There is likelihood of negative relationship between self-esteem and aggression.
2. There is likelihood of positive relationship between peer pressure and aggression.
3. There is likelihood of positive relationship between media violence and aggression.
4. There is likelihood of negative relationship between family environment and aggression.
5. Self-esteem, peer pressure, media violence and family environment will contribute substantially to the aggression.

3. Material and Methods:

3.1 Participant and Procedures

The present study was conducted on a sample of 300 participants. The sample consists of 125 boy and 175 girl students selected from various schools i.e. Bhanu Pratap School, S. K. Sr. Sec. School, Nav Durga Sr. Sec. School and Govt. High School, Bishanpura from jind (Haryana). The age range of the



selected subjects was between 8 to 15 years with the mean age of 11.5 years. The selected sample involves students from all walks of the society. The overall health of the participants was good.

3.2 Measures

The measures were selected in accordance with the aims of the study. While selecting the tools, psychometric properties, nature of sample, competence of the investigator in scoring and interpretation were taken into consideration. The following measuring tools are used in the present study:

Aggression Scale (Buss & Perry, 1992).

Self-Esteem (Coopersmith, 1981).

Peer Pressure (Saini & Singh, 2010).

TV Attitude (Huesmann, Eron, Klein, Brice & Fischer, 1983).

Family Environment Scale (Harpreet & Chada, 1993).

3.3 Administration and scoring of the tests

The subjects were contacted in their respective educational institutions to seek their consent for the participation in the study. After getting their consent of the participants, the date and time of the administration was decided. Tests were administered in single session. The tests were administered in a group of 10 to 15 participants. Proper setting arrangements were taken care of during the tests administration. Tests were administered strictly in accordance with the procedure specified in the respective tests manuals. Although there is no time limit to complete the tests yet participant were asked to complete them as soon as possible. The procedure was uniform all through.

They were assured that they should respond on the tests without any fear and hesitation. There is no right and wrong answer because every behavior aspect has its own advantages. They were also told that information obtained through these tests would be used for research purpose only and would be kept confidential. The participants were instructed to check whether responses to all the items were given and no item was left unanswered. All the participants responded to all the items and helped whenever they encountered any difficulty. The participants were generally very co-operative and seemed very much interested in the tests.

The tests were scored strictly according to the procedures mentioned in respective manuals by using by using separate keys or scoring instructions. Aggression Questionnaire by Buss and Perry was scored on five point Likert-scale i.e. strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), uncertain (3), agree (4) and strongly agree (5). The assignment of the items to the subscales according to the original four factors model was as follows: Anger: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9; Physical Aggression: 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21; Verbal Aggression: 3, 7, 10, 22, 23; Hostility: 11, 12, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29. The subscale as well as scale scores were obtained by adding the scores of participants on all the items making that dimensions.

The Self-esteem inventory was scored for single score. The respondents were given their responses generally favorable or generally unfavorable statements about the self, which they indicate as “like me” or “unlike me”. One score was given to the response matched with scoring key. Total score of the inventory was obtained by adding the scores of participants on all the items.

The Peer Pressure Scale was scored for a single score on 5 point Likert-scale i.e. strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), Can't say (3), agree (4) and strongly agree (5). Total score of the scale was obtained by adding the scores on all the items obtained by the respondents.

TV Attitude scale is scored on 5 point Likert-scale i.e. Item numbers 2, 3 and 5 are scored as First response = 1, Second response = 2, Third response = 3, Fourth response = 4 Fifth response = 5. Items



numbers 1, 4 and 6 are reverse coded. Total score of the scale was computed by adding the scores from all six items. The scale was scored for single measure.

The family environment scale was scored for eight subscales. The responses were given by the respondent on 5 point Likert-scale i.e. strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree and strongly disagree (5 to 1 score for positive items & 1 to 5 score for negative items). The items scored for Cohesion were 1, 9, 24, 37, 43, 55, 60, 63, 66, 69 (positive items) and 17, 49, 31 (negative items), for Expressiveness were 10, 25, 38, 44, 56 (positive items) and 2, 18, 32, 50 (negative items), for Conflict were 11, 19, 39, 51, 61, 67 (positive items) and 3, 26, 33, 45, 57, 64 (negative items), for Acceptance & caring were 8, 16, 36, 42, 48, 54, 59, 62 (positive items) and 23, 30, 65, 68 (negative items), for Independence were 4, 27, 46, 52 (positive items) and 12, 20, 34, 40, 58 (negative items), for Active-Recreational Orientation were 5, 13, 21, 28, 47 (positive items) and 35, 41, 53 (negative items) for Organization were 14 (positive item) and 6 (negative item), for Control were 7, 22 (positive items) and 15, 29 (negative items). The subscale scale scores were obtained by adding the scores of participants on all the items making that dimensions.

3.4 Statistical Analysis

The investigator uses appropriate statistical technique to make analyses on different type of scores available to draw inference. The analyses are done by the help of SPSS. The obtained data was analyzed for means comparison, Pearson's product moment correlations and stepwise multiple Regression analyses.

4. Result and Discussions

In view of the major objectives of the study the obtained data were processed for descriptive statistics, t-test, Pearsonian correlation and stepwise multiple regression analysis. The results as well as the implications of these analyses are described under separate heading:

Descriptive Statistics:

The means and standard deviations of the observed variables for boy and girl groups are presented in Table-2. A perusal of the results reveals that the means score of boys on Anger (AN), Physical Aggression (PA), Verbal Aggression (VA), Hostility (H), Peer Pressure (PP), Media Violence (MV), Expressiveness (EX), Conflict (CON), Acceptance (ACPT) and Independence (IND) are on lower side as compared to girls. Whereas on Self-esteem (SE), Cohesion (COH), Active Recreational Orientation (ARO), Organization (ORG) and Control (CTL) boys tends to be on a higher side. The significance of difference between means has been checked through t-test. As it was one of the main objectives to compare the boys and girls on the study variables.

A careful examination of Table-2 reveals that the mean of boy group on variable Anger (AN) is 17.55 whereas it is 17.96 for girl group. Standard deviation for boy group is 4.49 as compared to 4.03 for girl group on this variable. The obtained t-value for Anger is .82 which is non-significant. The result shows that boys and girls group does not differ on anger. On variable Physical Aggression (PA) a measure of aggression, the mean and SD for boy group is 22.07 and 5.20, respectively, whereas these are 22.14 and 5.19 for girl group. The t-value for this variable is .12 which is non-significant. The result shows that boys and girls group does not differ on Physical Aggression in the present study. The mean and SD on the measure of Verbal Aggression (VA) is obtained 13.48 and 3.33, respectively for boys group whereas it is 13.50 and 3.48 in girls group. The t-value for this variable is .051 which is non-significant. The result shows that boys and girls group does not differ on Verbal Aggression. On the variable Hostility (H), the mean and SD of boy group are 19.80 and 5.03 respectively whereas



these are 20.01 and 5.80 for girl group. The t-value for this variable is .47 which is non-significant. The result shows that boys and girls group does not differ on Hostility.

On the variable Self-Esteem (SE) the mean and SD of boy group are 15.02 and 3.29 respectively whereas these are 14.93 and 3.81 for girl group. The t-value being .21 is non-significant. The result shows that boys and girls group does not differ on Self-esteem. On the variable Peer Pressure (PP) the mean and SD of boy group are 63.95 and 12.74 respectively where as these are 64.86 and 12.96 for girl group. The t-value for this variable is .60 which is non-significant. The result shows that boys and girls group does not differ on Peer Pressure. On the variable Media Violence (MV) the mean and SD of boy group are 18.36 and 2.44 respectively whereas these are 18.48 and 2.62 for girl group. The t-value for this variable is .40 which is non-significant. The result shows that boys and girls group does not differ on Media Violence.

On the variable Cohesion (COH), a measure of Family Environment, the mean and SD of boy group are 50.44 and 6.86 respectively whereas these are 50.32 and 6.87 for girl group. The t-value for this variable is .14 which is non-significant. The result shows that boys and girls group does not differ on Cohesion. On the variable Expressiveness (EX) the mean and SD for boy group are 29.79 and 4.13 respectively, whereas these are 29.93

Table 1
List of Variables and their code names

Sr. No	Variables	Code Name
	Aggression Questionnaire	
1	Aggression	AN
2	Physical Aggression	PA
3	Verbal Aggression	VA
4	Hostility	H
5	Aggression Questionnaire total	AQT
6	Self-Esteem	SE
7	Peer Pressure	PP
8	Television Attitude	TV
	Family Environment Scale	
9	Cohesion	COH
10	Expressiveness	EX
11	Conflict	CON
12	Acceptance	ACPT
13	Independence	IND
14	Active Recreational Orientation	ARO
15	Organization	ORG
16	Control	CTL

Table 2
Mean, SD of Boy and Girl groups for different variable
Boys (N=125) Girls (N=175)



Variables	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	t-Value	P Level
AN	17.55	4.49	17.96	4.03	.82	NS
PA	22.07	5.20	22.14	5.19	.12	NS
VA	13.48	3.33	13.50	3.48	.05	NS
H	19.80	5.03	20.10	5.80	.47	NS
AQT	72.91	12.99	73.72	14.07	.51	NS
SE	15.02	3.29	14.93	3.81	.21	NS
PP	63.95	12.74	64.86	12.96	.60	NS
TV	18.36	2.44	18.48	2.62	.40	NS
COH	50.44	6.86	50.32	6.87	.14	NS
EX	29.79	4.13	29.93	4.43	.27	NS
CON	39.96	5.47	41.39	5.52	2.22	0.05
ACPT	41.65	4.29	41.69	4.77	.06	NS
IND	29.84	4.69	30.02	5.27	.29	NS
ARO	27.63	4.58	26.27	4.46	1.73	NS
ORG	7.56	1.88	7.55	1.83	.02	NS
CTL	15.03	2.80	14.85	3.07	.52	NS

Note: Significant at .05 probability level= 1.96

Significant at .01 probability level= 2.58

and 4.43 for girl group. The t-value for this variable is .27 which is non-significant. The result shows that boys and girls group does not differ on Expressiveness.

On the variable Conflict (CON) the mean and SD for boy group are 39.96 and 5.47 respectively, whereas there are 41.49 and 5.52 for girl group. The t-value for this variable is 2.22 which is significant. The result shows that boys and girls group is differ on Conflict. On the variable Acceptance (ACPT) the mean and SD for boy group are 41.65 and 4.29 respectively whereas these are 41.69 and 4.77 for girl group. The t-value for this variable is .066 which is non-significant. The result shows that boys and girls group does not differ on Acceptance. On the variable Independence (IND) the mean and SD for boy group are 29.84 and 4.69 respectively, whereas these are 30.02 and 5.27 for girl group. The t-value for this variable is .29 which is non-significant. The result shows that boys and girls group does not differ on Independence. On the variable Active Recreational Orientation (ARO) the mean and SD for boy group are 27.63 and 4.58 respectively, whereas these are 26.71 and 4.46 for girl group. The t-value for this variable is 1.73 which is non-significant. The result shows that boys and girls group does not differ on Active Recreational Orientation. On the variable Organizational (ORG) the mean and SD for boy group are 7.56 and 1.88 respectively, whereas these are 7.55 and 1.83 for girl group. The t-value for this variable is .026 which is non-significant. The result shows that boys and girls group does not differ on Organizational. On the variable Control (CTL) the mean and SD for boy group are 15.03 and 2.80 respectively, whereas these are 14.85 and 3.07 for girl group. The t-value for this variable is .52 which is non-significant. The result shows that boys and girls group does not differ on Control. The present study shows that there is no significant gender difference between school age boys and girls on study measures. Therefore, the data were pooled together for further analysis.



INTERCORRELATIONS:

The correlations between all possible pairs were computed by applying Pearson's Product Moment Method. The obtained correlations are reported in Table-3. It may be pointed out here that degrees of freedom being 298 (N=300), a correlation of .11 and .15 is significant at .05 level and .01 level, respectively. The intercorrelations of different sets of variables are described under separate heading.

Intercorrelation among the measures of Aggression:

An inspection of Table-3 reveals that the intercorrelation among these measures ranged between .30 to .46. All correlations among the measures of aggression are significant at or above .05 level of significance. AN has shown positive correlation with PA (r=.45), VA (r=.30) and H (r=.46). PA has also shown the significant positive association with VA (r=.19) and H (r=.49). VA is correlated positively with H(r=.35). Thus it is interpreted as that the correlations among all the measures of aggression show the association among them and shared common variance.

Correlation between measures of Aggression and Self- Esteem:

Correlation between measures of aggression and self-esteem are ranging from -.15 to -.51. Out of five correlations all are significant at or above .05 significance level. SE is negatively correlated with AN (r= -.37), PA (r= -.44), VA (r= -.15), H (r= -.46), AQT (r= -.51). It may be interpreted as those who are high on Self-esteem tend to be low on Anger, Physical Aggression, Verbal Aggression, Hostility and overall aggression scores.

Correlation between measures of Aggression and Peer Pressure:

Correlation between measures of aggression and peer pressure are ranging from -.02 to .27. Out of total 5 correlations 3 are significant at or above .05 level of significance. PA is positively correlated with PP(r=.27). It may be interpreted as those who are high on physical aggression are high on peer pressure. H is correlated positively with PP(r=.12). It may be interpreted as those who are high on hostility are high on peer pressure. AQT is positively correlated with PP(r=.17). It may be interpreted as those who are high on aggression questionnaire tend to be high on peer pressure.

Correlation between measures of aggression and TV Attitude:

Correlation between measures of aggression and TV Attitude are ranging from -.03 to -.07. In this study there is no significant correlation between aggression and TV attitude.

Intercorrelation among the measures of Family environment:

Correlations among the measures of family environment ranges from .24 to .53. All correlation among measures of aggression are significant at or above .05 level significance. COH shows positive correlation with EX(r=.50), CON(r=.46), ACPT(r=.53), IND(r=.49), ARO(r=.45), ORG(r=.36), CTL(r=.38). EX has also shown the significant positive correlation with CON(r=.41), ACPT(r=.33), IND(r=.38), ARO(r=.35), ORG(r=.23), CTL(r=.24). CON has also shown the significant positive association with ACPT(r=.31), IND(r=.45), ARO(r=.27), ORG(r=.38), CTL(r=.44). ACPT has also shown the significant positive correlation with IND(r=.48), ARO(r=.38), ORG(r=.38), CTL(r=.35). IND has also shown the significant positive correlation with ARO(r=.35), ORG(r=.40), CTL(r=.27). ORG has also shown the significant positive correlation with CTL(r=.37). Thus it is interpreted as that the correlation among all the measures of family environment show the association among them and shared common variance.

Correlation between measures of Aggression and Family Environment:

Correlation between measures of aggression and family environment are ranging from -.01 to -.37. Out of 40 correlations 32 are significant at or above .05 level of significance. AN is correlated negatively with COH(r=-.13), EX(r=-.18), CON(r=-.27), ACPT(r=-.17), IND(r=-.22), ORG(r=-.16), CTL(r=-.16). It may be interpreted as those who are high on anger tend to be low on cohesion,



Expressiveness, conflict, acceptance, independence, organization and control. High score on subscale conflict indicate low conflict and vice versa. It may be interpreted that low score on conflict indicate high amount of openly expressed aggression and conflict among family members. PA is correlated negatively with COH($r=-.24$), EX($r=-.26$), CON($r=-.37$), ACPT($r=-.17$), IND($r=-.20$), ARO($r=-.19$), ORG($r=-.13$), CTL($r=-.19$). It may be interpreted as those who are high on physical aggression tend to be low on cohesion, Expressiveness, conflict, acceptance, independence, active recreational orientation, organization and control. VR is correlated negatively with EX($r=-.11$). It may be interpreted as those who are high on verbal aggression tend to be low on expressiveness. In this study there is no significant correlation between VA and COH, CON, ACPT, IND, ARO, ORG, CTL. H is negatively correlated with COH($r=-.17$), EX($r=-.25$), CON($r=-.24$), ACPT($r=-.13$), IND($r=-.22$), ARO($r=-.27$), ORG($r=-.14$), CTL($r=-.18$). It may be interpreted as those who are high on hostility tend to be low on cohesion, Expressiveness, conflict, acceptance, independence, active recreational orientation, organization and control. AQT is correlated negatively with COH($r=-.20$), EX($r=-.29$), CON($r=-.33$), ACPT($r=-.18$), IND($r=-.23$), ARO($r=-.22$), ORG($r=-.15$), CTL($r=-.18$). It may be interpreted as those who are high on aggression questionnaire total tend to be low on cohesion, Expressiveness, conflict, acceptance, independence, active recreational orientation, organization and control.

Multiple Regression Analysis:

In order to examine the extent to which self-esteem, Peer pressure, Media violence and family environment can predict Aggression, multiple regression analysis was conducted on observed data. Undoubtedly, the multiple regression provides an opportunity, with little ambiguity, to assess the importance of each of the genuine contribution to the individual differences in the dependent measure. Multiple regression has been employed to find the subset of independent variables that are useful in predicting the dependent variable and to eliminate those do not provide additional prediction to the independent variables already in the equation. The model that suits this aim is stepwise multiple regression.

The stepwise regression equation starts out empty and independent variables are added in steps, one at a time, provided they meet the statistical criteria for entry (F with $<.05$). At each step, the independent variable not in the equation with a smallest probability of F is entered in the equation may be removed if they lose significant contribute towards multiple R^2 . The method when no more variables are eligible for inclusion or removal. The stepwise regression is the suggest path to the prediction equation when one is interested in identifying a subset of potent predictors are eliminating those which do not provide additional prediction to the predictors already entered (Tabahnick & Fidell, 1989). The results of regression analysis are presented in Table 4 they indicate the importance of each of the genuine contributors to the individual differences in Aggression and their joint contribution.

Table -3
Summary of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis

Step	Variable	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Df	F	Significance
1	Self-esteem	.52	.27	.26	1, 298	107.53	.0001
2	Expressiveness	.53	.29	.28	2, 297	59.18	.0001
3	Peer pressure	.54	.30	.29	3, 296	41.20	.0001



The results reported in Table 3 show that the independent variables used in analysis jointly contribute substantial proportion of variance in Aggression of school children. The multiple correlations equal to .54, the F statistics being 41.20 (df 3/296), it is significant at .0001 probability level. It may be noted that the multiple R square equals to .30. Therefore, 30% of variance in Aggression is accounted by Self-esteem, Expressiveness and Peer pressure. It is clear from these results that though 88.5% of the variance in Aggression remained uncounted, a substantial proportion of variance has been explained predominantly by three out of eleven predictors in the equation. The adjusted R square is being .29, which is fairly close to .54, the results represent the population parameters to the satisfactory level.

Self-esteem being the most pertinent predictor of aggression, it entered in the equation at step one. The R for the variable equals to .52 and $R^2 = .27$, F entering being, 107.53, it is significant at .0001 probability level. It includes that self-esteem is a very strong predictor of aggression among adolescents. The Expressiveness is another potent predictor which was entered at step two, multiple R increased to .53 ($R^2 = .29$) with the entry of Expressiveness in the equation after Self-esteem. The F ratio computed for significance of multiple R, at step two, equals to 59.18, it is significant at .0001 probability level. Hence it is indicate that Expressiveness is also a strong predictor of aggression. The last variable entered in regression equation is Peer Pressure. With the entry of this predictor at step three, the multiple R becomes .54 and $R^2 = .30$. The F ratio at this step equals to 41.20, it is significant at .0001 probability level.

The results of stepwise regression analysis revealed that the linear combination of Self-esteem, Expressiveness and Peer pressure accounts for significant proportion of variance (30%) in aggression among school children. Thus the results of stepwise regression analysis have clearly revealed that three of independent variable contributes significantly to the prediction of aggression among school children. The predictor's Self-esteem, Expressiveness and Peer pressure jointly accounts in academic achievement among school children.

Main Findings:-

1. The correlation between Self-esteem and measures of aggression ranged between -.15 to -.51. All correlations are significant at or above .05 level of significance. Thus hypothesis 1 regarding the relationship between Self-esteem and Aggression is accepted.
2. The correlation between Peer Pressure and measures of aggression ranged between -.02 to .27. Out of total 5 correlations 3 are significant at or above .05 level of significance. Thus hypothesis 2 regarding the relationship between Peer Pressure and Aggression is accepted.
3. The correlation between Television Attitude and measures of Aggression ranged between -.03 to -.07. In this study there is no significant correlation between aggression and TV attitude. Thus hypothesis 3 regarding the relationship between TV Attitude and Aggression is rejected.
4. The correlation between measures of Aggression and Family Environment ranged between -.01 to -.37. Out of 40 correlations 32 are significant at or above .05 level of significance. Thus hypothesis 4 regarding the relationship between Aggression and Family Environment is accepted.
5. Self-esteem, Expressiveness and Peer Pressure jointly explain the variance of 30% in Aggression among school children. Thus hypothesis 5 is accepted.

References

1. Anderson, C. A., & Bushman, B. J. (2001). Effects of violent video games on aggressive behavior, aggressive cognition, aggressive affect, physiological arousal, and prosocial behavior: A meta-analytic review of the scientific literature. *Psychological science*, 12(5), 353-359.



2. Anderson, C. A., & Bushman, B. J. (2002). Human aggression. *Psychology*, 53 (1), 27-51.
3. Andreas, J. B., & Watson, M. W. (2009). Moderating effects of family environment on the association between children's aggressive beliefs and their aggression trajectories from childhood to adolescence. *Development and psychopathology*, 21(01), 189-205.
4. Barry, C. T., Frick, P. J., & Killian, A. L. (2003). The relation of narcissism and self-esteem to conduct problems in children: A preliminary investigation. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 32(1), 139-152.
5. Baumeister, R. F., & Boden, J. M. (1998). Aggression and the self: High self-esteem, low self-control, and ego threat.
6. Baumeister, R. F., Bushman, B. J., & Campbell, W. K. (2000). Self-Esteem, Narcissism, and Aggression Does Violence Result From Low Self-Esteem or From Threatened Egotism? *Current directions in psychological science*, 9(1), 26-29.
7. Baumeister, R. F., Smart, L., & Boden, J. M. (1996). Relation of threatened egotism to violence and aggression: the dark side of high self-esteem. *Psychological review*, 103(1), 5-33.
8. Bhatia, H. & Chadha, N. K. (1993). *Family Environment Scale Manual*. Lucknow: Ankur Psychological Agency.
9. Boden, J. M., Fergusson, D. M., & Horwood, L. J. (2007). Self-esteem and violence: Testing links between adolescent self-esteem and later hostility and violent behavior. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 42(11), 881-891.
10. Bushman, B. J., & Baumeister, R. F. (1998). Threatened egotism, narcissism, self-esteem, and direct and displaced aggression: does self-love or self-hate lead to violence? *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 75(1), 219-229.
11. Bushman, B. J., & Geen, R. G. (1990). Role of cognitive€ motional mediators and individual differences in the effects of media violence on aggression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58(1), 156-163.
12. Buss, A. H., & Perry, M. (1992). The aggression questionnaire. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 63(3), 452.
13. Coopersmith, S. (1981). *SEI, Self-Esteem Inventory*. Consulting Psychologist Press.
14. Dahlberg, L. L., Toal, S. B., Swahn, M. H., & Behrens, C. B. (2005). Measuring violence-related attitudes, behaviors, and influences among youths: A compendium of assessment tools. *Centers for Disease Control and Prevention*.
15. Diamantopoulou, S., Rydell, A.M. & Henricsson, L. (2008). Can Both Low and High Self-esteem Be Related to Aggression in Children? *Social Development*, 17(3), 682-698.
16. Donnellan, M. B., Trzesniewski, K. H., Robins, R. W., Moffitt, T. E., & Caspi, A. (2005). Low self-esteem is related to aggression, antisocial behavior, and delinquency. *Psychological science*, 16(4), 328-335.
17. Dumas, T. M., Ellis, W. E., & Wolfe, D. A. (2012). Identity development as a buffer of adolescent risk behaviors in the context of peer group pressure and control. *Journal of adolescence*, 35(4), 917-927.
18. D'zurilla, T. J., Chang, E. C., & Sanna, L. J. (2003). Self-esteem and social problem solving as predictors of aggression in college students. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 22(4), 424-440.
19. Eamon, M. K. (2002). Poverty, parenting, peer, and neighborhood influences on young adolescent antisocial behavior. *Journal of Social Service Research*, 28(1), 1-23.



20. Eron, L. D., Huesmann, L. R., Lefkowitz, M. M., & Walder, L. O. (1972). Does television violence cause aggression? *American Psychologist*, 27(4), 253-263.
21. Esposito, A. J., Kobak, R., & Little, M. (2005). Aggression and Self-Esteem: A Diary Study of Children's Reactivity to Negative Interpersonal Events. *Journal of Personality*, 73(4), 887-906.
22. Farrell, A. D., Kung, E. M., White, K. S., & Valois, R. F. (2000). The structure of self-reported aggression, drug use, and delinquent behaviors during early adolescence. *Journal of clinical child psychology*, 29(2), 282-292.
23. Freedman, J. L. (1984). Effect of television violence on aggressiveness. *Psychological bulletin*, 96(2), 227-246.
24. Friedrich-Cofer, L., & Huston, A. C. (1986). Television violence and aggression: The debate continues. *Psychological Bulletin*, 100(3), 364-371.
25. Gentile, D. A., Coyne, S., & Walsh, D. A. (2011). Media violence, physical aggression, and relational aggression in school age children: a short-term longitudinal study. *Aggressive behavior*, 37(2), 193-206.
26. Graham, S. (2016). Victims of Bullying in Schools. *Theory Into Practice*, 55(2), 136-144.
27. Halloran, E. C., Ross, G. J., & Carey, M. P. (2002). The relationship of adolescent personality and family environment to psychiatric diagnosis. *Child psychiatry and human development*, 32(3), 201-216.
28. Hanson, R. F., Self-Brown, S., Fricker-Elhai, A. E., Kilpatrick, D. G., Saunders, B. E., & Resnick, H. S. (2006). The relations between family environment and violence exposure among youth: Findings from the National Survey of Adolescents. *Child Maltreatment*, 11(1), 3-15.
29. Haridakis, P. M. (2002). Viewer characteristics, exposure to television violence, and aggression. *Media Psychology*, 4(4), 323-352.
30. Heidgerken, A. D., Hughes, J. N., Cavell, T. A., & Willson, V. L. (2004). Direct and indirect effects of parenting and children's goals on child aggression. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 33(4), 684-693.
31. Huesmann, L. R. (1986). Psychological processes promoting the relation between exposure to media violence and aggressive behavior by the viewer. *Journal of social issues*, 42(3), 125-139.
32. Kant, R. (2016). Is TV Increasing Aggression in Secondary School Students: An Enquiry? *Asian Education Studies*, 1(1), 48-57.
33. Krahé, B., & Möller, I. (2010). Longitudinal effects of media violence on aggression and empathy among German adolescents. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 31(5), 401-409.
34. Kumar, R., & Varma, B. (2016) Adolescents' Aggression in Relation to Peer Pressure and Family Relationship. *International Journal of Science and Research*, 5(2), 628-631.
35. Loeber, R., & Hay, D. (1997). Key issues in the development of aggression and violence from childhood to early adulthood. *Annual review of psychology*, 48(1), 371-410.
36. Lopez, E. E., Pérez, S. M., Ochoa, G. M., & Ruiz, D. M. (2008). Adolescent aggression: effects of gender and family and school environments. *Journal of adolescence*, 31(4), 433-450.



37. Lyons-Ruth, K. (1996). Attachment relationships among children with aggressive behavior problems: The role of disorganized early attachment patterns. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, 64(1), 64-73.
38. Malpique, C., Barrias, P., Morais, L., Salgado, M., DA COSTA, I. P., & Rodriques, M. (1998). Violence and alcoholism in the family: How are the children affected?. *Alcohol and alcoholism*, 33(1), 42-46.
39. Maxwell, C. D., & Maxwell, S. R. (2003). Experiencing and witnessing familial aggression and their relationship to physically aggressive behaviors among Filipino adolescents. *Journal of Interpersonal violence*, 18(12), 1432-1451.
40. Mesch, G. S., Fishman, G., & Eisikovits, Z. (2003). Attitudes Supporting Violence and Aggressive Behavior among Adolescents in Israel The Role of Family and Peers. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 18(10), 1132-1148.
41. Miller-Johnson, S., Coie, J. D., Maumary-Gremaud, A., Lochman, J., & Terry, R. (1999). Relationship between childhood peer rejection and aggression and adolescent delinquency severity and type among. *African American youth. Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 7(3), 137-146.
42. Myers, D. G. (2005). *Social Psychology (8th edition)*, McGraw-Hill.
43. Nisar, M., Ullah, S., Ali, M., & Alam, S. (2015). Juvenile Delinquency: The Influence of Family, Peer and Economic Factors on Juvenile Delinquents. *Applied Science Reports*, 9 (1), 37-48.
44. Pagani, L., Tremblay, R., Nagin, D., Zoccolillo, M., Vitaro, F., & McDuff, P. (2004). Risk factor models for adolescent verbal and physical aggression toward mothers. *International journal of behavioral development*, 28(6), 528-537.
45. Paik, H., & Comstock, G. (1994). The effects of television violence on antisocial behavior: a meta-analysis. *Communication Research*, 21(4), 516-546.
46. Papps, B. P., & O'Carroll, R. E. (1998). Extremes of self-esteem and narcissism and the experience and expression of anger and aggression. *Aggressive Behavior*, 24(6), 421-438.
47. Park, J. H., Essex, M. J., Zahn-Waxler, C., Armstrong, J. M., Klein, M. H., & Goldsmith, H. H. (2005). Relational and overt aggression in middle childhood: Early child and family risk factors. *Early Education & Development*, 16(2), 233-258.
48. Pateraki, L., & Houndoumadi, A. (2001). Bullying among primary school children in Athens, Greece. *Educational Psychology*, 21(2), 167-175.
49. Phillips, D. P. (1983). The impact of mass media violence on US homicides. *American Sociological Review*, 560-568.
50. Prinstein, M. J., & Cillessen, A. H. (2003). Forms and functions of adolescent peer aggression associated with high levels of peer status. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 49(3), 310-342.
51. Pung, P. W., Yaacob, S. N., Baharudin, R., & Osman, S. (2015). Low Self-Control, Peer Delinquency and Aggression among Adolescents in Malaysia. *Asian Social Science*, 11(21), 193-202.
52. Ramsden, S. R., & Hubbard, J. A. (2002). Family expressiveness and parental emotion coaching: Their role in children's emotion regulation and aggression. *Journal of abnormal child psychology*, 30(6), 657-667.
53. Russell, A., Hart, C., Robinson, C., & Olsen, S. (2003). Children's sociable and aggressive behaviour with peers: A comparison of the US and Australia, and contributions of



- temperament and parenting styles. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 27(1), 74-86.
54. Santor, D. A., Messervey, D., & Kusumakar, V. (2000). Measuring peer pressure, popularity, and conformity in adolescent boys and girls: Predicting school performance, sexual attitudes, and substance abuse. *Journal of youth and adolescence*, 29(2), 163-182.
55. Savage, J., & Yancey, C. (2008). The effects of media violence exposure on criminal aggression a meta-analysis. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 35(6), 772-791.
56. Singh, D. (2015). Physical and verbal aggression in relation to peer pressure among students. *IAHRW International Journal of Social Sciences Review*, 2(2).
57. Singh, S. & Saini, S. (2010). *Peer Pressure Scale*. New Delhi: Prasad Psycho Corporation.
58. Smith, S. L., & Donnerstein, E. (1998). Harmful effects of exposure to media violence: Learning of aggression, emotional desensitization, and fear.
59. Snyder, J., Edwards, P., McGraw, K., Kilgore, K., & Holton, A. (1994). Escalation and reinforcement in mother-child conflict: Social processes associated with the development of physical aggression. *Development and Psychopathology*, 6(02), 305-321.
60. Talwar, P. (1998). The family and peer group influences in aggression. *Indian journal of psychiatry*, 40(4), 346-349.
61. Taylor, L. D., Davis-Kean, P., & Malanchuk, O. (2007). Self-esteem, academic self-concept, and aggression at school. *Aggressive Behavior*, 33(2), 130-136.
62. Vitaro, F., Barker, E. D., Boivin, M., Brendgen, M., & Tremblay, R. E. (2006). Do early difficult temperament and harsh parenting differentially predict reactive and proactive aggression? *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 34(5), 681-691.
63. Walker, J. S., & Bright, J. A. (2009). False inflated self-esteem and violence: A systematic review and cognitive model. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology*, 20(1), 1-32.
64. Wood, W., Wong, F. Y., & Chachere, J. G. (1991). Effects of media violence on viewers' aggression in unconstrained social interaction. *Psychological bulletin*, 109(3), 371-383.
65. Ybrandt, H., & Armelius, K. (2010). Peer aggression and mental health problems self- esteem as a mediator. *School Psychology International*, 31(2), 146-163.