

Socio-economic variables: a contributing factor for the development of aggression behaviour among the students with type A and type B personality

Ashok Malhotra^{1*}

ABSTRACT

The aim of the present study was to explore the relationship among the Personality types and different dimensions of aggression of high school students. One hundred seventy six male students in the age range of 16 to 18 years residing in Ranchi town constituted the sample for the study. They were equally divided into high and low SES groups and were selected by random sampling method. Aggression Inventory of Sultania and Type A/B Personality Pattern (ABBPS) Scale developed by Dhar and Jain were used for data collection. Subjects were classified as either Type A or Type B based on their scores on Type A/B Behavioural Pattern Scale. The results of this study indicate that a relationship exists between Personality types and different dimensions of aggressive behaviour. It was found that Type A personality was positively and significantly correlated to different dimension of aggression on the other hand Type B personality was negatively correlated with different dimensions of aggression. Some evidence of the moderating effect of socio-economic status on the level of aggression expressed by personality Type A was observed. No relationship between aggression and Type B personality. High and Low Socio-economic group was found.

Keywords: *Type A and Type B personality, Aggression, Socio-economic Status*

Aggressive behaviour can be conceptualized as the observable manifestation of aggression, which is defined as any act intended to cause harm, pain or injury in another (Zirpoli, 2008). Aggression is probably the most serious problem in youth population. Almost every country is passing through the hazards of aggressive acts either posed by their own countrymen or some alien element of Nations. It is a serious problem to all nations as strikes, sabotage, robbery, violence, arson, murder, suicide, criticisms, intimidation, tormentation, humiliation, hatred gherao and other forms of aggressive behaviour have become a common feature these day (Singh, 1976).

Aggression can be defined as any physical or verbal behaviour sequence intended to hurt or destroy, whether done reactively out of hostility or proactively as a calculated means to an end. Aggression increase during adolescence, likely due to pubertal reactions and peaking concerns for

¹Ph.D. Research scholar, University Deptt. of Psychology, Ranchi University, Ranchi

**Corresponding Author*

Received: June 15, 2020; Revision Received: June 20, 2020; Accepted: June 25, 2020

Socio-economic variables: a contributing factor for the development of aggression behaviour among the students with type A and type B personality

dominance among peers (Pellegrini and Long, 2002). Aggression is multidimensional construct where as goal oriented instrumental (Proactive) aggression is used strategically for personal gain, e.g. Forcing, dominating others (Bjorkqvist et.al, 1992), reactive aggression includes angry defensive responses to perceived provocation (Little et.al, 2003). Both types of aggression are related to peer rejection. Further overt aggression (physical and verbal) e.g. hitting, name calling is separated from relational aggression e.g. gossiping social exclusion etc. (Little et.al, 2003).

Aggressiveness is an innate emotional tendency of reaction formation to frustration when individual need is obstacle. This tendency can be modified by the environment and influences mainly by the inculcation of social norms rooted in socio-religions history. Aggression appears frequently when an urgent need fulfillment meets with barriers towards achievement and the threshold of tolerance is lessened.

Some theorists argue that personality variables are important predictors of aggressive behaviour (Anderson and Bashman 2002; Carvalho and Bobre 2013; Jones Miller and Lynam, 2011; Friedman and Ray Rosenman (1950) described two contrasting personality Type A and B. Type A personality is more likely to be preoccupied with social status, accomplishment in life and self esteem. These persons are action oriented who struggle to achieve poorly defined a goals by means of competitive hostility. They are aggressive, impatient, and upwardly mobile, striving and angry when frustrated. They are ambitious, rigid, organized, punctual and often high achieving workaholics. They are perfectionist, love solving problems and believe there is always a solution.

Type B personality is the opposite they are relaxed and less aggressive and tend to strive less vigorously to achieve their goals.

Review of literature shows diversity of opinion among researchers on the issue of Socio-economic status and aggression. According to Gorman, Smith et.al; 1996, Evans et.al, 2006, Lempers et.al 1990; Malaviya, 1977. Poverty and Low socio-economic status significantly risk factors for adolescent aggression in urban youth. According to the American Psychological Association (APA) Socio-economic Status is an individual groups social standing within a community based on education, income and occupation; Greitemeyer et.al (2016) observed that adolescents of Low socio-economic status exhibit higher aggressive behaviour to frustrating situation, it indicates that the factors of economic deprivation are a strong antecedent to aggression (Khalakdina, 2011).

On the other hand Chatterjee (2013) did not find any difference between the aggressive behaviour of students of high and low socio-economic status. Moher et.al, (2008) found that adolescents from lower socio-economic status back grounds tend to engage in heightened level of aggressive behaviour. That's the reason the children having low socio-economic status always have a shortage of always have a shortage of amenities. In absence of proper facilities they get frustrate and exhibited more aggression behaviour to frustrating situations. It appears that the factor of income by itself is not tenable to explain differences in aggression among various groups and the perhaps a composite index of social milieu, an education level together with income could be more appropriate (Khalaudina, 2011).

Despite the considerable evidence that suggests that personality type and poverty (LSES) influencing aggression, relatively few studies examined the relationship between personality type, socio-economic status and aggression. In the present study in attempt was made to

Socio-economic variables: a contributing factor for the development of aggression behaviour among the students with type A and type B personality

measure the level of aggression of the youth as related for their personality type and socio-economic status.

Objectives

The present study was undertaken with the following objectives:

- To study the relationship between Personality types and Aggression.
- To compare the Level of aggression between persons with Type A and Type B personality.
- To study the effect of Socio-economic Status on the aggressive behaviour of students with Type A and Type B personality.

Hypotheses

Following hypotheses were formulated for verification:

- The personality Type (Type A and Type B) significantly related with Aggressive. Type A personality will be positively and Type B personality will be negatively correlated with different dimensions of aggressive behaviour.
- Students with Type A personality will score greater on total as well as eight dimensions of B.D, Hostility inventory in comparison to Type B personality students.
- Socio-economic Status of the adolescents will produce significant moderating effect on Aggression.

METHOD

Participants:

One hundred seventy six male students in the age range of 16 to 18 years residing in Ranchi town were selected randomly for the study, of which 88 were taken from high and 88 were from low socio-economic background. The socio-economically high adolescents came from families with high income (taxable income), high caste affiliation (Brahmans and other upper caste) and high parental education (minimum graduation) where as low income (10000 or below), low parental education (matriculation or below) and low caste group (scheduled caste). Both groups were matched on family structure, religion and place of residence.

Measures:

The following measuring instruments were used in this study:-

1. **Hindi adaptation of Bus-Durkee Hostility Inventory** (Sultania 2006) was used as a measure of expression of aggression. The inventory was designed to assess different forms of aggression and hostility and represent the eight sub scale, such as assault, indirect aggression, irritability, negativism, resentment, suspicion, verbal aggression and guilt. The inventory includes 67 items out of which 52 are positive and 15 are negative items. The range of the score is 0 to 67. Higher scores greater is the magnitude of aggression.
2. **Type A/B Behavioural Pattern Scale (ABBPS)** developed by Dhar and Jain (2001) was used to identify Type A and B personality. It consists of two parts, part I and Part II. Part I measures Type A personality which include 17 items and Part II measures Type B behavioural Pattern and consists of 16 items. Each item of both forms has to be answered on 5 point scales- strongly agree, agree, uncertain, disagree and strongly disagree. The reliability of the scale was found to be 0.54 and validity of both forms was found to be 0.73 separately.

**Socio-economic variables: a contributing factor for the development of aggression behaviour
among the students with type A and type B personality**

Procedure:

The selected students were briefed about the study and its relevance. Consent was obtained. The above tools were administered. The protocols of all the subjects were scored and the coefficient of correlations means and standard deviation of the test scores for the subject were calculated. 't' test was used to examine significance of difference of means between the comparable group.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Results of correlations between personality types and different dimensions of aggressive behaviour of both high and low SES group are presented in table I and II.

Table- I

Inter correlations Matrix (High SES groups: n=88)

Sl. No.	variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	Type A personality		0.48	0.42	0.46	0.44	0.40	0.46	0.45	0.34	0.47
2	Type B personality			0.10	-0.16	-0.05	-0.11	-0.15	-0.18	-0.02	-0.05
3	Assault				0.28	0.36	0.28	0.25	0.31	0.37	0.18
4	Indirect Aggression					0.32	0.32	0.28	0.26	0.15	0.16
5	Irritability						0.26	0.21	0.24	0.32	0.26
6	Negativism							0.36	0.27	0.28	0.29
7	Resentment								0.23	0.25	0.27
8	Suspicion									0.32	0.36
9	Verbal Aggression										0.29
10	Guilt										

** /*Significant at 0.01/0.05
NS: - Not Significant

Table- II

Inter correlations Matrix (Low SES groups: n=88)

Sl. No.	variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	Type A personality		-0.36	0.25	0.28	0.26	0.32	0.33	0.25	0.42	0.12
2	Type B personality			-0.27	-0.16	-0.18	-0.17	-0.26	-0.12	0.18	0.19
3	Assault				0.22	0.45	0.41	0.37	0.24	0.42	0.23
4	Indirect Aggression					0.42	0.40	0.23	0.27	0.26	0.20
5	Irritability						0.36	0.28	0.26	0.31	0.18
6	Negativism							0.32	0.19	0.29	0.28
7	Resentment								0.28	0.36	0.20
8	Suspicion									0.29	0.22
9	Verbal Aggression										0.36
10	Guilt										

Results are showed significant positive correlation between Type A personality and different dimension of aggressive behaviour (Assault r = 0.42, Indirect Aggression r = 0.46, Irritability r=0.44, Negativism r = 0.34, Resentment r = 0.46, Suspicion r = 0.45, Verbal Aggression r =

Socio-economic variables: a contributing factor for the development of aggression behaviour among the students with type A and type B personality

0.34 and Guilt $r = 0.43$). All the correlations were significant at 0.01 level of significance. Negative correlation was found between Type B personality and different dimensions of personality (Assault $r = -0.27$, Indirect aggression $r = -0.16$, Irritability $r = -0.18$, Negativism $r = -0.17$, Resentment $r = -0.26$, Suspicion $r = 0.12$, Verbal aggression $r = 0.18$ and Guilt $r = 0.19$).

Table III
Significance of difference between Mean scores of the two personality Type A and Type B on different dimensions and aggression scores

	Group	N	M	SD	T ratio
A	A	88	4.13	1.03	6.50**
	B	88	3.40	1.05	
B	A	88	4.06	1.14	6.28**
	B	88	3.18	1.21	
C	A	88	3.22	1.07	5.35**
	B	88	2.47	1.07	
D	A	88	2.04	0.75	2.38*
	B	88	1.42	0.92	
E	A	88	2.79	1.07	0.35(NS)
	B	88	2.84	1.07	
F	A	88	3.99	1.21	3.93**
	B	88	3.44	1.21	
G	A	88	4.11	1.42	7.64**
	B	88	2.81	0.99	
H	A	88	2.65	0.86	1.93(NS)
	B	88	2.38	0.85	
Total	A	88	27.45	3.93	11.67**
	B	88	21.73	2.24	

** /*Significant at 0.01/0.05
NS: - Not Significant

The perusal of the data tabulated in the Table-III shows that students with A personality type scored 27.45 as mean value and the mean score of type B group being 21.73. It means that aggressive tendency was higher in Type A group in comparison to type B group.

It was also observed that in all dimensions of aggressive behaviour type A group secured higher mean scores (resentment and except guilt) than type B group. On resentment and guilt Type A and B did not show significant difference as t value are not statistically significant.

This finding of the study proves that personality type is an eminent factor which contributes adolescent's aggression. Various previous researchers found that people who have a Type A personality may be particularly susceptible to aggression. Types A are generally ambitious, high achieving. That experiences a constant sense of urgency and easily aroused to anger and hostility when frustrated. But the Type B persons are relaxed, less aggressive and experience lower level of stress and frustration (Carvalho and Nobre, 2013). Carvalho and Glaso (1970) also found that this type of personality would show more aggression under threatening circumstances. In contrast Type B is relaxed, Philosophical, creative and feels less stress, anxiety and aggression.

**Socio-economic variables: a contributing factor for the development of aggression behaviour
among the students with type A and type B personality**

Table IV
Significance of difference between Mean scores of the two Socio-economic groups (High and Low) with Personality Type A on total and different dimensions of Aggression

	Group	N	Mean	SD	t value
A	HSES	44	3.40	1.05	3.47**
	LSES	44	4.22	1.16	
B	HSES	44	3.18	1.21	4.62**
	LSES	44	4.33	1.12	
C	HSES	44	2.47	1.07	2.20*
	LSES	44	2.99	1.14	
D	HSES	44	1.42	0.92	6.20**
	LSES	44	2.67	0.97	
E	HSES	44	2.84	1.07	5.21**
	LSES	44	3.95	0.92	
F	HSES	44	3.44	1.21	2.61*
	LSES	44	4.04	0.92	
G	HSES	44	2.81	0.99	4.71**
	LSES	44	3.90	1.17	
H	HSES	44	2.38	0.85	NS
	LSES	44	2.38	0.91	
Total	HSES	44	21.73	2.24	12.64**
	LSES	44	28.52	2.77	

** /*Significant at 0.01/0.05
NS: - Not Significant

It is clear from the above table that the difference in the mean scores of high and low SES groups with Type A personality found highly significant on all the dimension (except guilt) of aggressive behaviour and overall score as t value for Assault (3.47), Indirect aggression (4.62), Irritability (2.20), Negativism (3.46), Suspicion (2.13), Verbal aggression (4.71) and 12.64 respectively statistically significant at 0.01. In all cases Low SES group obtained higher scores than high SES group. Thus we can conclude that Low SES groups are more aggressive than high SES group. Previous research on the association between SES and aggressive behaviour has produced mixed finding showing variation in the strength of association. In this study we find that high SES group are less aggressive possible reasons for this findings might be high SES group provide more facilities and their environment is less deprived as compared to the lower SES group it has a positive reinforcement effect to reduce aggressive tendencies in most cases.

These findings are in the hypothesis direction and suggest that the students from Low SES students have a higher chance of suffering from aggression than their counterpart from High SES background. This findings can be linked with the fact that although the personality type are same in the high and low SES group. The lack deprivation surely provide the High SES students an environment which is free from unnecessary competition, frustration, and pressure which help them to reduce aggressiveness such as irritability, negativism, suspicion etc.

The reasons of the difference obtained in this study are undoubtedly due to wide difference in the socio-economic status of the two groups. Poorer section of the urban population leads a life of acute deprivation of basic needs. Their children suffer from acute sense of insecurity.

Socio-economic variables: a contributing factor for the development of aggression behaviour among the students with type A and type B personality

As a result they have higher tendency for aggressive acts either as frustration or intense desire to get all those thing that richer classes have.

Table V
Significance of difference between Mean scores of the two Socio-economic groups (High and Low) with Personality Type B on total and different dimensions of Aggression

	Group	N	Mean	SD	t value
A	HSES	44	4.31	1.03	0.38(NS)
	LSES	44	4.22	1.16	
B	HSES	44	4.06	1.14	1.12(NS)
	LSES	44	4.33	1.12	
C	HSES	44	3.22	1.07	0.97(NS)
	LSES	44	2.99	1.14	
D	HSES	44	2.04	0.75	3.40**
	LSES	44	2.67	0.97	
E	HSES	44	2.79	0.07	5.45**
	LSES	44	3.95	0.92	
F	HSES	44	3.99	1.21	0.22(NS)
	LSES	44	4.04	0.92	
G	HSES	44	4.11	1.42	0.75(NS)
	LSES	44	3.90	1.17	
H	HSES	44	2.65	0.86	1.43(NS)
	LSES	44	2.38	0.91	
Total	HSES	44	27.45	3.93	1.47(NS)
	LSES	44	28.52	2.77	

** /*Significant at 0.01/0.05
NS: - Not Significant

The data obtained in table V show that High and Low SES group of Type B personality differ. Significantly on negativism and resentment dimension of aggressiveness. Where as they show insignificant difference on total and dimension assault, indirect aggression, irritability, suspicion, verbal aggression and guilt. Finding of study indicates that Type B personality of both high and low SES status was equally non- aggressive. Economic deprivation or economic sufficiency did not produce any effect on their leave of aggressiveness.

CONCLUSION

- Personality type is important predictors of aggressiveness in adolescents.
- Type A personality showed significant positive correlation with different dimensions of aggressive behaviour.
- Type B personality type was negatively correlated with different dimensions of aggressiveness.

REFERENCES

- Bem, S.L. (1974). The measurement of Psychological Androgyny. *Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology*, 42, 115-162.
- Bettencourt, B.A and Miller, N. (1996). Gender differences in aggression as a function of provocation: A meta-analysis. *Psychology Bulletin*, 119, 422-447.
- Bjorkqvist, K., Osterman, K., and Lagerspetz, K.M. (1994). Sex difference in covert aggression among adults. *Aggression behaviour*, 20(1), 27-33.

**Socio-economic variables: a contributing factor for the development of aggression behaviour
among the students with type A and type B personality**

- Campbell, A. (1994). Men, Women and Aggression basic books.
- Campbell, S.B. (1995). Behaviour problems in Preschool children: A review of recent research. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 5, 950-960.
- Cohn, L.D. (1991). Sex differences in the Course of Personality Development: A meta-analysis. *Psychology Bulletin*, 109(2), 252-266.
- Crick, N.R. (1996). The role of Overt aggression, Relation aggression and Pro-social behaviour in the Prediction of Children's future Social adjustment. *Child Development*, 67, 2317-2327.
- Debbs and Morris. (1990). Testosterone, aggressiveness and anti social personality. Onlinelibrary.wiley.com.
- Di Dio, L., Saragovi, C., and Koestner, R. (1996). Liking personal values to gender. *Sex roles*, 34, 621-637.
- Driscoll, H., Zinkvskay, A., Evans, K. and Campbell, A. (2006). Gender differences in Social representations of Aggression: The Phenomenological experience of differences in inhibitory control. *British Journal of Psychology*, 97(2), 139-153.
- Eagle, A.K. (1987). Sex difference in Social behaviour: A Social role Interpretation. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Eagly, A.H. and Wood, W. (1991). Explaining sex difference in social behaviour: A meta analytic perspective. *Personality and social Psychology Bulletin*, 17, 306-315.
- Eagly, A.H., and Steffen, F.J. (1986). Gender and aggressive behaviour. A meta-analytic review of the socio- psychological literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, 100, 309-330.
- Eagly, A.H., and Wood, W. (1991). Explaining Sex difference in Social behaviour: A meta analytic perspective. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 17, 306-315.
- Frend, (1920). Beyond the Pleasure Principle, S.E. 18: 7-64.
- Frieye, I.H., and Li, M.Y. (2010). Gender, Aggression and Pro-social behaviour. *In handbook of Gender research in Psychology*. New York: Springer-Verlag. (pp. 311-335).
- Harris, (1999). Psychology of Gender Aggression. 212 booksgoogle.com.
- Khalakdina, M. (2011). Human development in the Indian context. *A Socio-cultural focus*, 11, Sage Publications India Pvt. Ltd.
- Lorenz, (1966). *On Aggression*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- Nanda, D. (1997). *A Study of School going Children in Ludhiana*. Psychology Department of Dayanand Medical College.
- Nelson, B. (1983). *Aggression: Still a stronger trait for males*. The New York Times.
- Taylor, S.E., Peplau, L.A., and Sears, D.O. (1997). Aggression
- Thomas, S.P. (1989). Gender difference in Anger expression: Health implications. *Research in Nursing and Health*, 12, 389-398.

Acknowledgements

The author appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

Conflict of Interest

The author declared no conflict of interest.

How to cite this article: Malhotra. A (2020). Socio-economic variables: a contributing factor for the development of aggression behaviour among the students with type A and type B personality. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 8(2), 1486-1493. DIP:18.01.169/20200802, DOI:10.25215/0802.169