

Ego Strength and Aggression among Urban and Rural Youth

Mahesh B. Chauhan & Dr. Yogesh A. Jogsan

Department of Psychology
Suarashtra University, Rajkot-360 005
Gujarat (India)

Received Sept 05, 2017

Accepted Oct. 11, 2017

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this research was to find out the ego strength and aggression among urban and rural youth. The sample consisted of 100 youth persons out of which 50 urban youth and 50 rural youth were selected randomly from the same area of the Rajkot district (Gujarat). For this purpose of investigation ego strength scale (Q. Hassan, 2008) and aggression scale (Pragti Bansal) in English language. Gujarati translated by Jogsan, Y. A. (2017). The obtained data was analyzed t-test to know the mean difference between urban and rural youth and Karl Pearson correlation method was used to know the relation between ego strength and aggression variables. The result revealed that there is significant difference in ego strength and aggression among urban and rural youth. The correlation between ego strength and aggression was 0.68 which was positive correlation.

Key words: Ego Strength and Aggression.

According to Freud's tripartite division of the human psyche, ego strength is one of the important characteristic factors. Ego strength refers to ego ability for successfully manage forces contrasting instinctive demands, internal preventions and social needs. Furthermore, it includes individuals' ability to tolerate anxiety, moderating capacity and catalyzing instinctive stresses and super ego. In daily life, individuals have a significant ability to regulate ego and overcome impulses encouraging them to overeating, recreational drug use, involvement in violence, annoying others, lavishing, involvement in indecent sexual deeds, and procrastinating. Ego-Strength is the ability of an individual to manage both the id and superego despite the pressures of both that demand to increase pleasure or act within society standards. The Ego-Strength is the balance that Freud emphasized as the key to a healthy personality; one that is both able to seek pleasure successfully but doing so within reason and acceptable time and place.

Recently Mosby's Medical Dictionary (2009) defined Ego-Strength as the ability to maintain the ego by a cluster of traits that together contributes to good mental health. The Ego-Strengths or ego virtues are inherent active qualities that bring various forms of energy and vibrancy to people across the life span (Erikson, 1964, 1965). They reflect a strong inner core, and ultimately build toward solid commitments to ideals, beliefs, significant others, and the broader society. According to Wolberg (1977) Ego-Strength connotes the positive personality assets that will enable the individual to overcome his anxieties, to yield secondary gains of his illness, and to acquire new, more adequate defenses.

Human aggression is a social behavior, and whilst it has been studied from many perspectives, it is theoretical models and empirical research from the field of social psychology that have provided the strongest framework from which to understand it. This article focuses on the contribution of social psychologists to the understanding of human aggression, providing first some key definitions, then major theories (both classic and contemporary) and a brief summary of social psychological approaches to the study of aggressive behavior. An overview of research findings is presented, including those describing factors within a person that increase the likelihood they will aggress, situational cues that can trigger aggression, internal psychological processes that underlie an instance of aggressive behavior, and processes that increase trait aggressiveness. We conclude by suggesting a 'risk factor' framework for understanding societal violence and noting directions for future research. In social psychology, the term aggression is generally defined as any behavior that is intended to harm another person who does not want to be harmed (e.g., Baron & Richardson, 1994). Aggression is an external behavior that you can see. For example, you can see a person shoot, stab, hit, slap, or curse someone. Aggression is not an emotion that occurs inside a person, such as an angry feeling. Aggression is not a thought inside someone's brain, such as mentally rehearsing a murder.

Gender is a factor that plays a role in both human and animal aggression. Males are historically believed to be generally more physically aggressive than females (Coie & Dodge 1997, Maccoby & Jacklin 1974), and men commit the

vast majority of murders (Buss 2005). This is one of the most robust and reliable behavioral sex differences, and it has been found across many different age groups and cultures. There is evidence that males are quicker to aggression (Frey et al. 2003) and more likely than females to express their aggression physically. When considering indirect forms of non-violent aggression, such as relational aggression and social rejection, some scientists argue that females can be quite aggressive although female aggression is rarely expressed physically (Archer, 2004; Card, Stucky, Sawalani, & Little, 2008).

Aggression has been defined (Loeber & Hay, 1997) as 'a category of behavior that causes or threatens physical harm to others'. The authors note that 'aggression' as generally used is not a unitary term but encompasses a variety of behaviors, including verbal aggression, bullying, physical fighting, robbery, rape and homicide.

There is some suggestion that the causes and correlates of aggression in female youth are different from those in males. Ellickson, Saner, and McGuigan (1997) found that violent female high school students were more likely to report poorer mental health than violent males. Violent females report engaging in self-harm, and unpopularity and depression may be more likely to be reported by aggressive female children than aggressive male children. Based on teacher reports, overtly aggressive females are perceived to be more maladjusted than overtly aggressive males. There is also evidence for differential gender effects of gender-neutral school-based violence prevention programs. A universal violence prevention program for seventh-graders resulted in stronger support of nonviolence and less acceptance of the use of violence in males but not in females. Similarly a program aimed at improving social competency reduced physical fighting in boys but not in girls.

Aggressive and violent female youth is a growing issue and warrants attention. Despite this there are very few school-based violence prevention or intervention programs for females specifically. Although there are numerous school-based unisex programs for a variety of ages, only one school-based female-targeted social aggression prevention program has been developed, and one group-counseling relational aggression intervention for female youth living in a residential home. Thus, there is a need for a school-based female-specific violence prevention programs aimed at improving self-confidence, self-efficacy, and social skills. An effective program should also incorporate gender-specific

content such as discussions about what it means to be a girl, societal expectations of being a girl and the roles girls are expected to play, and how girls communicate and interact with each other.

Review of literature:

Parghi, A.G. (2016) Study on emotional maturity and ego strength among adolescences. Result revealed that significant difference in emotional maturity and aggression in adolescences.

Kantariya, A. (2015) a comparative study of aggression and Depression among students. Results revealed that significant difference in aggression and depression in students.

Research problem:

Ego strength and aggression among urban and rural youth

Objectives:

The main objectives of study were as under.

- 1 To measure the ego strength in urban and rural youth.
- 2 To measure the aggression in urban and rural youth.
- 3 To measure the correlation between ego strength and aggression.

Null-Hypothesis:

To related objectives of this study, null hypothesis were as under.

- 1 There will be no significant difference in ego strength among urban and rural youth.
- 2 There will be no significant difference in aggression among urban and rural youth.
- 3 There will be no correlation between ego strength and aggression.

Method

Participants:

According to the purpose of present study total 100 samples has been selected. There were 50 urban youth and 50 rural youth were taken as a sample from different area in Rajkot district (Gujarat).

Instrument:

Following Instrument were used for data collection:

- 1 Ego Strength scale:
Ego Strength scale made by Q Hassan(1976). This scale translated by Y.A. Jogsan (2015). It consisted 32 items each was tow point scale. The test retest reliability of whole test was 0.86 and 0.82 and validity 0.62 of this scale.

- 2 Aggression Scale
For measure aggression here aggression scale by Bansal P. was used. It consisted 30 items. It is six point scales. The scores of this scale are 0 to 150. The test retest reliability coefficient was

.78. The validity coefficient was .74 which shows the present scale is valid for the measurement of aggression.

Procedure of data collection:

In this study random sampling method was used. Initial meeting with the participants was made at different area. Total 100 Participants were taken as a sample. They were informed about the purpose of the study. Upon initial meeting, each participants was also explained the nature of the study. Participants were informed about the confidentiality regarding information collected from them. A time for data collection was set up that was conducive for the participants. Before administering the scale, the purpose of the study was again explained to the participants. A good rapport was built with the participant for getting

Results and Discussions:

The main objective of present study was to measure the ego strength and aggression among urban and rural youth. In it statistical t-test method is used. To check correlation between ego strength and aggression Karl Pearson 'r' method is used. Result discussion of present study is as under.

correct response. Some necessary instruction and guidelines were provided to them properly filling the scale. After this the both scale were provided to them and they were requested to fill up the both scales as per the instructions given in the scales. After completion of the scale participants returned the scale and they were thanked for their participation and co-operation.

Research Design:

The aim of present research was to a study of ego strength and aggression among urban and rural youth. For these total 100 samples were taken with used Random method. To check significance between groups t-Test was used. Check relation between ego strength and aggression Pearson correlation r-method was used. Result and discussion of study is as under:

Table-1 :Showing mean, S.D. and t-value score of ego strength among urban and rural youth

| Sr. No. | Variable | N | Mean | SD | t | Sig. |
|----------------------|-------------|----|-------|-------|------|----------------------------|
| 1 | Urban youth | 50 | 40.07 | 15.94 | | |
| 2. | Rural youth | 50 | 38.20 | 14.10 | 5.94 | 0.01 |
| Significance Level | | | | | | 0.05 = 1.98 0.01 = 2.63 |
| NS = Not significant | | | | | | |

The table-1 indicates that the mean score of ego strength in urban youth are 40.07 and rural youth are 38.20. The standard deviations for both urban youth and rural youth are 15.94 and 14.10 respectively. The t-value was 5.94 which were significant at 0.01 level. So we can say that first hypothesis was rejected.

Table-2 :Showing mean, S.D. and t-value score of aggression among urban and rural youth

| Sr. No. | Variable | N | Mean | SD | t | Sig. |
|----------------------|-------------|----|-------|-------|-------|----------------------------|
| 1 | Urban youth | 50 | 91.10 | 18.22 | | |
| 2. | Rural youth | 50 | 83.74 | 16.10 | 10.11 | 0.01 |
| Significance Level | | | | | | 0.05 = 1.98 0.01 = 2.63 |
| NS = Not significant | | | | | | |

The table-2 indicates that the mean score of aggression in urban youth are 91.10 and rural youth are 83.74. The standard deviations for both urban youth and rural youth are 18.22 and 16.10 respectively. The t-value was 10.11 which were significant at 0.01 level. So we can say that second hypothesis was rejected.

Table-3 :Correlation of the ego strength and aggression among urban and rural youth

| Sr. No. | Variable | N | r |
|---------|--------------|-----|------|
| 1 | Ego strength | 100 | |
| 2. | Aggression | 100 | 0.68 |

According to table-3 the results obtained positive co-relation between ego strength and aggression. It was 0.68 positive co-relations between ego strength and aggression. It means ego strength decrease aggression decreases and ego strength increase aggression increases.

Conclusion:

We can conclude by data analysis as follows:

There were significant differences between the mean scores of two groups in ego strength. There was significant difference between the mean scores of two groups in aggression. The co-relation between ego strength and aggression is 0.68 which is positive correlations. It means ego strength decrease aggression decreases and ego strength increase aggression increases.

Limitation and future research:

This study had several limitations that can be addressed by future research. Firsts, the participants consist only youth of the different areas in Rajkot district. So, it is not representative of all youth. Hence, a more representative participant might yield different result; for example, a participant from different areas of Gujarat might show significant interaction effects of areas.

Suggestions:

Endeavour can be executed to analyze more than 100 data of sample with efficacy to attain better results. For the accumulation of information, varied methods except questionnaires can be adopted. Selection of sample can be accomplished with the intake of different district from different state to ascertain their ego strength and aggression. To crown the research work, other method of selecting sample can be appropriated.

Reference

1. Archer, J. (2004). Sex differences in aggression in real-world settings: A meta-analytic review. *Review of General Psychology*, 8, 291 – 322
2. Buss, A. H. (2005). *The Aggression Questionnaire manual*. Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services.
3. Card, N. A., Stucky, B. D., Sawalani, G. M., & Little, T. D. (2008). Direct and indirect aggression during childhood and adolescence: A meta-analytic review of gender differences. *Child Development*, 79(5), 1185-1229.
4. Coie, J.K. & Dodge, K.A. (1997). Aggression and antisocial behavior. In W. Damon (Editor in Chief) and N. Eisenberg (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology*, 5th edition. Volume 3. Social, emotional, and personality development. NY: John Wiley & Sons.
5. Ellickson, P., Saner, H., & McGuigan, K.A. (1997). Profiles of violent youth: substance use and other concurrent problems. *American Journal of Public Health*, 87, 985-991.
6. Erikson, E. H. (1964). *Insight and Responsibility*. W.W. Norton, New York.
7. Erikson, E. H. (1965). Youth: Fidelity and diversity. In Erikson, E. H. (ed.), *The Challenge of Youth*. Anchor Books, Garden City, NY, pp. 1–28.
8. Freud, S. (1961). The ego and id. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 19, pp. 3-66). New York: Norton. (Original work published 1923)
9. Frey et al. 2003. Gender differences in laboratory aggression under response choice conditions. *Aggression behaviour journal*
10. Kantariya, A. (2015) a comparative study of aggression and Depression among students. Results revealed that significant difference in aggression and depression in students. *Theertinplus international journal*, vol.-2, issue-3, Rajkot
11. Loeber, R., & Hay, D. (1997). Key issues in the development of aggression and violence from childhood to early adulthood. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 371-410.
12. Maccoby, E. E., & Jacklin, C. N. (1974). *The psychology of sex differences*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
13. Maccoby, E. E., & Jacklin, C. N. (1980). Sex differences in aggression: A rejoinder and reprise. *Child Development*, 51, 964-980.
14. *Mosby's medical dictionary 2009*. St. Louis, MO : Mosby, English : 8th edition
15. Parghi, A.G. (2016) Study on emotional maturity and ego strength among adolescences. *Creative space journal*, junagadh.
16. Robert A. Baron and Deborah R. Richardson (1994). *Human aggression*, second edition, New York.
17. Wolberg, L. R. (1977). *The Technique of Psychotherapy*, New York: Grune and Stratton