

Relationship between Aggression and Interpersonal Communication

Dr. Soni Kewalramani^{1*}, Ms. Garima Singh²

ABSTRACT

The research investigated the relationship among Aggression and Interpersonal Communication in young adults. Aggression is any form of behavior directed toward the goal of harming or injuring another living being who is motivated to avoid such treatment. Baron & Byrne (2010). Communication is a process of exchange of information between two or more than two individuals. Since Interpersonal Communication plays a significant role in our lives, the way it is carried on may have its effect on the way we behave. This may be linked with our level of aggression experiences and displayed as our understanding of a situation and our consequent behaviour is linked with what is communicated and understood by us and how. With this rationale, the study was planned for young adults. Participants in the study were 100 young adults aged 18-21 years drawn from a private university from Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh. The results obtained pointed a significant negative correlation between the dimensions of interpersonal communication and aggression.

Keywords: *Aggression, Interpersonal Communication*

It is assumed that adolescence is a very tough period of life, with adolescents being highly stressed and moody. There is a great concern about the issues of violent and aggressive behaviour in adolescence. This troubling issue needs to be understood by parents and by other adults. Parents and other adults who witness the behavior may be concerned; however, they often hope that the child will "grow out of it." Violent or aggressive behavior in a child or adolescence at any age always needs to be taken seriously. Aggressive or violent behavior in children and adolescents can include a wide range of behaviors like temper tantrums, physical aggression, fighting, threats, attempts to hurt other persons (including thoughts of killing others), use of weapons, cruelty toward animals, and intentional destruction of property.

Aggression is considered as 'an intentional action aimed at doing harm or causing pain.' (Aronson etc., 1997).

¹ Assistant Professor, Psychology, Amity University Lucknow Campus, India

² Research Scholar, Arts in Counselling Psychology, Amity University Lucknow Campus, India

*Responding Author

Received: April 15, 2017; Revision Received: May 25, 2017; Accepted: June 10, 2017

Relationship between Aggression and Interpersonal Communication

Aggression is any form of behavior directed toward the goal of harming or injuring another living being who is motivated to avoid such treatment. (Baron and Byrne, 2010).

Aggression is behaviour- According to this definition aggression is a type of behavior not an emotion, need or motivation. It must be distinguished from emotions which may or may not accompany it (like anger), motives which may or may not underlie it (just as a desire to inflict pain), or there may be negative attitudes which sometimes facilitates its occurrence (like racial prejudices).

Intention to harm another Individual- Another thing which is being emphasized in the definition is the intention to harm the other person. Intention being private, hidden events that are not open to direct observation. Hence they must be inferred from events which both precede and follow acts of aggression. Sometimes the aggressor himself expresses just for examples, as before attacking a person the aggressor may declare that he is doing so because he has abused the aggressor. But many a times intention remains hidden. The aggressor may say that the injury has been caused to the victim accidentally even when there are proofs that the harm is caused intentionally. Attack on the missionary was intentional.

Aggression is directed towards Living beings- The third main aspect of the definition is that 'only action that injure and harm human being may be observed as aggressive in nature'. When an individual strike, kick or hit various lifeless objects such behaviour will not be considered to be aggressive. But such behaviour may be considered as an aggressive act if it causes some form of harm or injury to another animate object. For example, when a person burns another's property it is an aggressive act. But punching own pillow or throwing books violently is not an aggressive act according to the definition.

Aggression involves an avoidance-motivated victim- In the definition, it is emphasized that 'aggression may be said to have occurred only when the victim is motivated to avoid such treatment at the hands of the aggressor. By this it is meant that self-inflicting injury may not be called as aggressive act. For example, there are individuals who seem to enjoy being hurt in various ways by their lovers. Their sufferings are not due to aggression on them. Hence the words 'motivated to avoid such treatment have been included in the definition.

The expression of aggression can occur in number of ways that is mentally, verbally, and physically. Psychologists distinguish between different forms of aggression, different types of aggression and different purposes of aggression.

Forms of aggression

Aggression can take a numerous forms, including physical, verbal, direct, indirect, active and passive. It may be physical like attacking the others with fists or biting or hurting with weapons. It may be verbal like insults, abusing, warning, etc. It may be direct attack on the individual or it

Relationship between Aggression and Interpersonal Communication

may be indirect, harming individuals' property and assaults on those who love him. It may be active that is harming that person openly or it may be passive, harm is caused without open attack like denying some favours to the individual. The aggression may be of any forms it always involves form of behaviour in which one person attempts to harm or injure one or more others.

Purpose of aggression

Aggression can also serve a number of different purposes such as

1. To display anger or hostility,
2. To assert dominance,
3. To bully or threaten,
4. To achieve a goal,
5. To express possession,
6. A reaction to fear,
7. A reaction to pain,
8. To compete with other people.

Types of aggression

Psychologists label the two different types of aggression:

Hostile aggression, also known as affective aggression, which is characterized by strong emotions, commonly anger. Hostile aggression has historically been regarded as being impulsive, thoughtless, driven by anger, having the critical motive of harming the target, and occurring as a reaction to a number of perceived provocations. It is sometimes known as affective, impulsive, or reactive aggression. Affective aggressive behavior aimed mainly at injuring the provoking person.

Instrumental aggression, also called as predatory aggression, is marked by behaviors that are intended to achieve a bigger goal. Instrumental aggression is often planned and usually exists as a means to an end. Hurting another person in a robbery or car-jacking is an example of this instrumental aggression. Instrumental aggression is perceived as a premeditated means of obtaining some goal other than harming the victim, and being proactive rather than reactive (Berkowitz 1993, Geen 2001).

It must be noted that the distinction between affective and instrumental aggression is not a rigorous one. The two types of aggression are not equally exclusive, and some acts of aggression have both affective and instrumental properties. For example, a mother who becomes irritated at her child's behaviour and uses corporal punishment may be motivated to transform the child's behaviour (an instrumental use of aggression) while still reacting to that behaviour with anger.

A number of recent studies of aggression draw a distinction between reactive and proactive aggression (e.g. Crick and Dodge 1996). The first of these terms denotes as to aggressive

Relationship between Aggression and Interpersonal Communication

behavior that is enacted in response to provocation, such as an attack or an abuse, and it is manifested in both self-defensive and angry activities. The latter term refers to aggression that is initiated without apparent provocation, such as seen in bullying behavior. Such behavior is not aroused by anger, hostility or the need to defend oneself, but by other motives that relate to obtaining goods, asserting power, assuring the approval of reference groups and other such goals. Reactive and proactive aggressions are the equivalent of what earlier theorists called affective and instrumental aggression.

Nature of aggression

Is it inborn?

It cannot be said with full confidence that aggression is instinctual or not. In most of the studies it was found that aggression is not caused entirely by instinct.

1. Some chemicals like testosterone increases aggression in animals.
2. There exist gender differences in aggressive behaviour in almost all cultures.
3. The alcoholic drinks lower the inhibitions in committing anti-social acts like acts of aggression etc.
4. The pain and discomfort increases the tendency to aggress. Riots are more likely to occur on hot days.

Influence of aggression

There are various influences which leads to aggression. Among them are aversive incidents, arousal, the media and the group are mentioned.

Pain, heat, attack by others are aversive incidents which are conducive to violence.

The arousal of emotions like anger also results in aggressive behaviour. In investigations it has been found that sexual arousal and anger or other forms of arousal results in increase in aggression (Zillmann, 1989). It is rightly said that love is never so passionate as after a fight or a fright. In the experiments in laboratories it was found that erotic stimuli are more arousing to people who have just been frightened.

Violence watching on television or in films results in increase in aggressive behaviour. The effect of TV violence is very potential on young children. It also affects the adults. It makes them immune to the horrible happenings.

THEORIES

Social learning theory (SLT) developed from operant conditioning. It considers the effect of observing individuals being rewarded – how this forms or shapes our own behaviour. According to this theory, aggressive behaviour can be learned by observing and copying the aggressive behaviour of other people.

Relationship between Aggression and Interpersonal Communication

SLT was introduced by Albert Bandura, who used the term modelling to explain how persons can rapidly learn specific acts of aggression and take in them into their behaviour. Modelling is at times known as vicarious learning. The term vicarious means indirect; we can learn aggression without being openly or directly reinforced for aggressive behaviour of our own. This works when we observe aggression in other individuals somehow being rewarded. An example would be if a child observed two of his/peers arguing over a toy. If one kid gains control of the toy through force (e.g. by hitting the other child) they have been rewarded for behaving aggressively or violently. The violent aggressive behaviour has been vicariously reinforced for the observer and this may lead to mocking of the aggressive behaviour.

Cognitive-ecological model is a model for understanding the development of aggressive behavior. The model put emphasis on the role of cognitive processes that work as guides for behavior, how they are learned over time and across contexts, and how they influence reacting across these contexts. The model begins with the recognition that aggression has adaptive and maladaptive functions, and that individuals have innate evolved cognitive processes related to aggression.

Drive theory suggests that aggression stems from externally elicited drive to harm others. These drives, in turn, stem from external events such as frustration. Although Sigmund Freud made the first modern statement frustration leads to aggression, Dollard, Doob, Mowrer, Miller, and Sears (1939) translated the theory into behavioral terms and made it more testable. They illustrated with the following example. Four-year-old James hears the ice-cream-truck bell and says he wants some ice cream. He is refused and so becomes aggressive.

1. The bell instigates the response of trying to get ice cream.
2. A goal-response (such as eating the ice cream) reduces the instigation to make the goal response.
3. Prevention of the goal response produces interference; not letting James have ice cream is interference.
4. Interference with goal directed behavior produces frustration, an internal state.
5. Frustration instigates aggressive behavior that is intended to harm someone. If the instigated aggressive behavior is itself interfered with, this interference is further instigation to aggressive behavior.
6. Aggressive behavior may be inhibited, particularly by fear of punishment.
7. Aggressive behavior may be direct (aimed at the source of the frustration) or indirect (displaced). Indirect aggression may involve a change in the object of aggression (perhaps a more vulnerable target than the direct object) or a change in the form of aggression (such as from physical to psychological).
8. According to the concept of catharsis, aggressive acts are assumed to reduce further instigation to aggression.

Relationship between Aggression and Interpersonal Communication

Role of aggression

The frustration-aggression hypothesis says that blocking a goal instigates. People tend to become angry when they perceive that someone has unjustly or arbitrarily deprived them of some anticipated gratification. People tend to become angry when they perceive that someone has unjustly or arbitrarily deprived them of some anticipated gratification.

Anger reduction

Anger is bad for mental health, it should be released. This 'ventilationist' point of view holds that aggression is expressing anger is cathartic, that anger will be reduced faster it is expressed. Tavis (1983), however, argues that venting anger simply makes people raises the noise level of our lives, and does not do any particular good most of the time.

Communication

Communication is like breathing; it is a requirement for life. And like breathing, communication is inescapable. Unless an individual live in isolation, he/she communicate interpersonally every day. Listening to roommate, talking to a teacher, meeting for lunch with friend, or talking to parents or spouse are all examples of communication.

The Latin term for communication is *communitas*, which means to share or commonness (Gayeski, 1993; Hawkins & Preston, 1981). In simplest terms, the goal of communication is to "develop a commonness of meaning between sender and receiver" (Hawkins & Preston, 1981, 3). This meaning allows two or more people to transfer information, and to define or understand respective realities, so other human activities can be achieved. (Daniels & Spiker in Gayeski, 1993; Northcraft & Neale, 1994; Rogers & Kinced in Vezzuto, 1984). Communication is the process of acting on information. Somebody does or says something, and others think or do something in response to the action or the words as they understand them. Once we make contact with others, we communicate, and we continue to do so until we draw our last breath. It is done with these interactions with others that we develop interpersonal relationship.

Interpersonal communication deals with direct face-to-face communication "between two or more people in physical proximity in which all of the five senses can be utilized and immediate feedback is present" (Gordon in Vezzuto, 1984). Interpersonal communication is a distinctive, trans actual form of human communication involving mutual influence, usually for the purpose of managing relationships. Interpersonal communication occurs when a person interact with another person as a unique and authentic individual. The communicators have developed an attitude toward each other that is honest, open, spontaneous, non-judgmental and based on equality rather than superiority.

Relationship between Aggression and Interpersonal Communication

Communication patterns

Communication follows particular patterns in an organization. Gibson, Ivancevich and Donnelly (1994) suggest that there are five directions of communication - downward, upward, horizontal, diagonal and the grapevine pattern. Downward communication includes policies, instructions, and official memos, whereas upward communication includes suggestion boxes, group meetings, and grievance procedures. Horizontal communication occurs across functions (peer to peer), whereas diagonal communication cuts across actions and levels. The grapevine pattern includes rumours that cut across all formal channels of communication (Gibson, Ivancevich & Donnelly, 1994; Northcraft & Neale, 1994).

The formal communication patterns within a group or an organization are exhibited in its organizational chart (Northcraft & Neale, 1994). "Organizations, out of necessity, develop formal networks of communication. The networks represent the 'official' lines of communication. They usually follow upwards and downwards patterns, are designated on organizational charts, and are specified between line and staff, between superiors and subordinates, between departments and divisions, etc." (Case, 1975,230)

Along with the formal channels, organizations also develop informal communication channels. Informal communication networks may exist because formal communication channels are inadequate or do not exist where they should. The term informal has usually been used to describe those relationships or channels diverging from the official ones and arising from human reactions spontaneously generated between and within groups" (Redding in Case, 1975.230).

Types of informal communication patterns include horizontal, diagonal, grapevines, and 'Old Boy Networks'. Both horizontal and diagonal patterns are rarely seen on formal organizational charts, and are therefore usually elements in the informal channels. Grapevines typically make information available to anyone who will listen, whereas Old Boy Networks "collect information and share it only among themselves" (Northcraft & Neale, 1994, p. 259).

Communication style

The manner in which an individual communicates, or their style, also has a great impact on interpersonal communication. Individuals' tendencies for communicating can be classified along two dimensions: exposure and feedback (Northcraft & Neale, 1994).

Exposure refers to how openly an individual discloses feelings and information, whereas feedback refers to how well an individual elicits information or feelings from others.

Types of interpersonal communication

There are three types of communication;

1. Oral,
2. Written, and
3. Nonverbal.

Relationship between Aggression and Interpersonal Communication

Oral communication is the most prevalent type of communication and includes "all messages or exchanges of information that are spoken" (Steers & Black, 1994,439). Nonverbal communication differs from culture to culture and refers to any form of interpersonal communication other than formal verbal language. It typically includes "voice inflection and content, facial cues, hand or arm gestures, and body positioning. Clothing can be used to send nonverbal signals as well - for example. When a male colleague buttons up his shirt and tightens his tie to signal that a meeting is all business" (Northcraft & Neale, 1994, 249).

Nonverbal communication can be divided into two categories; body language and physical or symbolic language. Nonverbal communication- through physical or symbolic language - includes communicating status through time (chronemics), using objects or office designs to communicate status or culture (ionics), and communicating values or expectations through clothing or other aspects of physical appearance (dress) (Northcraft & Neale, 1994; Steers & Black, 1994; Wagner & Hollenbeck, 1995).

Nonverbal communication through body language includes variations in voice such as loudness, pitch, rate, or hesitations (paralinguistic), the use of gestures, facial expressions, eye movements, and body positions (kinesics), and the use of touch in communication (haptic) such as a handshake, a pat on the back or an arm around the shoulder (Gibson, Ivancevich, & Donnelly, 1994; Wagner & Hollenbeck, 1995). According to Kettner (1994), when an individual interprets a message, 7% of the comprehension comes from verbal content, 38% from vocal inflection and content, and 55% from facial content (in Gibson, Ivancevich & Donnelly, 1994). Assuming this, 93% of the message is conveyed through non-verbal communication. This is because nonverbal channels are often used to highlight or reinforce parts of a verbal message (Northcraft & Neale, 1994). However, the verbal and the nonverbal portions of the message must also be consistent. or relay the same information, in order for the receiver to understand. Complete consistency is almost impossible to achieve since nonverbal communication is ambiguous in its perceived meaning and likelihood of receipt. For example, due to cultural differences "some perceivers may not attend to nonverbal communication attempts or may not completely understand them" (Northcraft & Neale, 1994,250).

Barrier to effective communication

Considerable research has been conducted in this area and many problems within interpersonal communication have been isolated and illustrated. One problem or barrier that has been examined extensively, and will consequently be examined in this study, is proximity or proxemic behaviours. Proximity refers to spatial arrangements or an individuals' use of space when interpersonally communicating with others (Gibson, Ivancevich, & Donnelly, 1994, 592).

Other barriers to effective communication include frame of reference (past experiences shaping one's perceptions), selective listening, value judgements, source credibility (trust, confidence,

Relationship between Aggression and Interpersonal Communication

and faith in the words and actions of the communicator), status differences, time pressures, semantic problem (similar words meaning entirely different things), and information overload (Gibson, Ivancevich, & Donnelly, 1994).

Additionally, barriers such as the use of filtering (manipulating information so the receiver perceives it as positive) and jargon or in-group language occur in organizations and can decrease the effectiveness of interpersonal communication (Gibson, Ivancevich & Donnelly, 1991). There are ways to improve communicator effectiveness (i.e., active listening, sender empathy, appropriate media selection) but before these can be put into action, an organization must understand how a manager communicates.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter deals with the several studies which researchers have been conducted on the topic:

Aggression

Baier, (2009); München, (2013), conducted a study in Germany which reported that 43,7% of male adolescents and 23,6% of the females, interviewed, were involved in antisocial behaviours; 20,2% of males and 6,4% of females were involved in violent acts; 17,8% of males and 15,5% of females have caused physical violence; 29,9% of males and 7,1% of females were involved in acts of vandalism and 14,2% of males and 12,4% of females were involved in shop-lifting.

Barlett and Anderson (2012) researched on the 'Big Five' personality traits and aggression stating that people low in agreeableness and high in neuroticism are more aggressive and violent. Furthermore, both of these dimensions are associated with aggressive emotions, and low agreeableness is also associated with greater aggressive thinking.

According to Essau and Conradt (2004) aggression in adolescence might be displayed openly or could be hidden, 1. Open (physical violence, guns etc.). 2. Hidden, the behaviours that accompany this kind of aggression are leaving school and their homes, stealing etc.

A study in USA (2002) investigating physical, verbal and indirect aggression of adolescents resulted that one in five children bullied others, and more than one in three high school students were involved in some form of physical attack. About 30-40% of males adolescents and 16-32% of females were involved in criminal, violent acts by the age of 17 (National Youth Violence Prevention Resource Center, 2002). Studies have shown that girls would display and receive more relational aggression (kind of nonverbal aggression) especially during interactions with females or inside their social group (Ostrov & Keating, 2004)

According to Loeber and Farrington, (2000); Brannigan et al., (2001), similar to previous studies, hostile parenting was shown to increase the odds of aggressive behaviour for children. The odds of having an aggressive behaviour problem are considerably higher among children whose

Relationship between Aggression and Interpersonal Communication

parents use hostile parenting techniques (such as getting angry or annoyed at the child, focusing on negative rather than positive child behaviours) as compared to those whose parents use these parenting styles less often.

Anderson & Bushman (1999), have found that aggression in laboratory studies is strongly increased by such factors as direct provocation, exposure to media violence, high temperatures, and the consumption of alcohol- variables that have also been found to influence aggression outside the laboratory.

According to Avakame, (1998); Breslin et al., (1990), most research has focused on male violence toward their partner, there is some evidence that women who witnessed inter-parental violence in childhood have a higher likelihood of using violence against their own spouses or dating partners.

Many studies show that men who witnessed their father's abuse their mothers are at greater risk of abusing their own partners as adults (American Psychological Association, 1996). According to the 1993 Canadian VAWS, men who witnessed their mothers being physically abused by their fathers as children were three times more likely to be violent in their own marital relationships than men who grew up in non-violent homes (Johnson, 1996).

Silvern et al., (1995), have found that women who witnessed their mothers being abused are more likely to have low- self-esteem as adults and are significantly more likely to suffer from abuse in their own marital relationships (Dauvergne and Johnson, 2001).

According to Bushman (1995), showed that participants who scored higher on a measure of aggressive tendencies were more likely to feel angry after watching it, and were more likely to commit aggressive acts after viewing videotaped violence than their less aggressive counterparts. According to Baron & Richardson, (1994); Centerwall, (1989) A large body of research indicates that aggression may indeed be learned through observation. Apparently, when children and adults are exposed to new ways of aggressing against others- techniques they have not previously seen- they may add these new behaviours to their repertoire. Later, when angry, irritated, or frustrated, they may put such behaviours to actual use assaults against others.

Interpersonal communication

Philip J. Auter (2007) in his study on the topic 'Portable social groups: willingness to communicate, interpersonal communication gratifications, and cell phone use among young adults'. Study was conducted on the sample of 182 students of southern university. Results revealed that respondents typically used their phones an average of 10.5 hours per week and the overwhelming majority of that with traditional calling. Limited support was found for the hypothesis that cell phone use may be utilized to avoid communication apprehension events.

Relationship between Aggression and Interpersonal Communication

Stronger support was found for the hypothesis that interpersonal communication motives are positively correlated with cell phone usage gratifications.

Paul Schrodt and Andrew M. Ledbetter (2007) in their studied on ‘Communication Processes That Mediate Family Communication Patterns and Mental Well-Being: A Mean and Covariance Structures Analysis of Young Adults from Divorced and Non-divorced Families’ *examined demand/withdraw patterns and feeling caught were tested as mediators of family communication patterns and young adults’ mental well-being. Participants included 567 young adults from divorced and non-divorced families. For young adults in non-divorced families, family conversation orientations had both a positive, direct effect on mental well-being and an indirect effect on well-being through witnessing marital demand/withdraw patterns and feeling caught. For young adults in divorced families, however, conversation orientations had only a direct, positive effect on well-being, whereas conformity orientations had a negative, indirect effect through witnessing demand/withdraw patterns. Interestingly, respondents from divorced families reported more feelings of being caught between their parents, yet such feelings predicted diminished well-being only for respondents from non-divorced families.*

Joy Koesten & Karen Anderson (2004) studied on ‘Exploring the Influence of Family Communication Patterns, Cognitive Complexity, and Interpersonal Competence on Adolescent Risk Behaviors’, examines how family communication patterns, cognitive complexity, and interpersonal competence influence certain adolescent risk behaviors. In a college-age sample, socio-orientated family communication pattern significantly predicted lower levels of cognitive complexity, although, cognitive complexity was not significantly associated with self-reports of interpersonal competency. Correlational analyses had shown a significant relation between family communication patterns and perceived interpersonal competence in interpersonal relationships both for same-gender friends and romantic partners. Additionally, multiple regression analyses shown that concept-orientated family communication patterns significantly predicted whether a young person develops the interpersonal competence necessary for managing interpersonal relationships. Risk behaviors related to drinking, smoking, and sexual intercourse were significantly tied to specific dimensions of interpersonal competency.

Nancy K. Baym, Yan Bing Zhang, and Mei-Chen Lin (2004) studied on ‘Social Interactions across Media: Interpersonal Communication on the Internet, Face-to-Face, and the Telephone’. Two studies were conducted in this investigation to compare college students’ interpersonal interaction online, face-to-face, and on the telephone. The first study was about a communication diary, evaluated the relative amount of social interactions college students conduct via the internet in comparison to face-to-face conversation and telephone calls. Results indicated that the internet was used nearly as often as the telephone; however, face-to-face communication was far more frequent. The second study, a survey, compared reported use of the internet within local and long distance social circles to the use of other media within those circles, and examined

Relationship between Aggression and Interpersonal Communication

participants' most recent significant social interactions conducted online, face-to-face, and on the telephone in terms of purposes, contexts, and quality. Major findings included that online interaction was perceived as high in quality, but slightly lower than telephone calls and face-to-face conversations. Use of the internet was positively correlated with the use of other modes of interpersonal communication. Together, results show that the internet is integrated into social life, but face-to-face remains the dominant mode of interpersonal communication.

Carole A. Barbato, Elizabeth E. Graham & Elizabeth M. Perse (2003) in their article on 'Communicating in the Family: An Examination of the Relationship of Family Communication Climate and Interpersonal Communication Motives', reported the results of two studies designed to explore the role of family communication climate (FCC) on parent-child communication choices. The first study explored how FCC as well as parent and child age and gender affected the reasons why parents talk to their children. The second study explored the influence of parents and children's perceptions of FCC on the children's motives for communicating with others. In Study 1, parents (n = 258) completed questionnaires assessing their FCC, their interpersonal communication motives (ICM) for communicating with a target child, and demographics. In Study 2, parent-child pairs (n = 202 pairs) completed questionnaires assessing FCC, ICM, and demographics. Results from these two studies led to the conclusion that FCC had a strong influence on the ICM of both parents and children. Differences in communication climate were linked to marked differences in parents' motives for talking with their children. As predicted, conversation-oriented families communicated with their children for relationally-oriented motives (affection, pleasure, relaxation) and conformity-oriented families communicated with their children for personal-influence motives (control and escape) and to show affection. Children's conversation or conformity schemata influenced their motives for talking with others.

Robbins and Hunsaker (2003) reviewed a large number of studies and synthesized the interpersonal skills that surfaced on most lists. Most of these skills belong to three categories – leadership, the process of communication and motivation. Interpersonal skills under leadership relate to leadership style, handling conflicts, running meetings, team building and promoting change. The process of communication includes sending messages, listening and providing feedback. Similarly, motivating is broken down into goal setting, clarifying expectations, persuading and empowering. Other interpersonal skills include negotiating (Bambacas and Patrickson, 2008: 52-53).

Sherry L. Anders and Joan S. Tucker (2000) in their study on 'Adult attachment style, interpersonal communication competence, and social support' indicated that individuals with a more secure attachment style report having larger and more satisfying social support networks. Individuals with a more anxious or a more avoidant attachment style, by contrast, report having smaller and less satisfying support networks. Mediation analyses shown that global deficits in ICC could account for the smaller social support network sizes and lower levels of satisfaction

Relationship between Aggression and Interpersonal Communication

among both more anxiously attached and more avoidantly attached individuals. In addition, subsequent analyses examining specific dimensions of ICC exposed that the lower support satisfaction among more anxious individuals could be uniquely accounted for by a lack of assertiveness in social interactions. For more avoidantly attached individuals, smaller network sizes could be uniquely accounted for by lower levels of self-disclosure, and less support satisfaction could be uniquely accounted for by a lack of assertiveness in addition to lower levels of self-disclosure.

SA Westmyer, RL DiCioccio and RB Rubin (1998) in their study on 'Appropriateness and effectiveness of communication channels in competent interpersonal communication' examined perceived appropriateness and effectiveness of six communication channels (face-to-face, telephone, voice mail, electronic mail, letter, fax) used in relation to interpersonal communication motives (inclusion, affection, control relaxation, escape, pleasure) in other-directed and self-directed need-fulfillment situations. In Study 1, respondents selected the channel they thought would best communicate standard messages and rated it on effectiveness and appropriateness. In Study 2, respondents rated the effectiveness and appropriateness of all six communication channels by considering scenarios that reflected the two need-fulfillment directions of all six motives. Analyses revealed significant main effects for direction, channel, and motive, and significant interaction effects.

Matthew M. Martin & Carolyn M. Anderson (1995) in their study on 'the father-young adult relationship: Interpersonal motives, self-disclosure, and satisfaction' investigated self-disclosure, interpersonal communication motives, and communication satisfaction in the father-young adult relationship. A total of 159 father-young adult dyads participated. The results of this study indicated that: (a) young adults and fathers are similar in their interpersonal motives and self-disclosures in communicating with each other; (b) interpersonal motives for communicating are related to self-disclosure behavior; and people's motives and self-disclosures in the young adult-father relationship explain their satisfaction with that relationship. The findings of this study support the proposition that the communication that takes place in the family and the reasons for that communication affects the satisfaction that is felt by members of the family.

Andrew S. Rancer, Roberta L. Kosberg and Vito N. Silvestri (1992) in their study 'The relationship between self-esteem and aggressive communication predispositions' explored the relationship between self-esteem and the aggressive communication predispositions of argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness and two dimensions of self-esteem: personal power and competence. Self-esteem is a pervasive component of the self-concept. This study explored the relationship between self-esteem and the aggressive communication predispositions of argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness and two dimensions of self-esteem: personal power and competence. Personal power emerged as the strongest predictor of argumentativeness. Significant negative relationships were observed between verbal aggressiveness and three

Relationship between Aggression and Interpersonal Communication

dimensions of self-esteem: defensive self-enhancement, moral self-approval and lovability. Defensive self-enhancement emerged as the strongest predictor of verbal aggression.

Okun (1987) states that if you are aware of your own values you are less likely to impose them indirectly on others and that confusion regarding values usually results in interpersonal difficulties. According to him, double messages occur when there is in-congruency between non-verbal and verbal interpersonal communication. He remarks that defocusing from the topic under discussion during interpersonal communication is a less positive interpersonal communication skill.

Rationale of the Study

Aggression is very common and important social issue in young people. Young people with aggression may harm their family members, friends, or society. Many research have shown that children having serious aggression problems are more prone to be an aggressive adolescents, who may have the mental health related issues or substance abuse and later on as adults they more likely to involve in the acts of violence. It has been observed that communication plays an important role in performing aggressive acts. Now-a-days, communication is one of the reasons causing aggressive behaviour. According to researcher, there are reasons like lack of communication or communication gap between people, misunderstanding while communicating information, barriers which take place during communication, are few of them. The ways of communication between people vary from person to person which also includes culture differences, type of living like living in rural area or urban area, type of the family like joint or nuclear, etc. Also as a student of university, the researcher observed that there are many factors which leads to aggressive behaviour on campus. The incidence of bullying, gang wars, and teasing led the researcher to explore the causes behind such acts. One of the factor which came to the mind was communication. Many times, it has been observed that communication or the lack of communication causes problems on campus. Thus the researcher planned this study to explore the relationship between aggression and communication.

METHODOLOGY

Purpose

- To study the effect of interpersonal communication on aggression.

Variable

Independent variable: Interpersonal communication

Dependent variable: Aggression

Research design

The research design employed in the present study is ex-post facto research with co-relational orientation.

Relationship between Aggression and Interpersonal Communication

Tools used

- 1. Aggression scale:** For assessing aggression of the respondents adapted version of aggression scale by Buss & Perry (1992) was used. The scale comprised of 29 items which is a five point Likert scale. The reliability of the scale is $\alpha = .72$ to $\alpha = .80$. The validity is construct validity.
- 2. Interpersonal communication scale:** For assessing interpersonal communication of the respondents, Interpersonal Communication Inventory by Millard J. Bienvenu, Sr. (1969) was used. The scale comprised of 40 items which is 3 point Likert scale. The reliability of the scale is $\alpha = .86$ to $\alpha = .87$. The scale is face validity.

Sample

The sample comprised of 50 boys and 50 girls of Amity University Uttar Pradesh. The age of the participants ranged between 18-21. The participants were under-graduate students.

Boys	Girls
50	50

Method of sampling

Incidental sampling technique was used in this study.

Procedure

After the tools were finalized, respondents were contacted and data was collected in small groups of 5 to 6 respondents. The total time taken to fill all the questionnaires was approximately 30 minutes; therefore, the whole data collection took almost a week to complete.

Data Analysis

t-test, correlation, ANOVA were applied to the data.

RESULTS

The 4 dimensions of aggression, (i.e. Physical Aggression, Verbal Aggression, Anger, Hostility) were correlated with the six dimensions of interpersonal communication (i.e. Awareness of Self and Self-Disclosure, Self-Expression and Clarity, Awareness of Others, Acceptance of feedback and Evaluation, Coping with Feelings and Differences, Does not fit).

Table:1. Correlations between dimensions of aggression and interpersonal communication.

	Awareness of Self and Self-Disclosure	Self-Expression and Clarity	Awareness of Others	Acceptance of feedback and Evaluation	Coping with Feelings and Differences	Does not fit
Verbal Aggression	.027	-.037	.005	-.271**	-.041	-.022
Anger	-.169	-.295**	-.104	-.168	-.431**	-.132
Physical Aggression	.023	-.302**	-.113	-.239*	-.139	-.142
Hostility	-.110	-.255*	-.063	-.258**	-.113	-.222*

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed); * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Relationship between Aggression and Interpersonal Communication

Table 1 indicates that ‘verbal aggression’ was found to be negatively correlated to ‘acceptance of feedback and evaluation’, $r(100) = -.271, p < 0.01$, ‘anger’ was found to be negatively correlated with ‘self-expression and clarity’, $r(100) = -.295, p < 0.01$, as well as ‘anger’ was found to be negatively correlated with ‘coping with feelings and differences’, $r(100) = -.431, p < 0.01$, ‘physical aggression’ was found to be negatively correlated to ‘self-expression and clarity’, $r(100) = -.302, p < 0.01$, as well as ‘physical aggression’ was found to be negatively correlated to ‘acceptance of feedback and evaluation’, $r(100) = -.239, p < 0.05$, ‘hostility’ was found to be negatively correlated to ‘self-expression and clarity’, $r(100) = -.255, p < 0.05$, ‘hostility’ was found to be negatively correlated with ‘acceptance of feedback and evaluation’, $r(100) = -.258, p < 0.01$, ‘hostility’ was found to be negatively correlated to ‘does not fit’, $r(100) = -.222, p < 0.05$.

In order to find out the significant differences between the variables i.e. Aggression and interpersonal communication, the demographic variables such as gender, family type, number of siblings and birth order were selected.

Table:2. Gender differences among the dimensions of the variables.

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	P
Physical Aggression	Male	50	28.5400	6.51595	.92149	2.85	.006
	Female	50	25.2000	5.23723	.74066		
Anger	Male	50	21.6000	5.16266	.73011	.339	.735
	Female	50	21.2200	6.01118	.85011		
Hostility	Male	50	26.7400	6.73950	.95311	1.249	.215
	Female	50	25.2000	5.53283	.78246		
Verbal Aggression	Male	50	17.0400	3.30096	.46683	1.615	.110
	Female	50	15.8600	3.97446	.56207		
Awareness Of Self And Self Disclosure	Male	50	15.5400	3.86090	.54601	-.598	.551
	Female	50	16.0000	3.82793	.54135		
Self Expression And Clarity	Male	50	11.7200	3.12358	.44174	-.382	.703
	Female	50	11.9600	3.15556	.44626		
Awareness Of Others	Male	50	18.7800	5.22666	.73916	-.874	.384
	Female	50	19.6800	5.06464	.71625		
Acceptance Of Feedback And Evaluation	Male	50	7.9800	2.98630	.42233	.169	.866
	Female	50	7.8800	2.92519	.41368		
Coping With Feelings And Differences	Male	50	16.5400	4.98246	.70463	.611	.543
	Female	50	15.9400	4.84204	.68477		
Does Not Fit	Male	50	1.5600	1.29615	.18330	-.921	.359
	Female	50	1.8000	1.30931	.18516		

Relationship between Aggression and Interpersonal Communication

Table 2 shows the gender difference in all the variables. The results suggest that mean ratings of 'Physical Aggression' were significantly higher for male respondents ($M = 28.54$, $SD = 6.51$) than female respondents ($M = 25.20$, $SD = 5.23$), $t(100) = 2.825$.

Table: 3. Family type differences among the dimensions of the variables.

	Family Type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	p
Physical Aggression	Joint	39	26.5897	6.66380	1.06706	-.365	.716
	Nuclear	61	27.0492	5.78915	.74122	-.354	.725
Anger	Joint	39	21.2821	5.46736	.87548	-.183	.856
	Nuclear	61	21.4918	5.69100	.72866	-.184	.854
Hostility	Joint	39	26.5128	5.34037	.85514	.700	.485
	Nuclear	61	25.6230	6.68621	.85608	.735	.464
Verbal Aggression	Joint	39	16.7179	3.56111	.57023	.580	.563
	Nuclear	61	16.2787	3.77770	.48369	.587	.558
Awareness Of Self And Self Disclosure	Joint	39	16.3333	3.34297	.53530	1.178	.242
	Nuclear	61	15.4098	4.10031	.52499	1.232	.221
Self Expression And Clarity	Joint	39	10.8718	3.23777	.51846	-2.544	.013
	Nuclear	61	12.4590	2.91304	.37298	-2.485	.015
Awareness Of Others	Joint	39	19.2051	4.41993	.70775	-.038	.969
	Nuclear	61	19.2459	5.58765	.71543	-.041	.968
Acceptance Of Feedback And Evaluation	Joint	39	7.5897	2.88114	.46135	-.924	.358
	Nuclear	61	8.1475	2.98237	.38185	-.931	.354
Coping With Feelings And Differences	Joint	39	16.2308	4.25788	.68181	-.015	.988
	Nuclear	61	16.2459	5.29986	.67858	-.016	.987
Does Not Fit	Joint	39	1.7436	1.22942	.19686	.389	.698
	Nuclear	61	1.6393	1.35441	.17341	.387	.692

Table 3 shows the difference of family types in all the variables. The results shows that mean ratings of 'Self Expression and Clarity' were significantly higher for nuclear family respondents ($M = 12.45$, $SD = 2.91$) than joint family respondents ($M = 10.87$, $SD = 3.23$), $t(100) = -2.544$.

Relationship between Aggression and Interpersonal Communication

Table: 4. Birth orders differences among the dimensions of the variables.

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Physical Aggression	Between Groups	14.024	3	4.675	.122	.947
	Within Groups	3689.286	96	38.430		
	Total	3703.310	99			
Anger	Between Groups	124.286	3	41.429	1.345	.264
	Within Groups	2955.904	96	30.791		
	Total	3080.190	99			
Hostility	Between Groups	19.631	3	6.544	.167	.918
	Within Groups	3765.279	96	39.222		
	Total	3784.910	99			
Verbal Aggression	Between Groups	19.081	3	6.360	.461	.710
	Within Groups	1323.669	96	13.788		
	Total	1342.750	99			
Awareness Of Self And Self Disclosure	Between Groups	9.490	3	3.163	.210	.889
	Within Groups	1444.220	96	15.044		
	Total	1453.710	99			
Self Expression And Clarity	Between Groups	9.695	3	3.232	.324	.808
	Within Groups	957.745	96	9.977		
	Total	967.440	99			
Awareness Of Others	Between Groups	55.079	3	18.360	.688	.561
	Within Groups	2560.631	96	26.673		
	Total	2615.710	99			
Acceptance Of Feedback And Evaluation	Between Groups	7.767	3	2.589	.293	.830
	Within Groups	848.743	96	8.841		
	Total	856.510	99			
Coping With Feelings And Differences	Between Groups	43.813	3	14.604	.602	.616
	Within Groups	2330.427	96	24.275		
	Total	2374.240	99			
Does Not Fit	Between Groups	4.767	3	1.589	.936	.427
	Within Groups	162.993	96	1.698		
	Total	167.760	99			

Relationship between Aggression and Interpersonal Communication

Table 4 shows the differences in birth orders in the variables. The result shows that there is no significance difference found within the groups and between the groups.

Table: 5. Number of siblings' differences among the dimensions of the variables.

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Physical Aggression	Between Groups	274.587	5	54.917	1.506	.195
	Within Groups	3428.723	94	36.476		
	Total	3703.310	99			
Anger	Between Groups	85.019	5	17.004	.534	.750
	Within Groups	2995.171	94	31.864		
	Total	3080.190	99			
Hostility	Between Groups	95.329	5	19.066	.486	.786
	Within Groups	3689.581	94	39.251		
	Total	3784.910	99			
Verbal Aggression	Between Groups	80.635	5	16.127	1.201	.315
	Within Groups	1262.115	94	13.427		
	Total	1342.750	99			
Awareness Of Self And Self Disclosure	Between Groups	88.068	5	17.614	1.212	.309
	Within Groups	1365.642	94	14.528		
	Total	1453.710	99			
Self Expression And Clarity	Between Groups	66.109	5	13.222	1.379	.239
	Within Groups	901.331	94	9.589		
	Total	967.440	99			
Awareness Of Others	Between Groups	56.101	5	11.220	.412	.839
	Within Groups	2559.609	94	27.230		
	Total	2615.710	99			
Acceptance Of Feedback And Evaluation	Between Groups	46.975	5	9.395	1.091	.371
	Within Groups	809.535	94	8.612		
	Total	856.510	99			
Coping With Feelings And Differences	Between Groups	114.113	5	22.823	.949	.453
	Within Groups	2260.127	94	24.044		
	Total	2374.240	99			
Does Not Fit	Between Groups	7.228	5	1.446	.847	.520
	Within Groups	160.532	94	1.708		
	Total	167.760	99			

Table 5 shows the differences in number of siblings in the variables. The results show that there is no significance difference found between the groups and within the groups.

DISCUSSION

This study provides an overview of the links between young adults' aggression and interpersonal communication. This study revealed that the dimensions of aggression are negatively correlated with the dimensions of interpersonal communication.

Earlier study reported that, communication flexibility was negatively correlated to verbal aggressiveness and flexible communicators are less likely to use verbal aggression (Martin,

Relationship between Aggression and Interpersonal Communication

Anderson & Thweatt, 1998). In the table.1, the results show that, verbal aggression and hostility was found to be highly negatively correlated to acceptance of feedback and evaluation, which shows that people who are highly verbally aggressive does not like to receive feedbacks from others. Verbally aggressive individuals attack the self-concept of others through communication in order to give them psychological pain. Individuals who are highly verbally aggressive get satisfaction by giving other people psychological pain and they do not focus on the problem to solve it but attacks individuals and hence they do not like to accept feedback from others.

Earlier study reported that self-expressiveness was only slightly related to anger expression, and only when the designated other was describing the subject's anger experiences (Burrowes, B.D. & Halberstadt, A.G. J, 1987) but in the present study, from table 1. anger was found to be highly negatively correlated with self-expression and clarity and coping with feelings and differences showed that people who are not able to express themselves and are not clear about their thoughts, feelings and emotions with other people show more anger and these people cannot easily cope up with the feelings and differences with other people. They are not much socially involved and do not like to interact with people.

In the present study, from table.1 reported that physical aggression was found to be highly negatively correlated to self-expression and clarity also showed that people who are not able to express themselves and are not clear with their viewpoint with other people are found to be more physically aggressive as whatever they want to say, they cannot able to say at the same point and in turn physically harm and attack other people and they cannot express whatever they are thinking and feeling.

In the present study, from table 1; physical aggression was found to be less negatively correlated to acceptance of feedback and evaluation showed that people who tend to be more physically aggressive does not like and want feedback from other people. Whatever other people say they cannot accept it whether it is right or wrong and they in turn physically harm or attack other individual in order to defend himself or herself.

Aggressive individuals tend to perceive hostility in others where there is no hostility; that is, they display a hostile attributional bias (Dodge, 1980; Graham and Hudley, 1994; Schneider, 1991). Zelli and Huesmann (1993) found that college students with greater ingrained persecution beliefs are more likely to perceive hostility when no one is present. From the table 1; the result shows that hostility was found to be highly negatively correlated with acceptance of feedback and evaluation and less negatively correlated to self-expression and clarity and does not fit. As the individual who has high hostile nature perceive the feedback of others as hostile in nature, thus doesn't like to accept the feedback of others and are very less self-expressive. Individuals who are hostile in nature are not self-expressive and clear with their thoughts and feelings and they don't know which behaviour is appropriate for present situation.

Relationship between Aggression and Interpersonal Communication

Substantial evidence suggests that females are more likely to engage in indirect forms of aggression, males are more likely to engage in direct physical aggression, and both genders are about equally likely to engage in verbal aggression (Bjorkqvist et al., 1992; Crick and Grotpeter, 1995; Lagerspetz et al., 1988; Lagerspetz and Bjorkqvist, 1992). However, the results of present study, from the table 2. reported that males are more physically aggressive as compared to females. It has been witnessed that males tend to be highly physically aggressive as majority of the males more often involved in fighting, abusing, harming others and public properties for no big reasons. It has been observed in school and colleges that boys for very little reasons and after little arguments involves in fight and harming others and public properties. In case of girls, mostly they involve in arguments only.

The results of this study, from table 3; reported that self-expression and clarity were significantly higher for nuclear family than joint family. It has been observed that now a day, there are lesser number of joint family and more are nuclear family. In joint family, there are more conflict found as compared to nuclear family. The youth cannot able to openly express his own thoughts and feelings with family members because of being rejected or being judged or being criticized by them but Mogre & Batham, 2013., concluded that there is significant impact of structure of family on decision making and interpersonal skills of youth and there is no significant impact of structure of family on Confidence, Health, Communication Skills, Personality, Leadership, Coordination and Creativity. In the present study, from table 4; the results reported that there is no significant difference found in between the dimensions of aggression and interpersonal communication on the basis of birth order. In the present study, from table 5; the results reported that there is no significant difference found in between the dimensions of aggression and interpersonal communication on the basis of number of siblings.

Acknowledgments

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

Conflict of Interests: The author declared no conflict of interests.

REFERENCES

- Auter, P.J., (2007). Portable social groups: willingness to communicate, interpersonal communication gratifications, and cell phone use among young adults . *International Journal of Mobile Communications*, 5(2), 139-156 .
- Barbato C.A, Graham E.E & Perse E.M., (2003). Communicating in the Family: An Examination of the Relationship of Family Communication Climate and Interpersonal Communication Motives. *Journal of family communication*, 3(30), 123-148.

Relationship between Aggression and Interpersonal Communication

- Baron, R. A. (2001). Motivation and Emotion. In *Psychology* (5th ed., pp. 368-409). South Asia: Pearson Education, Inc. and Dorling Kindersley Publishing.
- Baym, N.K, Zhang, Y.B & Lin, M.C. (2004). Social Interactions across Media: Interpersonal Communication on the Internet, Face-to-Face, and the Telephone'. *New Media & Society*, 6(3), 299-318.
- Beck, R.C. (2005). *Motivation Theories & Principles*. (Fourth ed.). Delhi: Pearson.
- Beebe, S. A., & Redmond, M. V. (2008). Introduction to interpersonal communication. In S. A. Beebe (Ed.), *Interpersonal communication relating to others* (4th ed., pp. 1-15). Pearson.
- Berg, J. (2012). *Aggression And Its Management In Adolescent Forensic Psychiatric Care*, 1-64.
- Cherry, K. (2013, January 13). What is aggression. Retrieved from <http://psychology.about.com/od/aindex/g/aggression.htm>
- Graham, J. L. (1998). Interpersonal Communication Inventory. *An Analysis of Sport Managers' Interpersonal Communication Skills in Selected Ontario Amateur Sport Organizations*, 1-115.
- Hotton, T. (2003). *Childhood Aggression and Exposure to Violence in the Home*, 1-25. Retrieved from [http://violenceresearch.ca/sites/default/files/Hotton \(2003\) Childhood Aggression & Exposure To Violence In The Home.pdf](http://violenceresearch.ca/sites/default/files/Hotton%20(2003)%20Childhood%20Aggression%20&%20Exposure%20To%20Violence%20In%20The%20Home.pdf)
- I. K., & Melonashi, E. (2015). Aggression among Albanian Adolescents. *Aggression among Albanian Adolescents*, 3, 1-15.
- Koesten, J & Anderson, K. (2004). Exploring the Influence of Family Communication Patterns, Cognitive Complexity, and Interpersonal Competence on Adolescent Risk Behaviors. *Journal of Family Communication*, 4(2), 99-121.
- Martin, M. A., & Anderson, C. M. (1995). The father-young adult relationship: Interpersonal motives, self-disclosure, and satisfaction. *43*(2), 119-130.
- Mathur, S.S. (2010). Aggression and violence. In Mathur, S.S (Ed), *Social Psychology* (pp. 628-648). Agra: Agrawal Publications.
- Rancer, A. S., & Kosberg, R. L. (2009). The relationship between self-esteem and aggressive communication predispositions. *9*(1), 23-32.
- Schrodt, P., & Ledbetter, A. M. (2007). Communication Processes That Mediate Family Communication Patterns and Mental Well-Being: A Mean and Covariance Structures Analysis of Young Adults From Divorced and Non-divorced Families. *Human Communication Research*, 33(3), 330-356.
- Warburton, W. A., & Anderson, C. A. (2015). Social Psychology of Aggression. *Aggression, Social Psychology of*, 1-8.
- Westmyer, S.A, Dicioccio, R.L & Rubin, R.B. (1998). Appropriateness and effectiveness of communication channels in competent interpersonal communication. *Journal of Communication*, 48(3), 27-48.

How to cite this article: Kewalramani S, Singh G (2017), Relationship between Aggression and Interpersonal Communication, *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, Volume 4, (3), DIP: 18.01.090/20170403