

Impact of Aggression Behavior on Personality Big Five Factors among Gymnastics person

NARAYAN GANPAT GAVRE¹

Research Scholar, (Dept. of Psychology),
Vivekanand Arts Sardar Dalipsingh Commerce and Science College,
Aurangabad – 431001. (MS, India).

Dr. Ravindra. R. Shinde²

Department of Psychology
Vivekanand Arts, Sardar Dalipsingh Commerce and Science College

Abstract

The purpose of the study to find out the effect of aggression level on big five factor of Regular doing Gymnastics person. Aggression Inventory by Roma Pal and Tasneem Naqvi. And Personality Inventory (N.E.O.P.I) by Paul T. Costa, McCrae, 1992. Hypotheses of the study There will be significant difference between high aggressive Regular doing Gymnastics person and low aggressive Regular doing Gymnastics person on the dimension of personality i e Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness and Neuroticism. conclusion.1. High aggressive Regular doing Gymnastics person have significantly high openness than low aggressive Regular doing Gymnastics person. 2. High aggressive Regular doing Gymnastics person have significantly high conscientiousness than Non- Sports Teachers. 3. Low aggressive Regular doing Gymnastics person have significantly high extraversion than High aggressive Regular doing Gymnastics person.4. High aggressive Regular doing Gymnastics person have significantly high agreeableness than Low aggressive Regular doing Gymnastics person. 5. High aggressive Regular doing Gymnastics person have significantly high neuroticism than Low aggressive Regular doing Gymnastics person.

Introduction:

The Big Five framework of personality traits from Costa & McCrae, 1992 has emerged as a robust model for understanding the relationship between personality and various academic behaviors. Aggression and personality theorists posit that personality variables are important predictors of aggressive behavior (see Anderson & Huesmann, 2003). Indeed, several personality traits are related to aggressive behavior, including, narcissism (Bushman & Baumeister, 1998), impulsivity (Campbell & Muncer, 2009), among others. The predominant overall model of personality has identified the “Big 5” personality factors, traits that repeatedly appear across culture and gender. The predominant social-cognitive models of aggression (e.g., General Aggression Model; GAM) include personality variables, and to some extent explicate psychological processes that link traits to aggression. For example, the GAM postulates that traits can influence aggression through their impact on aggressive emotions or on aggressive cognitions. The present research tested the direct and indirect effects of the Big 5 personality traits (Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism) on aggressive behavior. We used multi-group path modeling from two samples that used different Big 5 measures to test the direct effects of personality on two types of aggression (physical, violent) as well as indirect effects (mediated effects) through aggressive emotions and aggressive attitudes.

The strongest Big 5 predictor of aggressive behavior is Agreeableness, which is characterized as good-natured, trustful, and cooperative (John & Srivastava, 1999). It is negatively related to self-report and peer-report aggressive behavior (Gleason, Jensen-Campbell, & Richardson, 2004) and violence (Heaven, 1996). Conscientiousness is characterized by being responsible, orderly, and dependable (John & Srivastava, 1999), and tends to be negatively related to aggression (Sharpe & Desai, 2001). Neuroticism, characterized by being easily upset and emotionally unstable (John & Srivastava, 1999), is positively related to aggressive behavior (Sharpe & Desai, 2001). Openness, characterized by being intellectual, polished, and independent-minded (John & Srivastava, 1999), tends to be unrelated to aggressive behavior (e.g., Gleason et al., 2004).

Finally, Extraversion is characterized as being talkative, assertive, and energetic (John & Srivastava, 1999) and its relations with aggression are mixed. Sharpe and Desai (2001) found that the correlation between self-reported physical aggression and Extraversion was negative, whereas Gallo and Smith (1998) found a positive relation between Extraversion and physical aggression.

Research has shown that Agreeableness and Conscientiousness are both negatively related to vengefulness (an aggressive emotion), whereas Neuroticism is positively related to vengefulness (McCullough, Bellah, Kilpatrick, & Johnson, 2001). Sharpe and Desai (2001) found that Neuroticism is positively related to anger and hostility (aggressive emotions), whereas Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness are negatively related to these emotions. Anderson et al. (2004) found that Agreeableness and Conscientiousness were negatively related to attitudes towards violence (an aggressive attitude). Thus, this literature suggests that the Big 5 personality traits may be related to aggressive behavior directly and/or indirectly through aggressive emotions and aggressive attitudes.

Aggressiveness and aggressive behaviour is a highly multifaceted construct (Parrott & Giancola, 2007) and a widespread social phenomenon. Within the framework of Eysenck's personality theory it is included within the wider structure of the dimension psychoticism (Knezović et al., 1989; Milas, 2004; Hudek-Knežević, Krapić, & Kardum, 2006). It may be defined as any behavioural pattern the aim of which is to hurt others, physically or mentally (Glavota, 1990; Maxwell & Moores, 2007; Parrott & Giancola, 2007). With regard to behaviour, we differentiate between *verbal* and *physical aggression*. *Verbal aggression* is manifested as shouting, swearing, threatening, insulting and similar, whereas *physical aggression* is characterized by a more or less direct physical assault on a person (Smits, De Boeck, & Vansteelandt, 2004; Žužul, 1989). Further, according to the object of *aggression* manifestation, we distinguish *direct* from *indirect aggression*. *Direct aggression* is oriented directly towards the source of frustration, whereas *indirect aggression* is oriented towards substituted goals, other persons, or any other objects (Campbell, 2006; Garandea & Cillessen, 2006; Žužul, 1989).

Christopher P. Barlett, Craig A. Anderson (2012) Direct and indirect relations between the Big 5 personality traits and aggressive and violent behavior. Relations between the Big 5 personality traits and aggressive behavior have been studied frequently. However, no work has tested whether that relation is direct or indirect through aggressive attitudes and aggressive emotions. Data from two large samples that used different Big 5 measures examined these effects. Overall, results showed that the paths from Big 5 traits to aggressive behavior depends on both the specific type of aggressive behavior and the Big 5 traits measured. For example, Openness and Agreeableness were both directly and indirectly related to physical aggression, but were only indirectly related (through aggressive attitudes) to violent behavior. Similarly, Neuroticism was both directly and indirectly (through aggressive emotions) related to physical aggression, but not to violent behavior. Theoretical implications and future work are discussed.

Objective and aim of the study:

To find out effect of aggression level on big five factor of Regular doing Gymnastics person.

Hypothesis:

- 1) There will be significant difference between high aggressive Regular doing Gymnastics person on the dimension of personality i. e. Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness and Neuroticism.

Method:

Sample:

For the present study 200 Regular doing Gymnastics person were selected from Aurangabd, Maharashtra State, India. The effective sample consisted of 200 Regular doing Gymnastics person, 100 high aggressive Regular doing Gymnastics person and 100 low aggressive Regular doing Gymnastics person. The age range of subjects was 18-25years Ratio were 1:1, as well as ratio of male and female were 1:1. The present study at the first aggression inventory as a scrutiny test was administered for deciding the different Regular doing Gymnastics person. 100 Regular doing Gymnastics person of high aggressive and 100 Regular doing Gymnastics person of low aggressive. And Non- probability accidental and purposive sampling was used.

Tools:

Aggression Scale (A scale) (1983):

This test is developed and standardized by Km Roma Pal and Mrs. Tasneem Naqvi. The test consisted of 30 Items and response categories. The reliability coefficient of the test was found 0.82.

NEO Personality scale.

Paul T. Costa, McCrae, 1992. Marathi adaptation by Dr Lodhi (Pune University). This test is developed and standardized by Costa and McCrae the 60 items are rated on a five point scale. The NEO-FFI has a grade six reading level. The subjects were required to respond to each item in terms of “Strongly disagree”, “Disagree”, “Neutral”, “Agree”, “Strongly agree”. Reliability and Validity Internal consistency coefficients range from .86 to .95 for domain scales, and from .56 to .90 for facet scales. Stability coefficients ranging from .51 to .83 have been found in three-year, six-year, and seven-year longitudinal studies of the original NEO-PI factors. The NEO PI-R has been validated against other personality inventories and projective techniques.

Variables:

Independent variable:

Aggression a) High b) Low

Dependant variable:

Personality characteristics

- 1) Openness
- 2) Conscientiousness
- 3) Extraversion
- 4) Agreeableness
- 5) Neuroticism

Statistical Analysis and Discussion

Shows the mean S.D and ‘t’ value of Personality characteristics

Personality Dimension	High Aggressive Regular doing Gymnastics person			Low Aggressive Regular doing Gymnastics person			DF	t
	Mean	SD	SE	Mean	SD	SE		
Openness	52.06	5.26	0.53	45.97	4.10	0.41	198	9.13
Conscientiousness	53.67	4.18	0.42	48.74	4.01	0.40	198	8.51
Extraversion	42.63	4.20	0.42	49.05	5.52	0.55	198	9.26
Agreeableness	51.12	4.47	0.45	46.32	4.11	0.41	198	7.90
Neuroticism	54.52	7.62	0.76	47.89	5.97	0.60	198	6.85

The results related to the hypothesis have been recorded. Mean of high aggressive Regular doing Gymnastics person is 52.06 and low aggressive Regular doing Gymnastics person Mean is 45.97. the difference between the two mean is highly significant (‘t’= 9.13, df =198, P < 0.01). Conscientiousness of the high aggressive Regular doing Gymnastics person is 53.67 and low aggressive Regular doing Gymnastics person Mean is 48.74 the difference between the two mean is highly significant (‘t’= 8.51, df =198, P < 0.01). Extraversion of the high aggressive Regular doing Gymnastics person is 42.63 and low aggressive Regular doing Gymnastics person Mean is 49.05 the difference between the two mean is highly significant (‘t’= 9.26, df =198, P < 0.01). Agreeableness of the high aggressive Regular doing Gymnastics person is 51.12 and low aggressive Regular doing Gymnastics person Mean is 46.32 the difference between the two mean is highly significant (‘t’= 7.90, df =198, P = NS). Neuroticism of the high aggressive Regular doing Gymnastics person is 54.52 and low aggressive Regular doing Gymnastics person Mean is 47.89 the difference between the two mean is highly significant (‘t’= 6.85, df =198, P < 0.01).

Results:

- 1) High aggressive Regular doing Gymnastics person have significantly high openness than low aggressive Regular doing Gymnastics person.
- 2) High aggressive Regular doing Gymnastics person have significantly high conscientiousness than Non-Sports Teachers.
- 3) Low aggressive Regular doing Gymnastics person have significantly high extraversion than High aggressive Regular doing Gymnastics person.
- 4) High aggressive Regular doing Gymnastics person have significantly high agreeableness than Low aggressive Regular doing Gymnastics person.
- 5) High aggressive Regular doing Gymnastics person have significantly high neuroticism than Low aggressive Regular doing Gymnastics person.

Reference

- Anderson, C. A., & Bushman, B. J. (2002). Human aggression. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 27–51.
- Anderson, C. A., & Dill, K. E. (2000). Video games and aggressive thoughts, feelings, and behavior in the laboratory and in life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 772–790.
- Anderson, C. A., & Huesmann, R. L. (2003). Human aggression: A social-cognitive view. In M. A. Hogg & J. Cooper (Eds.), *The sage handbook of social psychology* (pp. 259–287). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Anderson, C. A., Carnagey, N. L., Flanagan, M., Benjamin, A. J., Eubanks, J., & Valentine, J. C. (2004). Violent video games: Specific effects of violent content on aggressive thoughts and behavior. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 36, 199–249.
- Bushman, B. J., & Baumeister, R. F. (1998). Threatened egotism, narcissism, self-esteem, and direct and displaced aggression: Does self-love or self-hate lead to violence? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 219–229.
- Buss, A. H., & Perry, M. (1992). The Aggression Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63, 452–459.
- Campbell, A., & Muncer, S. (2009). Can ‘risky’ impulsivity explain sex differences in aggression? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47, 402–406.
- Christopher P. Barlett, Craig A. Anderson (2012) Direct and indirect relations between the Big 5 personality traits and aggressive. and violent behavior. *Personality and Individual Differences* 52 (2012) 870–875.
- Conger, R. D., Patterson, G. R., & Ge, X. (1995). It takes two to replicate: A mediational model for the impact of parents’ stress on adolescent adjustment. *Child Development*, 66, 80–97.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Gallo, L. C., & Smith, T. W. (1998). Construction validation of health-related personality traits: Interpersonal Circumplex and Five-Factor model analysis of the Aggression Questionnaire. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 5, 129–147.
- Gleason, K. A., Jensen-Campbell, L. A., & Richardson, D. S. (2004). Agreeableness as a predictor of aggression in adolescence. *Aggressive Behavior*, 30, 43–61.
- Heaven, P. C. L. (1996). Personality and self-reported delinquency: Analysis of the “Big Five” personality dimensions. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 20, 47–54.
- John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big-Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.).