GENDER DIFFERENCES IN THE MANIFESTATION OF AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOR IN ADOLESCENTS

This article presents the results of a study of the gender difference in presence of aggressive behavior of the teenagers. The gender difference in presence of aggressive behavior was determined and analyzed by the following methods as: Bassa-Darky questionnaire, The method of “Personal aggress and conflict” (Ilyn E. P. and Kovalev P. A.) proposed for determination of subject to the conflict and aggress in purpose of personal characteristic. Scale: short temper, touchiness, intransigence, compromise, vindictiveness, intolerance to the others opinions, suspicion; positive aggressiveness, negative aggressiveness, conflict. The method of diagnosis of the self-esteem mental states (by Aizenk) proposed for determination of the level of following important mental traits: anxiety, frustration, aggressiveness and rigidity.

For math treatment of the data, there was used the Spearman’s correlation coefficient and U-criteria Manna-Whitney in the program of statistical treatment SPSS16. By the results of empirical study of gender differences in presence of aggressive behavior of teenagers, there was confirmed the hypothesis, that the boys more often show aggressive behavior in comparison with girls, but girls dominated by physical and verbal types of aggressive behavior. By results of statistical analyses by Manna-Whitney criteria, there are was determined, that rigidity, immutability of behavior more pronounced at the boys. Boys often use physical force against other persons, and also express their negative feelings both through the form (cry, squeal), and through the content of verbal responses (curses, threats). In general, boys are more likely to show aggressive behavior, unlike girls.
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Gender Differences in the Manifestation of Aggressive Behavior in Adolescents

Introduction

A person spends most of his time communicating with other people. The society with which the person builds interpersonal relations sets social norms of behavior, according to which the members of this community build their behavior respecting these rules of living together. In most cases, what is called aggression in a society of people is determined by the social norms of the society itself. (Ozerova, Larina, 2018)

There are culturally approved forms of aggression (for example, killing another person in a war) and forms of individual aggression that society rejects. (Wade, 2016)

The spectrum of aggression in the modern world is very wide. Starting from gossip, threats, insults, fights, murders, to hostilities and terrorist acts. Aggression can be physical, verbal, direct, indirect, latent, reactive, and proactive. (Ozerova, Larina, 2018)

One gets the feeling that aggression is an integral part of human life. What is aggression? The active study of the problem of aggression began in the 1960s. Since then, different definitions of the concept of aggression have been formed. In our study, we will understand aggression as a form of behavior that causes harm to another living being.

The new 2019 year in Kazakhstan began with shocking news that first appeared on social networks and was later covered on domestic television channels. This is a terrifying video in which, as it later became known, in the city of Turkestan, a group of teenagers brutally beat two boys of primary school age, accompanying their beatings with selective swearing in the Kazakh language.

On January 21, 2019, a video was distributed on social networks in which a group of teenagers, presumably high school students, physically and morally humiliates boys of lower grades. The Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of
Kazakhstan immediately responded to the video information and took steps to clarify the common information.

Unfortunately, this is not an isolated case. There are quite a few similar videos about the spread of aggressive and cruel behavior among adolescents in our society. The growth of aggressive tendencies in the adolescent environment reflects one of the most acute social problems of our society, where in recent years youth crime has increased dramatically, especially teenage crime. At the same time, it is alarming that an increase in the number of crimes against a person entails serious bodily injuries. Cases of group fights of teenagers of a fierce nature have become more frequent, and many researchers have noted the participation of girls and girls in them.

Aggression, perhaps, like no individual personality characteristic, affects the quality of social life and the life of each person. This explains the attention and interest that psychologists have witnessed over the past decades in the problems of aggression (Baron & Richardson, 1994; Kovalev et.al., 1995).

**Main part**

Regarding the concept of aggression in science, three debatable problems can be identified: the first is the problem of the emergence of aggression. Is aggression congenital or acquired? The second is the problem of psychological mechanisms of aggression. Within the framework of this problem, the issue of cognitive and emotional components of aggression is relevant. Also, the third problem reflects the factors of occurrence and manifestation of factors. (Baron, Richardson, 2001) These problems find their solution in different psychological approaches. Thus, the problems of aggression are interpreted differently by supporters of psychoanalytic, evolutionary, behavioral, cognitive and other approaches. (Berkovits, 2007).

Independent consideration was given to the problem of aggression in psychological diagnostics. So, A. Bass, who took a number of aspects of his predecessors, differentiated the concepts of “aggression” and “hostility” and considered the latter as: “... a reaction that develops negative feelings and negative evaluations of people and events.” For the analysis of aggressive behavior, he proposed a conceptual framework that includes three scales: physical – verbal, active – passive, direct – indirect. The scientist recognizes as aggressive only those actions that harm living beings. Creating their own questionnaire, A. Bass and A. Darki identified the following types of aggressive reactions: physical aggression, indirect aggression, verbal aggression, irritation, negativism, resentment, suspicion, guilt (Baron, Richardson, 2001). The category of “aggression” itself is generally neutral. In fact, aggression can be both positive, serving life interests and survival, as well as negative, focused on satisfying the aggressive drive by itself (Chernikova, 2014).

As studies of modern Russian and Russian scientists-psychologists show, aggressive behavior in adolescence is most often (not counting cases of aggressive behavior caused by physiological disorders of the brain) due to the type of parent-child relationships and the style of upbringing in the family. (Zorya, 2015). Kazakhstani scientists, studying modern foreign experience of correctional methods in overcoming aggressive behavior in adolescents, are developing their own effective programs for the correction of aggressive behavior and other forms of deviant behavior in adolescents. (Sadvakasova, 2015) Improving the effectiveness of such remedial programs requires a further comprehensive study of the problem of aggressive behavior in adolescents. Including the actual problem of clarifying gender and gender differences in the manifestation of aggressive behavior. There are modern studies of gender differences in the manifestation of aggressive behavior in adolescents in Russian psychological science. Thus, according to these studies, physical forms of aggression are more characteristic of adolescent boys, and verbal and indirect forms of aggression are more characteristic of girls. (Isaeva, 2003). Similar results, as it seems to us, require additional research in our Kazakhstan society.

The purpose of the work is to study gender differences in the manifestations of aggression in adolescents.

Object of study – Teens aged 13 to 17 years.

The subject is gender features of aggression.

Hypothesis: we assume that there are gender differences in the manifestation of adolescent aggression:

a) in boys, the manifestation of an aggressive reaction is more common than in girls;

b) in boys, physical and verbal aggressive behaviors predominate.

Study participants A group of teenagers aged 13-17 years (grades 6-11) in the amount of 70 people. Of these, 35 boys and 35 girls.

**Research methods:**

1. The Bass-Darki Questionnaire was developed by A. Bass and A. Darki in 1957 and
is intended for the diagnosis of aggressive and hostile reactions. The questionnaire consists of 75 statements, each of which refers to one of the eight indices of forms of aggressive or hostile reactions. By the number of matches of answers with the key, indices of various forms of aggressiveness and hostile reactions, as well as a general index of aggressiveness and an index of hostility, are calculated.

Creating their own questionnaire, differentiating manifestations of aggression and hostility A. Bass and A. Darki identified the following types of reactions:

PA – physical aggression (applying aggression to another person).
IA – indirect aggression (aimed at another in the form of ridicule or not directed at anyone – trampling with feet, breaking dishes, etc.).
I – irritation (readiness to display aggression, rudeness).
N – negativism (opposition reactions directed against established rules and customs).
R – resentment (envy, hatred at the feeling of anger at the whole world).
S – suspicion (distrust of people, which is based on the desire to cause harm).

VA – verbal aggression (the expression of negative feelings in the form of scandal, cry)
G – guilt (the degree of conviction of a person that he is bad).
IH – Individual Hostility
IA – individual aggression.

2. The method of “Personal aggressiveness and conflict” (EPIlyin and P.A. Kovalev) is intended to identify as a personal characteristic of the subject’s inclination to conflict and aggression.

Scales: hot temper, offensiveness, touchiness, intransigence, compromise, vindictiveness, intolerance to the opinions of others, suspicion; positive aggressiveness, negative aggressiveness, conflict.

3. The method of diagnosing self-assessment of mental states (according to Aysenec) is designed to determine the level of the following important mental traits: anxiety, frustration, aggressiveness and rigidity.

For mathematical data processing, the Spearman correlation coefficient and the Mann-Whitney U-criterion were used in the statistical processing program SPSS16.

Analysis of the results.

According to the results of the Bass-Darka questionnaire, the following indicators of types of aggression were obtained (Table 1).

| Scale                  | Boys          | Girls         |
|------------------------|---------------|---------------|
|                        | Average value by scale | Average value by scale |
| Physical aggression    | 8,3           | 6,9           |
| Indirect aggression    | 7,4           | 7,2           |
| Irritation             | 6,0           | 6,5           |
| Negativism             | 4,9           | 4,2           |
| Touchiness             | 4,6           | 4,6           |
| Suspicion              | 7,0           | 5,4           |
| I                      | 2             | 3             |
| Verbal aggression      | 11,6          | 9,1           |
| Guilt                  | 7,2           | 6,6           |
| Aggression index       | 18,5          | 14            |
| hostility index        | 10,3          | 9,5           |

According to Table 1, verbal aggressiveness comes to the forefront in adolescents. Boys are characterized by a predominance of reactions of physical aggression, while girls more often resort to indirect means of expressing aggression: verbal, indirect, and negativity. Indices of hostility and aggressive-
ness in both groups are within the normal range, except for the aggressiveness index in boys, which is slightly above the norm. For clarity, these figures are shown in Figure 1.

![Figure 1 – Average indicators on the scale of aggression](image)

According to the results of the method “personal aggressiveness and conflict”, the level of positive aggressiveness prevails in boys. Indicators of negative aggressiveness in boys and girls were slightly above average, and the level of conflict is on average within the normal range. These results are graphically presented in Figure 2.

![Figure 2 – Average indicators on the scales of the method “personal aggressiveness and conflict”](image)

According to the results of the questionnaire “assessment of mental states” by Aysenck, there were no pronounced gender differences in the indicators of the average values on the scales. As shown in Figure 3, in adolescents, indicators for all scales are within the average level from 7 to 14.

The results of statistical processing by the Mann-Whitney U-test. We have verified the significance of the differences between boys and girls by the non-parametric Mann-Whitney test.

1. Comparison of scales of physical aggressiveness, indirect aggressiveness and irritability according to the Bass-Darki test between boys and girls.
Figure 3 – Average indicators on the scales of the “Assessment of Mental States” method according to Aysenck

Table 2 – The results of statistical processing by the Mann-Whitney U-test in the manifestation of physical, indirect aggressiveness and irritability in boys and girls

|                  | PA         | IA         | Irritability |
|------------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| Mann-Whitney U   | 112,500    | 171,000    | 154,000      |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | 0,015 | 0,423 | 0,209 |

The results include the following indicators:
– test value U, determined using the test of Mann and Whitney.
– the exact value of the probability of error p when the number of observations is less than 10.

It turns out that the difference in the manifestation of physical aggressiveness is statistically significant (p = 0.015). Thus, boys and girls differ in the manifestation of physical aggressiveness. According to the average ranking indicators of the variables listed above, shown in Table 3, the boys’ average rank value is higher than that of girls, which indicates that physical aggressiveness prevails in boys.

Table 3 – Average rank values of variables physical aggressiveness, indirect aggressiveness, irritability in boys and girls

|                  | Gender | N  | MeanRank |
|------------------|--------|----|----------|
| PA               |        |    |          |
| 1                | 35     | 497,50 |
| 2                | 35     | 322,50 |
| Total            | 70     |     |
| IA               |        |    |          |
| 1                | 35     | 381,00 |
| 2                | 35     | 439,00 |
| Total            | 70     |     |
| Irritability     |        |    |          |
| 1                | 35     | 456,00 |
| 2                | 35     | 364,00 |
| Total            | 70     |     |
Differences in the remaining scales of the Bass-Darki method – indirect aggression and irritability – between these samples are not statistically significant. 2. Comparison of the scales of negativity, resentment and suspicion on the Bass-Darki test between boys and girls.

Table 4 – Results of statistical processing according to the Mann-Whitney U-criterion in the manifestation of negativity, resentment and suspicion of boys and girls

|                  | Negativism | Offense | Suspicion |
|------------------|------------|---------|-----------|
| Mann-Whitney U   | 179,000    | 153,500 | 158,000   |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | ,551      | ,200    | ,248      |

It turns out that the difference in the manifestation of negativity, resentment and suspicion in boys and girls is not statistically significant.

3. Comparison of scales of verbal aggression, feelings of guilt according to Bass-Darki test between boys and girls.

Table 5 – Results of statistical processing according to the Mann-Whitney U-test for manifestation of verbal aggressiveness and guilt feelings of boys and girls

|                  | Verbal aggression | Indirect aggression |
|------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Mann-Whitney U   | 112,000           | 172,500             |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | ,016     | ,448                |

It turns out that the difference in the manifestation of verbal aggressiveness is statistically significant (p = 0.016).

Table 6 – Average ranking values of variables verbal aggressiveness and guilt feelings in boys and girls

|                  | Gender | N  | MeanRank |
|------------------|--------|----|----------|
| Verbal aggression| 1      | 35 | 498,00   |
|                  | 2      | 35 | 322,00   |
|                  | Total  | 70 |          |
| Guilt            | 1      | 35 | 437,50   |
|                  | 2      | 35 | 382,50   |
|                  | Total  | 70 |          |

Those boys and girls differ in the manifestation of verbal aggressiveness. According to the average ranking indicators for this variable, shown in Table 6, the boys’ average rank value is higher than that of girls, which indicates that verbal aggressiveness prevails in boys.

The differences on the second scale of the Bass-Darki method – the feeling of guilt – between these samples are not statistically significant.

4. Comparison of indices of hostility and aggressiveness on the Bass-Darki test between boys and girls.
Table 7 – Results of statistical processing by the Mann-Whitney U-test in terms of indices of hostility and aggressiveness in boys and girls

|               | Hostility index | Aggression index |
|---------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Mann-Whitney U| 156,500        | 109,500         |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | .235           | .014            |

It turns out that the difference in the indexes of aggressiveness is statistically significant (p = 0.014).

Table 8 – Average rank values of variables hostility index and aggressiveness index for boys and girls

| Gender | n  | MeanRank |
|--------|----|----------|
| Hostility index | 1  | 453,50   |
|          | 2  | 366,50   |
|          | Total | 70         |
| Aggression index | 1  | 500,50   |
|          | 2  | 319,50   |
|          | Total | 70         |

According to the average ranking indicators for this variable, shown in Table 8, the average rank value of boys is higher than that of girls, which indicates that the level of aggressiveness prevails in boys. Differences in the second scale of the Bass-Darki method – an index of hostility – between these samples are not statistically significant.

5. Comparison of scales of anxiety, frustration, aggressiveness, rigidity according to Aysenck’s test between boys and girls.

Table 9 – Results of statistical processing by the Mann-Whitney U-test in terms of anxiety, frustration, aggressiveness, rigidity of boys and girls

|               | anxiety | frustration | aggression | rigidity |
|---------------|---------|-------------|------------|---------|
| Mann-Whitney U| 185,500 | 190,000     | 151,500    | 124,000  |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | .693   | .784       | .187       | .038       |

It turns out that the difference in indicators of rigidity is statistically significant (p = 0.038).

Table 10 – Average ranking values of variables of anxiety, frustration, aggressiveness, rigidity of boys and girls

| Gender | N  | MeanRank |
|--------|----|----------|
| Anxiety | 1  | 424,50   |
|          | 2  | 395,50   |
|          | Total | 70         |
| Frustration | 1  | 400,00   |
|          | 2  | 420,00   |
|          | Total | 70         |
| Aggression | 1  | 458,50   |
|          | 2  | 361,50   |
|          | Total | 70         |
| Rigidity | 1  | 486,00   |
|          | 2  | 334,00   |
|          | Total | 70         |
Those boys and girls differ in the manifestation of rigidity. According to the average ranking indicators for this variable, shown in Table 10, the average rank value of boys is higher than that of girls, which indicates that the level of rigidity, i.e. constancy of behavior, beliefs, attitudes, even if they disagree with the real situation, prevails in boys.

Differences in other scales of the Eysenck method – anxiety, frustration, aggressiveness – between these samples are not statistically significant.

6. Comparison of scales, negative aggressiveness, positive aggressiveness and conflict by the method of «personal aggressiveness and conflict» between boys and girls.

Table 11 – Results of statistical processing by the Mann-Whitney U-test in terms of positive and negative aggressiveness, conflict between boys and girls

|                      | Positive aggression | Negative aggression | Conflict |
|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------|
| Mann-Whitney U       | 185.000             | 190.500             | 180.500  |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)| .026                | .064                | .187     |

It turns out that the difference in the manifestation of positive aggressiveness is statistically significant (p = 0.026).

Table 12 – Average rank values of variables positive and negative aggressiveness, conflict in boys and girls

|                | Gender | N  | MeanRank |
|----------------|--------|----|----------|
| Positive aggression | 1      | 35 | 424,50   |
| 2              | 35     | 395,50 |
| Total          | 70     |     |          |
| Negative aggression | 1      | 35 | 400,00   |
| 2             | 35     | 420,00 |
| Total          | 70     |     |          |
| Conflict       | 1      | 35 | 458,50   |
| 2             | 35     | 361,50 |
| Total          | 70     |     |          |

According to the average ranking indicators for this variable, shown in Table 12, the average rank value of boys is higher than that of girls, which indicates that the level of positive aggressiveness prevails in boys.

Differences in the remaining scales of the methodology – negative aggressiveness and conflict – between these samples are not statistically significant. The results of the correlation analysis: According to the results of the Spearman correlation analysis, the following scale correlations were obtained according to three methods with gender:

- gender variable negatively correlates with such scales as rigidity, physical aggression, verbal aggression, Bass-Darki index of aggressiveness, positive aggressiveness. These results fully confirm the results of statistical analysis according to the Mann-Whitney test, which indicates the reliability of the data obtained.

Table 13 – The results of the correlation analysis

| Variable | Rigidity | PA | VA | AI | PA |
|----------|----------|----|----|----|----|
| Gender   | -.332*   | -.389* | -.385* | -.393* | -.383* |
Thus, according to the results of our study, statistically significant differences in the manifestation of rigidity, physical and verbal aggressiveness according to Bass-Darki, as well as positive aggressiveness according to the method of E.P. Ilyin and PA Kovalev.

Findings

According to the results of an empirical study of gender differences in the manifestation of aggressive behavior in adolescents, hypotheses were confirmed that boys are more likely to show aggressive behavior, unlike girls, and they have physical and verbal types of aggressive behavior. According to the results of statistical analysis on the Mann-Whitney criterion, it was found that boys are more pronounced rigidity, immutability of behavior, they often use physical force against other people, and also express their negative feelings both through the form (cry, squeal), and the content of verbal responses (curses, threats). In general, boys are more likely to show aggressive behavior, unlike girls.

Conclusion

Aggression is a complex, multilevel phenomenon, with respect to which there is no generally accepted opinion: by means of it, individual and group influences of people, diverse in purposes, mechanisms, methods and results, are designated. Therefore, all modern research is focused on a comprehensive study of various levels and components of aggression.

A variety of theoretical concepts of aggression, explain the psychological mechanisms of the emergence of aggression in different ways. The most famous are: the theory of attraction (Z Freud); ethological theory (K. Lorenz); the theory of frustration-aggression (L. Berkovits, A. Bass); theory of social learning (A. Bandura); theory of coercive force (Fischbach).

In our work, we mean by aggression “individual or collective behavior, action aimed at causing physical or psychological damage or the destruction of another person or group of persons” and under aggressiveness - readiness for aggressive actions towards another, which is ensured (prepares) personality readiness perceive and interpret the behavior of another accordingly.

It is well known that adolescence is an acute transition from childhood to adulthood. The special position of adolescence in the development of a child is reflected in its names: “transitional”, “critical”, “difficult”, “critical”.

The emergence of pressure from adults and the lack of adequate channels for self-realization, cause in many adolescents not only aggressive attitudes, but also contribute to the formation of such traits as temper, irritability, and inability to restrain themselves.

Aggressive behavior in adolescence is becoming one of the most common, and for many, the most convenient way to solve problems arising in difficult situations and causing mental tension.

Researchers have repeatedly established that the manifestation of the level of aggression is influenced not only by the age characteristics of individuals, but by their sex differences.

The aim of our study was to study the gender differences manifestations of aggressiveness in adolescence.

The main indicators of aggressiveness in our work are: the index of aggressiveness and the index of hostility (obtained by questioning A. Bass-Darki), the level of aggressiveness (obtained by the method of Eysenck), indicators of aggressiveness and conflict according to the method of E.P. Ilyin and PA Kovalev.

As a result of a study of adolescents conducted on the basis of a secondary school, we found that in a given age period, aggressiveness in its various manifestations is somehow inherent in most children, but is, as a rule, within the normal range. Subjects are more aggressive than hostile. According to the results of our empirical study of gender differences in the manifestation of aggressive behavior in adolescents, hypotheses were confirmed that boys are more likely to show aggressive behavior, unlike girls, and they have physical and verbal types of aggressive behavior. According to the results of statistical analysis on the Mann-Whitney criterion, it was found that boys are more pronounced rigidity, immutability of behavior, they often use physical force against other people, and also express their negative feelings both through the form (cry, squeal), and the content of verbal responses (curses, threats). In general, boys are more likely to show aggressive behavior, unlike girls.

The practical significance of the study is due to its focus on the scientific and methodological support of practical psychology of education. The results can be used in the work of psychological, pedagogical and social centers for working with adolescents.
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