A Comparative Study of Aggression among Student Teachers of Humanities and Sciences

Preeti Goel¹ and Dr. Ishrat Naaz^{2*}

¹M.Ed. Scholar, School of Education, Galgotias University, Gautam Budh Nagar, Uttar Pradesh, India
preejana_goel.gsoemed@galgotiasuniversity.edu.in

²Assistant Professor, School of Education, Galgotias University, Gautam Budh Nagar, Uttar Pradesh, India
E-mail: ishrat.naaz@galgotiasuniversity.edu.in; ishratnaaz2610@gmail.com

Abstract

Aggression is an emotion felt by almost all of us in life on a regular basis. But this emotion can be very dangerous if not properly controlled in personal as well as in professional life. Aggression among youth is caused by ill treatment of teachers (Deb et al., 2017; Gershoff, 2017; Longobardi et al., 2018). Since teachers are the role models to their students, they learn this by imitating aggressive behaviour of teachers. Teachers need to demonstrate the upright behaviours with their students in and out classrooms, that would be reflected in their students. Therefore, teachers should be trained in such a way that they identify and handle their own as well as student aggressiveness in the classroom. Most teacher education institutes (TEIs) have failed to offer such training that deals with aggression (Myles, 1993). It becomes pertinent to study the level of aggression among students of two different disciplines. 60 student teachers (30 Sciences & 30 Humanities) from Khalsa College of Education, Punjab were taken for the current study. Buss Perry Aggression scale (1992) was used to collect data from student teachers. Data was tabulated and final interpretations gave some interesting figures indicating the overall mean score of student teachers of Khalsa College of Education ($M = 81.8$; $S.D = 21.08$) to be average. The student teachers of Sciences ($N=30; M=85.7$; $S.D=17.45$) compared to student teachers from humanities ($N=30; M=77$; $S.D=23.8045$) demonstrated significantly better peak flow scores, $t(60) = 1.456$, $p = 0.075$. There was no significant effect of subjects $t(60) = 1.7$, $p = .097$, despite Sciences student teachers ($M=85.7$; $S.D=17.45$) attaining higher scores than humanities student teachers ($M=77$; $S.D=23.8045$).

Keywords: *Aggression, Humanities, Sciences, Student Teachers*

Introduction

The spread of aggressive behaviour among youth, teacher impacted society as well as individuals. Youth spend their lots of time in the classroom with their peers and teachers. Aggression among youth is caused by ill treatment of teachers (Deb et al., 2017; Gershoff, 2017; Longobardi et al., 2018). Classrooms are emotional places, where all

emotions like enjoyment, excitement, anger, hurt and boredom, happiness have their unique place at different times. Hence, ability of adolescents to equilibrium their emotional responses to anger is being increasingly acknowledged as an important skill for ensuring academic success, mental health, and healthy alteration into adulthood (Eisenberg et al., 2010). The job of a teacher is not only to provide knowledge to his pupil but also understand them, managing their emotions in the

*Corresponding Author

accurate manner, at the right time and by a right method. Hence, it is necessary to understand that the budding Indian society can attain holistic development with the help of the skilled teachers who act as an influential agent in spreading such required competencies. Along with this teacher should not have a high level of aggressive behaviour as students imitate such aggressive behaviour. According to Social Theory of Aggression, aggressive responses can be learned by reinforcement or by imitation or by modelling (Bandura, 1965). Children imitate the aggression behaviour of their model. At this stage teachers are role models for their students. Hence, students learn this by imitating aggressive behaviour of the teacher. Aggressiveness among teachers is one of the major sources of aggression among children. Therefore, teachers should be trained in such a way that they identify and handle their own as well as student aggressiveness in the classroom. Most teacher education institutes (TEIs) have failed to offer such training that deals with aggression (Myles, 1993). For that reason, it is necessary to assess the aggression level among student teachers. Most of the current researches suggest that there is no significant gender difference on aggression (Edalati et al., 2010; Mritikana 2012, Ghosh, 2012; Shaban, Kumar, 2016), however some study showed relationship of aggression and emotional intelligence (Johnston, 2003); (Fayaz, 2019). Research has confirmed that there exists a significant difference among streams (Art, Sciences, Social Sciences) on Emotional Intelligence (Agrawal, 2017). However, researcher could not find study that determine significant difference among streams on aggression. Therefore, in this current study, researcher explored the significant difference among student teachers of different streams on aggression.

Statement of the Problem

A Comparative Study of Aggression among Student Teachers of Humanities and Sciences

Operational Definition of the key words

For the purpose of the present study, the key terms have been operationally defined as under

Aggression: Aggression is a behavior/emotion when an individual assault other individual in the form of physical aggression, verbal aggression, anger, and hostility. It is displayed by individuals when they fall into different circumstances, including real or perceived failure, damage, humiliation, threats, or injustice.

Student Teachers: Students teachers of B. Ed. 2nd year of Sciences and Humanities discipline of Khalsa College, Amritsar, Punjab.

Objectives

1. To determine the level of aggression among student-teachers of humanities and sciences.
 - 1.1. To determine the level of aggression among sciences student-teachers
 - 1.2. To determine the level of aggression among humanities student-teachers.
2. To compare the level of aggression among student-teachers of humanities and sciences.

Hypotheses

1. There is no significant difference in level of aggression among student teachers, discipline wise.

Research Methodology

For the present study non-probability sampling technique was used and a sample of 60 student teachers (30 Sciences and 30 Humanities) studying in Khalsa college, Amritsar, Punjab (T=60, S=30; H=30) were drawn. The purposive convenient sampling was used as institutions were selected keeping the time, purpose and distance in the mind. For obtaining the objectives of the study the following statistical techniques were applied:

- Mean, Median, Mode and Standard Deviation
- T test

In order to fulfil the objectives, *The Questionnaire on Aggression (BPAQ; Buss & Perry, 1992)* was used. This scale is a self-report tool with 29 items that examines aggressive actions across four sub-scales: physical aggression (9 items), verbal

aggression (5 items), frustration (7 items), and hostility (8 items).

Analysis and Interpretation of Data

In order to investigate the degree of aggression and stream wise differences in aggression among student teachers, the current study was conducted. In the present study descriptive statistics and t-test have been employed for the analysis of data. Descriptive statistic was used to assess the mean of aggression level of student teacher and t-test was used to study significant differences in aggression level based on sciences and humanities

stream student-teachers. The results are presented in figure 1, 2 and 3 for Sciences and Humanities and in terms of overall percentage of aggression, respectively. While analyzing the figures 1 and 2, we found that percentage of student-teachers belongs to humanities stream (20%) is higher than Sciences student teachers (10.1%). But when the low aggression is compared, humanities participants are slightly about 40% participants show low aggression whereas for sciences participants the number is 13.3%. Here we can say that humanities student teachers are at a 26.8% hike on low aggression in comparison to sciences student teachers.

Figure 1 and 2: Percentage of Sciences and Humanities student-teachers having different level of Aggression

Figure 3: Percentage of Total student-teachers having different level of Aggression

The results also reveal that overall, 15% participants experience high aggression among student teachers. This result also suggested that one sixth student teachers population fall in the category of high aggression. Figure 3 represents this information graphically.

Mean of Aggression Level			Sciences Student Teacher		Humanities Student Teachers		Total Student Teacher	
Buss Parry Aggression Score	High	107-145	N=30	M=85.7 S.D =17.45	N=30	M=77.9 S.D =23.8045	N=60	M=81.8 S.D =21.08
	Average	68-106						
	Low	29-67						

Table 1: Aggression level of student teachers

The stream differences in aggression have been calculated by applying independent samples ttest (as the data include only two groups) and results

are presented in table 1. The meancomparison for both the groups is also presented in figure 4 for a visual representation.

Figure 4: Streamwise mean comparison of Aggression

The results are presented in Table 1 for mean of aggression level of sciences stream, and humanities stream student teacher and researcher found that mean of aggression score of sciences student teachers (N=30;M=85.7; S.D=17.45) is higher than of humanities student teachers (N=30;M=77; S.D=23.8045).By comparing with

Buss Parry scale it was analyzed that both Sciences as well as humanities teachers having average aggression level .Total mean score of student teachers(N=60;M=81.8 ;S.D=21.08) was lie between 68-106. For this reason, aggression level of the student teacher of Punjab was found to be average.

Source		Total (N)	Mean (M)	Df	Square Difference (SS)	p-value	t-value	Significance Level
Stream	Sciences	N ₁ : 30	M ₁ : 85.7	df ₁ = N - 1 = 30 - 1 = 29	SS ₁ : 8826.3	.075393	1.456	0.05
	Humanities	N ₂ : 30	M ₂ : 77.97	df ₂ = N - 1 = 30 - 1 = 29	SS ₂ : 15716.97			

Table 2: Aggression level based on Sciences and Humanities student teachers

The results are presented in Table 2 showed that mean of aggression level of Sciences, humanities Student teacher and researcher found that mean of aggression score of sciences student teachers (N=30;M=85.7) are more than that of humanities student teachers (N=30;M=77.9) but the t -value is 1.456. The p -value is .075393 at 0.05 significance level. **The result is not significant at $p < .05$.** It is evident from table 2 that ($p .075393 > 0.05$) so there is no significant difference in aggression between sciences and humanities student teachers. In spite of the difference between the mean value of aggression of sciences and humanities student teachers, there was no significant difference between their aggression level.

Educational Implications

The present study suggests that aggression of teachers plays a pivotal role in determining Academic Performance, behaviour of students in the classroom. This study suggests that all student teachers require less aggression level to perform well academically and become emotionally mature ones. Less aggressive student teachers can not only perform well but also, they may be right human beings as well as better citizens. Sciences student teachers need to improve their aggression control likewise humanities students. In this fast-growing World, students are perspiring to obtain high marks, high positions and high grades but most students suffer from anxiety, stress, tension, depression, frustration, pessimism, idleness, procrastination, and negativity as a result of aggression. *National Education Policy 2020 shows concern about adolescents' issues such as drug abuse, harassment including violence and suggests developing mechanisms that deal with such issues effectively and timely (sec.8.11. pp. 33). For developing such mechanisms teachers should be competent enough to deal with aggression of self as well as of students.* Student teachers need to be familiar with the skills needed for teachers to assess and monitor factors related

to school aggression and abuse, risk factors of aggression on students, teachers and community, and to explore few recommendations for teacher educators to reshape current practices to deal with the violence of students.

Based on the findings and conclusions drawn from the current empirical research following recommendations were made:

- Better student-teacher relationship was recommended based on the findings of the current research so as to cater and minimize the levels of aggression among student teachers.
- Conclusions of this research suggested that aggression and its handling shall be a part of teacher education curricula, so that student teachers know well about the aggression and its handling strategies while classroom management.
- In colleges, especially, responsibility lies with the administration to provide conducive and relaxed environment to reduce the aggression levels to the minimal point.
- Awareness and anger management seminars and workshops are one way to equip teachers and students to deal with aggression.
- Peer relation is an important aspect suggested to neutralize aggression.
- Further research should be conducted to establish correlation or cause-effect-cause relationship between aggression and its types, especially a comparative study featuring a developed country and a developing country is suggested by the researchers.
- The researchers used descriptive statistical techniques only but further research could adopt other data analyses techniques.
- The current research could be replicated on similar educational institutions with larger sample

Discussion and Conclusion

In short, we can conclude that there is no agreement on streamwise disparities on aggression, but research is spread in order to

suggest that sciences student teachers are strong, equivalent or low on aggression to humanities student teachers. Most of the latest study, however, shows that there is no substantial stream wise variation in violence. The current study also supports the view and shows that student teachers

of sciences as well as humanities are equal in experiencing aggression. However, the current study includes a tiny sample, which becomes its delimitation, but it provides new insights to developing a new involvement in conducting studies in areas related to aggression.

References

- Akhtar, J., & Kushwaha, A. K. S., (2015). Gender differences in aggressive behavior of adolescents. 5. 525-527
- Agrawal, M., & Sk, N. (2017). *Predictors of Academic Performance: Emotional Intelligence and Stream among Graduate Students*. 8(3), 743–750. <https://doi.org/10.5958/2230-7311.2017.00130.1>
- Deb S., Kumar A., Holden G.W., Rowe L.S. School corporal punishment, family tension, and students' internalizing problems: evidence from India. *Sch. Psychol. Int.* 2017;38(1):60–77.
- Edalati, A., & Redzuan, M., (2010) women aggression (A Review). Report and opinion, 2
- Fayaz, I. (2019). *Asian Journal of Multidimensional Research*, 8 (2).
- Geiger B. Sixth graders in Israel recount their experience of verbal abuse by teachers in the classroom. *Child Abuse Negl.* 2017; 63:95–105
- Gershoff E.T. School corporal punishment in global perspective: prevalence, outcomes, and efforts at intervention. *Psychol. Health Med.* 2017;22(S1):224–239.
- Longobardi C., Settanni M., Prino L.E., Gastaldi F.G.M. Emotionally abusive behavior in Italian middle school teachers as identified by students. *J. Interpers Violence.* 2018;33(8):1327–1347.
- Johnston, A. W. (2003). *Scholarship at Windsor A correlational study of emotional intelligence and aggression in adolescent*.
- Ministry of Human Resource Development. (2020). National Education Policy 2020
- Government of India. *Government of India*. https://www.mhrd.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/NEP_Final_English.pdf
- Myles, B. S. (1993). A survey of teachers needs and concerns in responding to problem students. Unpublished manuscript. Department of Special Education, University of Kansas, Lawrence.
- N Shaban, P Kumar (2016), Young Adults and Aggression: A Comparative Study of Gender Differences, *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, Volume 3, Issue 4, No. 57, ISSN 2348-5396 (e), ISSN: 2349-3429 (p), DIP: 18.01.031/20160304, ISBN: 978-1-365-23993-9
- <https://oapub.org/edu/index.php/ejep/article/view/647/1812>