Reactions to Provocation and Feelings About Aggression in an Indian sample

VanLal Thanzami, School of Psychology, University of Central Lancashire, Preston, United Kingdom
John Archer, School of Psychology, University of Central Lancashire, Preston, United Kingdom

Vol. 7 (2) 2013

Reactions to Provocation and Feelings About Aggression in an Indian sample

VanLal Thanzami, School of Psychology, University of Central Lancashire, Preston, United Kingdom
John Archer, School of Psychology, University of Central Lancashire, Preston, United Kingdom

Western studies have found that men tend to view their aggression as instrumental whereas women tend to view it in expressive terms. A preliminary qualitative study on an Indian sample found low internal consistency for these measures, and that men viewed their aggression in both instrumental and expressive terms. The present study used scenarios to examine feelings about aggression in 300 males and females in India, aged 16 and 26 years. Males were more likely to view aggression in terms of loss of control, shame for family, and acceptability, while 16-year-olds were more likely to feel shame and embarrassment following aggression. These robust findings indicate that for this sample feelings about aggression are more complex than the two constructs, instrumental and expressive, can capture.

Research into beliefs and feelings about aggression was initiated in the West by Campbell and Muncer (1987), who set out to examine "social representations" of aggression in the conversations of men and women. They found sex differences in the way people viewed their aggression, with men tending to have instrumental and women expressive views. While an instrumental view serves to justify an aggressive action, an expressive view excuses the action by emphasising loss of control (Campbell, Muncer, and Coyle 1992). Campbell, Muncer, and Coyle (1992) developed the Expressions of Aggression Scale (Expagg), consisting of twenty forced-choice items measuring instrumental and expressive "social representations" of aggression, which has been expanded and refined since then (Archer and Haigh 1997a; Campbell et al. 1999; Muncer and Campbell 2004).

Most of the studies that have used the Expagg have been conducted in the United Kingdom (Archer and Haigh 1997a, 1997b; Archer and Latham 2004; Campbell, Muncer, and Coyle 1992; Campbell and Muncer 1994; Campbell et al. 1999; Driscoll et al. 2006; Holland, Ireland, and Muncer 2009; Thanzami and Archer 2005) or the United States (Campbell, Muncer, and Gorman 1993), with studies also in the Slovak Republic (Baumgartner 1995), and the Phil-

ippines (Puyat 2001). Cross-national studies have compared French and American students (Richardson and Huguet 2001) and Spanish and Japanese samples (Ramirez, Andreu, and Fujihara 2001). All these studies have shown consistent sex differences in the way men and women view their aggression, in accordance with the first study by Campbell, Muncer, and Coyle (1992).

To explore the extent to which previous findings on aggression from individualist cultures such as the United Kingdom and the United States generalized to a collectivist culture, Thanzami and Archer (2013) used the Expagg on sixteen- and twenty-six-year-old males and females in eastern India. The instrumental (I) and expressive (E) scales showed low internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha: I = .50, E = .29), and males endorsed both instrumental and expressive views significantly more than females.

The low reliabilities found for the Expagg suggest that the items on these scales do not hold the same meaning for the sample used. Based on the methodology used by the authors of the Expagg (Campbell and Muncer 1987), Thanzami, Archer, and Sullivan (2011) conducted a qualitative study among a similar Indian sample. The findings

indicated that although there were instrumental and expressive components involved in the way this sample viewed their aggression, there were other equally important issues, such as gender role conformity and the way the respondent would be perceived by members of their ingroup. One of the characteristics of a collectivist sample such as this is the importance members pay to ingroup norms. Thus the way the particular sample viewed their aggression was very much associated with their cultural beliefs and perceptions.

Feelings of shame with respect to their own aggression appeared to be a particularly important part of the belief system of this sample. This is what we might expect from a collectivist culture, as self-conscious emotions such as shame arise as a result of self-evaluations, and the type of self-evaluations a person has will be linked to their experience of these emotions. Because collectivist cultures tend to hold interdependent self-construals (Markus and Kitayama 1991), people from these cultures will be more likely to experience shame than those from individualist cultures. For example, in a study comparing young adults from India and Italy, Anolli and Pascucci (2005) found that the Indian sample reacted more intensely to shame and had higher levels of shame-proneness.

The aim of the present study was to use scenarios involving situations to which people from a collectivist sample would be able to relate. The scenarios were based on findings from the qualitative study examining views and feelings about aggression among a similar sample (Thanzami, Archer, and Sullivan 2011). Although not widely employed, scenarios have been used as a measuring device in research into adult aggression. For example, van Goozen, Frijda, Kindt, and van de Poll (1994) used provoking scenarios to measure women's emotional responses to provocation. O'Connor, Archer, and Wu (2001) also used provoking scenarios, to measure aggression in men. The use of this method enables participants to "put themselves" in the described situation, allowing them to respond more precisely about how they feel or would feel like reacting. Responses to questionnaires on aggression usually ask what the person typically does, which may differ from real situations due to the absence of a provoca-

tion (which is usually the main initiator for an aggressive response in real life).

In the present study, scenarios involving a variety of provocations were used to assess a range of different hypothetical responses, and participants were also asked how they would feel if they had responded with physical aggression in order to evaluate how they viewed their own physical aggression. We therefore investigated first, the range of responses to provocation (behavior), and second how people would view their aggression once it had occurred (their feelings about their aggression).

Although this was to some extent an exploratory study, certain hypotheses were formulated based on the themes identified in the qualitative study (Thanzami, Archer, and Sullivan 2011), and from the consensus in previous studies involving Western samples, particularly in relation to sex differences. In the first part of the scenario, concerned with behavior, it was predicted: (i) that males would show more direct forms of aggression than females (Archer 2004); and (ii) that females would endorse responses that were indirect and internalised more so than males. In the exploratory study (Thanzami, Archer, and Sullivan 2011) both men and women emphasised the importance of remaining in control: hence another aim of this study was to examine whether there was a sex difference in remaining in control and not responding with aggression when participants were faced with scenario-based situations involving a provocation.

In the second part of the scenario, concerned with feelings about aggression, it was predicted that males would report a more instrumental view of their behaviour, as found in studies using the Expagg (Archer and Haigh 1997a, 1997b; Campbell, Muncer, and Coyle 1992; Campbell, Muncer, and Gorman 1993; Puyat 2001; Ramirez et al. 2001). This was expected because men show more direct aggression than women do (Archer 2004) and studies have shown a strong association between instrumental beliefs and direct forms of aggression (Archer and Haigh 1997a, 1997b). In the qualitative study (Thanzami, Archer, and Sullivan 2011), feelings of shame and embarrassment (self-conscious emotions) were emphasised when the respondents

talked about their aggression. We therefore examined whether there were any sex or age differences in endorsement of these feelings.

In summary, the overall aim of this study is to understand and obtain a clearer view of how people in this culture respond to a range of hypothetical provocations, and how they viewed their aggression once it had occurred.

1. Method

1.1. Construction of the Scenarios

Twelve scenarios were constructed based on the findings of a previous qualitative study (Thanzami, Archer, and Sullivan 2011) that investigated how a similar sample viewed their aggression. Each scenario consisted of a provoking situation, followed by a list of nine responses asking participants how they would react in that particular situation (i.e. their behavioral responses). The second part of the scenario instructed participants to imagine they had responded with physical aggression in the previously described situation. They were asked to assess how they would feel afterwards in terms of nine response categories derived from the exploratory study (i.e. their feelings). Like the Expagg, these responses included instrumental and expressive feelings, but also the emotions of shame, embarrassment, and guilt (see the Appendix for all the scenarios and responses).

The scenarios were identical for the two age groups, except in four cases where the situation and the provoking opponents were modified to be more appropriate for the particular age group: for example, a scene involving an employer as an authority figure was used for the older age group whereas a teacher was used for the younger age group. The following example is one of the scenarios for the sixteen-year-olds:

> Imagine this: you are in the school playground and you see a group of students standing together looking at you and laughing. You know they don't like you and that they are talking about you. What would you do?

Responses to each scenario consisted of two parts. In the first part, concerning behavior, the participant was asked to rate his or her responses to the provoking situation

along a five-point scale (ranging from 1 = most unlikely to 5 = most likely) for each of the following nine behaviours:

1. Get angry and respond with physical aggression (physical aggression)
2. Yell at the person (verbal aggression)
3. Let those around you know you are angry (overt expression of anger)
4. Express your anger towards an object by kicking a wall or slamming a door (explosive act directed away from provocation)
5. Cry (expression of upset)
6. Feel like crying but wait until you are alone (delayed expression of upset)
7. Leave and sulk (avoid the situation)
8. Spread rumours about him/her (indirect aggression)
9. Control your feelings and remain calm (control of feelings)

The second part (concerned with feelings) asked participants how they would feel if they had responded with physical aggression in the described scenario. The following instructions were given:

> Imagine that you became extremely outraged and you responded with physical aggression, like hitting out at one of them. How would you feel afterwards?

Participants were then presented with nine feelings and were asked to choose as many responses as was appropriate for them by ticking alongside them (listed here are the feelings they were intended to measure):

1. It would be ok or acceptable (instrumental)
2. I would feel the other person asked for it (instrumental)
3. I would feel ashamed of myself (shame)
4. I would feel ashamed for my family (shame)
5. I would feel embarrassed for my family, or myself (embarrassment)
6. It would have been wrong to do so (guilt)
7. I would feel guilty and regret my actions (guilt)
8. I would feel that I had lost control (expressive view of aggression)
9. Any other feelings

1.2. Participants

The sample consisted of participants from the northeastern Indian state of Mizoram, with two age groups, sixteen-and twenty-six-year-olds. There were 300 participants in all: seventy-five sixteen-year-old males, seventy-five sixteen-year-old females, seventy-five twenty-six-year-old males, and seventy-five twenty-six-

year-old females. The 16-year-old participants were recruited from schools in the city of Aizawl, the state capital of Mizoram. Participants filled out the questionnaires in a classroom setting and the completion rate was 83 percent. For the older age group, participants were recruited by going to workplaces such as offices, colleges/ universities, schools, and social gatherings where members of the relevant age group could be expected to be found. The completion rate for this group was 100 percent as questionnaires were handed out only to participants who belonged to the required age group and were willing to participate in the study. The sample was English-speaking, so the scenarios were presented in English. Similar samples have been used for other studies (Archer and Thanzami 2007, 2009; Archer, Fernández-Fuertes, and Thanzami 2010).

2. Results

2.1. Internal Consistency of Measure

Cronbach's alphas for each of the nine responses to the twelve scenarios were acceptable, ranging from .73 to .87. Cronbach's alpha for the eight feelings experienced after reacting with physical aggression were also acceptable, ranging from .72 to .84. This shows a degree of consistency across the situations for both measures, and for this reason the values were combined from the twelve scenarios for each of the behaviours. The behaviors and feelings were

not combined as single scales as they are not intended to measure single concepts.

2.2. Correlations Between Responses and Feelings

Correlations between the responses to the scenarios and feelings after responding with physical aggression were computed and are presented in Table 1. Significant positive correlations were found between the direct forms of aggression, such as physical and verbal aggression, and the instrumental view of physical aggression as acceptable (physical aggression: $r = .22$; $p < .001$, verbal aggression: $r = .19$; $p < .005$). There were significant negative correlations between self-conscious emotions (such as embarrassment) and physical aggression ($r = -.12$; $p < .05$) and expressing anger ($r = -.13$; $p < .05$). Responding to the scenarios by remaining calm and in control was negatively and significantly associated with all the direct forms and expressions of anger and aggression, such as physical aggression ($r = -.32$; $p < .001$), verbal aggression ($r = -.25$; $p < .001$), overt expression of anger ($r = -.23$; $p < .001$), and expressing anger ($r = -.21$; $p < .001$), as well as with the view that physical aggression was acceptable ($r = -.13$; $p < .05$). Viewing acts of physical aggression as a loss of control was significantly and positively associated with the self-conscious emotions of shame ($r = .29$; $p < .001$), shame for the family ($r = .26$; $p < .001$) and embarrassment ($r = .14$; $p < .05$).

Table 1: Zero-order correlations between some responses to scenarios and feelings after responding with physical aggression

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Physical aggression	–								
2. Verbal aggression	.41**	–							
3. Overt expression of anger	.34**	.42**	–						
4. Explosive act directed away from provocation	.45**	.38**	.38**	–					
5. Control of feelings	-.32**	-.25**	-.23**	-.21**	–				
6. Instrumental (acceptable)	.22**	.19*	.11	.04	-.13*	–			
7. Shame	-.09	-.01	-.09	-.02	.07	-.06	–		
8. Shame for family	-.02	.08	-.03	.03	.07	.01	.51**	–	
9. Embarrassing	-.12*	-.03	-.08	-.12*	.02	.29**	.29**	.40**	–
10. Expressive (lost control)	-.003	-.07	.06	-.11*	.04	.29**	.29**	.26**	.14*

Note: ** – $p < .01$; * – $p < .05$
1 – 5: Responses to scenarios; 6 – 10: Feelings experienced after responding with physical aggression

2.3. Sex and Age Differences in Responses to Scenarios

A factorial MANOVA (sex x age) was conducted to examine the effects of age and sex on each of the nine responses across the twelve scenarios combined. A MANOVA was used as the specific items for both the behavioral responses and the feelings were not intended to measure overall con-cepts. This approach was used previously where response items were relatively loosely associated (Thanzami and Archer 2013). The means and standard deviations for males and females and the sixteen- and twenty-six-year-olds for each of the nine responses to the scenarios are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Means and standard deviations for males and females and 16– and 26-year-olds in responses to the 12 scenarios

Variables	Male $n = 75$		Female $n = 75$		16 years old $n = 75$		26 years old $n = 75$	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
1. Physical aggression	26.51***	4.47	22.03	7.73	25.88**	8.80	22.65	7.69
2. Verbal aggression	28.77	9.32	28.15	8.46	28.41	7.96	28.52	9.77
3. Overt expression of anger	34.36	9.02	34.94	9.64	33.73	9.71	35.57	8.85
4. Explosive act directed away from provocation	22.81	9.25	21.03	7.84	21.51	8.81	22.33	8.40
5. Expression of upset	17.58	9.36	25.39***	9.50	20.56	8.95	22.41	9.46
6. Delayed expression of upset	22.89	9.86	33.01***	10.62	25.85	10.13	30.05**	12.26
7. Avoid the situation	27.75	7.67	29.99*	7.77	29.37	7.56	28.37	8.00
8. Indirect aggression	28.39	8.82	29.19	9.23	27.29	9.68	30.30**	8.07
9. Control of feelings	41.65	8.87	42.93	8.98	42.00	9.95	42.57	7.81

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$

2.4. Sex and Age Differences Concerning Feelings after Responding with Physical Aggression

The means and standard deviations of feelings after responding with physical aggression for males and females and for the sixteen and twenty-six-year-olds are presented in Table 3. A factorial MANOVA (sex x age) was also used to investigate each of the feelings following responding to the scenarios with physical aggression, again because the responses were not intended to measure a single concept.

There was an overall main effect for both sex [$F(1,296) = 4.44; p < .001$] and age [$F(1,296) = 3.59; p < .01$] but no significant interaction [$F(1,296) = 1.54; p = .14$]. Table 3 indicates that males were more likely than females to endorse feelings that physical aggression was "OK" ($d = .34, t = 2.89; p < .005$), that physical aggression would be shameful for their families ($d = .40, t = 3.45; p < .005$), and

that responding with physical aggression would make them feel they had lost control ($d = .23, t = 2.03; p < .05$).

Table 3 also indicates that the sixteen-year-old participants significantly endorsed feelings of shame ($d = .36, t = 2.91; p < .005$), shame for their families ($d = .39, t = 3.40; p < .005$), and embarrassment ($d = .47, t = 4.05; p < .0001$) more than the twenty-six-year-olds. On the other hand, twenty-six-year-olds were more likely to endorse feelings that the other person asked for it ($d = -.25, t = -2.14; p < .05$) than the sixteen-year-olds.

Table 3: Means and standard deviations for males and females and 16– and 26-year-olds in feelings experienced after responding with physical aggression

Feeling after responding with physical aggression	Male n = 75		Female n = 75		6 years old n = 75		26 years old n = 75	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
1. Instrumental (acceptable)	2.53**	2.62	1.72	2.19	2.06	2.36	2.19	2.54
2. Instrumental (asked for it)	1.83	2.32	1.90	2.25	1.59	2.05	2.15*	2.47
3. Shame	4.59	3.20	4.25	3.02	4.93**	3.17	3.90	2.97
4. Shame for family	1.95**	2.50	1.09	1.75	1.95**	2.48	1.10	1.78
5. Embarrassing	1.74	2.46	2.29	2.55	2.59***	2.87	1.44	1.95
6. Guilt (regret)	4.10	3.33	4.08	3.36	4.23	3.41	3.95	3.27
7. Guilt (wrong)	3.29	2.85	3.33	2.88	3.36	2.89	3.26	2.84
8. Expressive (lost control)	5.84*	3.37	5.04	3.46	5.71	3.43	5.17	3.42

Note: Asterisks indicate significant (* = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .005$; *** = $p < .0001$) main effects in a 2x2 MANOVA (2 sex x 2 age) for responses to scenarios and feelings after responding with physical aggression. There were no significant interactions.

3. Discussion

The aim of the present study was to examine how participants from an Indian, collectivist sample viewed their aggression by using scenarios constructed using the findings of an exploratory study with a similar sample. The scenarios consisted of provoking situations that participants were likely to encounter in their daily lives, with responses in two parts: the first part consisted of typical behaviors in response to the situation while the other consisted of how they would feel after having responded with physical aggression. Examining thoughts and feelings associated with having engaged in physical aggression would indicate how they viewed their own aggression, an issue addressed by the Expagg in Western samples.

As predicted, males reported significantly more physical aggression than females in response to the provoking scenarios. The difference applied in both age groups, although effect sizes were larger for the younger group. The pattern of sex difference is similar to that found in past research measuring physical aggression, mostly but not exclusively in Western samples, where males score significantly higher than females in self-reported and scenario measures of aggression (Archer 2004; 2009; Archer, Ireland, and Power 2007; Reinisch and Sanders 1986). There was also a significant age difference for physical aggression, with the younger sample scoring higher than

the older sample. This supports previous findings that physical aggression decreases with age during young adulthood (e.g. Archer and Haigh 1997a; Harris 1996; O'Connor, Archer, and Wu 2001).

Females of both ages showed significantly higher scores than males for both "cry" and "cry when alone", which is again consistent with past research (Lombardo et al. 1983; Williams and Morris 1996). The present finding that in response to a provoking situation, women report crying more than men is likely to be due at least partially to the gender role socialization, in that the masculine role includes suppression of the expression of negative emotions, which are associated with girls or women (Archer 1992). Thus, men become more practiced at suppressing their feelings due to the social pressures to not cry that they experience (Scheff and Bushnell 1984). Borgquist (1906) found that amongst students, crying occurred as a result of three mood states, namely, grief or sadness, anger, and joy. Vingerhoets, van Geleuken, van Tilburg and van Heck (1997) also found that amongst women, one of the common situations that resulted in crying was being faced with a conflict situation.

There was also a significant age difference for crying when alone, with the older respondents scoring higher than the younger respondents. One possible explanation is that their

social roles as adults included the expectation that they should not display public crying; there is greater pressure for them not to be seen crying in front of others, as that could damage their self-image. This explanation is supported by a series of studies (Frey 1985; Williams and Morris 1996; Vingerhoets and Becht 1997; Vingerhoets et al. 1997) finding that adults often cry when alone. The Expagg (Campbell et al. 1999) includes an item involving crying on the instrumental scale. From an instrumental viewpoint, crying is a more negative response than hitting an opponent in an argument. Because men endorse instrumental beliefs about aggression to a greater extent than women do, they are more likely to be annoyed if they cried rather than hit the person with whom they were arguing.

Females showed higher scores than males on "leave and sulk", which is consistent with the finding of Campbell and Muncer (2008) that women are more likely than men to engage in "defusing" non-injurious angry behaviour as a result of their greater inhibitory control. Girls show greater effortful control than boys from early in life (Else-Quest et al. 2006). Few studies have examined sulking as a response to provocation. In their study on indirect aggression amongst children, Bjorkqvist, Lagerspetz, and Kaukiainen (1992) included sulking as a response to feelings of anger. They found that girls sulked more than boys ($d = -.51$), and that the sex difference was greater at eleven and fifteen years of age than at age eight.

Spreading rumours is a central feature of the category described as indirect or relational aggression (Archer and Coyne 2005). In our study, the older participants scored higher than the younger participants although there were no overall sex differences. This direction of finding is interesting as it would be expected from previous research that the younger participants would indulge more in this type of behaviour (Owens 1996; Bjorkqvist 1994), although previous studies did not involve the age groups used in the present study. In our study, younger females showed lower mean scores than the other three groups for this response, which is contrary to previous findings where adolescent girls reported more instances of this behaviour than male adolescents (Bjorkqvist, Lagerspetz, and Kaukiainen 1992; Owens 1996). However, in the preceding qualitative study

(Thanzami, Archer, and Sullivan 2011) the most common response to conflict among sixteen-year-old girls was confrontation rather than an indirect response such as spreading rumours.

Although there were no sex or age differences in "remain calm and in control", it was the most frequent response, indicating that overall these respondents attached greatest importance to remaining calm and in control when faced with a provoking situation. It should be kept in mind that respondents were able to choose more than one response for each scenario, so that although the response of remaining in control was the most frequently chosen option, it may have been accompanied by others.

The second section of the scenarios asked how the respondent would feel afterwards, had they responded with physical aggression. It had been predicted that males would endorse instrumental feelings to a greater extent than females would. There was a sex difference in the male direction for feeling that responding with physical aggression was "OK and acceptable", which is consistent with the higher male scores for physical aggression. The correlations between physical aggression and feeling that it was "acceptable" was positive and significant but small. Viewing aggressive behaviour as "acceptable" corresponds to some extent with the instrumental view of aggression, whereby aggression is seen as an acceptable response, which in turn is positively associated with physical aggression (Archer and Haigh 1997a,b).

There were age differences, but no sex differences in feelings that the opponent had "asked for it", which corresponds closely with instrumental beliefs measured by the Expagg. The 26-year-olds showed higher scores than the sixteen-year-olds, although the effect size was small. This was unexpected, as instrumental responses were expected to occur to a greater extent in the younger group, as they are usually more directly aggressive, as was the case in this sample. However, this unexpected finding can be supported by the lack of significant age difference for feeling that physical aggression was "OK and acceptable", another instrumental response. In the exploratory study (Thanzami, Archer, and Sullivan 2011) the older group had

talked about it being wrong to react physically, but if the other person started the fight or if the subject was doing it for a reason (such as getting back at someone), they would then think the other person asked for it. Thus the opponent and the situation to which they were responding influenced the response in this age group. We should also note that there were no sex differences in this response.

There was a sex difference in the male direction for feelings of shame for the family. This is consistent with the role of men as family protectors, where one aspect of protection would involve ensuring that the family's name is not tarnished. This is a common theme in societies where traditional values prevail and can be exaggerated as the culture of honour (Cohen and Nisbett 1996). The younger age group reported more feelings of shame for the family than the older age group.

The younger group also scored higher than the older group for feelings of shame and embarrassment. Feelings of shame are associated with perceptions of being criticised, devalued, and disapproved by others for actions that others find undesirable or unattractive (Gilbert 1998; Tangney 1996). This implies that shame is closely associated with behaving in a way that is held to be undesirable. In the present case, responding with physical aggression is associated with being disapproved of and devalued by others, and therefore leads to shame. Because the sixteen-year-olds endorsed more physical aggression, it is likely that they would report greater feelings of shame, as behaving aggressively would be a behaviour that is disapproved by others.

There was a small sex difference in the male direction for the feeling of having lost control. This is inconsistent with previous findings using the Expagg – mainly in individualist cultures – that women were more likely to view their aggression as an expression of loss of control (Campbell, Muncer, and Gorman 1993; Campbell et al. 1999; Camp-

bell and Muncer 1994; Archer and Haigh 1997a, 1997b, 1999). In the present sample, it is possible that men are more likely to feel the need to be in control, due to the pressure of responsibility, and will hence have a tendency to view their aggression as stemming from a loss of control. The tendency for males to hold more expressive beliefs is consistent with the findings of the preceding study (Thanzami and Archer 2013) where males scored significantly higher than females on the expressive scale as well as on the instrumental scale. For these samples, instrumental and expressive beliefs are likely to be related and form part of a single belief system, particularly for males, which involves both the justification of physical aggression in certain circumstances, yet a feeling that it also involves guilt and a sense of loss of control.

These results show certain patterns consistent with those found previously in Western studies, and others that are inconsistent. Also, in line with previous evidence, the present study showed that males endorsed feelings closely related to expressive beliefs (e.g. feeling that they had lost control) alongside feelings closely resembling instrumental beliefs (that physical aggression was "OK" and acceptable). The explanation for these findings probably lies in the requirements of the male role in this culture. Here, the roles and responsibilities of a man are given greater importance than is the case in Western samples. The participants in this study belong to a patrilineal society where the role of the male is one of authority. But authority and power come with responsibility that means they have to be more cautious about their actions. Because of this, the issue of control has greater weight for them, and they more readily view their aggression as a form of loss of control. On the whole, the pattern of responses is robust and explains much about how this population view their aggression. Although instrumental and expressive views are clearly present in the ways this sample views their aggression, other-focussed beliefs also form an integral part of the way they view their aggression.

References

Anolli, Luigi, and Patrizia Pascucci. 2005. Guilt and guilt-proneness, shame and shame-proneness in Indian and Italian young adults. *Personality and Individual Differences* 39:763–773.

Archer, John. 1992. Childhood Gender Roles: Social Context and Organization. In *Childhood Social Development: Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. Harry McGurk, 31–61. Hove, UK: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Archer, John. 2004. Sex Differences in Aggression in Real-World Settings: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Review of General Psychology* 8:291–322.

Archer, John. 2009. Does Sexual Selection Explain Human Sex Differences in Human Aggression? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 32:249–311.

Archer, John, and Sarah M. Coyne. 2005. An Integrated Review of Indirect, Relational, and Social Aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 9:212–30.

Archer, John, and Anadelle Haigh. 1997a. Do Beliefs about Aggression Predict Self-reported Levels of Aggression? *British Journal of Social Psychology* 36:83–105.

Archer, John, and Anadelle Haigh. 1997b. Beliefs about Aggression among Male and Female Prisoners. *Aggressive Behavior* 23:405–15.

Archer, John, and Anadelle Haigh. 1999. Sex Differences in Beliefs about Aggression: Opponent's Sex and the Form of Aggression. *British Journal of Social Psychology* 38:71:84.

Archer, John, Jane L. Ireland, and Christina L. Power. 2007. Differences between Bullies and Victims, and Men and Women, on Aggression-related Variables among Prisoners. *British Journal of Social Psychology* 46:299–322.

Archer, John, and Marcus Latham. 2004. Variations in Beliefs about Aggression as a Function of Relation to the Opponent. *Personality and Individual Differences* 37:33–41.

Archer, John, and VanLal Thanzami. 2007. The Relation between Physical Aggression, Size and Strength, among a Sample of Young Indian Men. *Personality and Individual Differences* 43:627–33.

Archer, John, and VanLal Thanzami. 2009. The Relation between Mate Value, Entitlement, Physical Aggression, Size and Strength, among a Sample of Young Indian Men. *Evolution and Human Behavior* 30:315–21.

Archer, John, Andrés A. Fernández-Fuertes, and VanLal Thanzami. 2010. Does Cost-benefit Analysis or Self-control Predict Involvement in Two Forms of Aggression? *Aggressive Behavior* 36:292–304

Baumgartner, František. 1995. Effects of Instrumental vs. Expressive Views of Aggression in Strategies of Aggressive Behaviour. *Studia Psychologica* 37, 197–98.

Bjorkqvist, Kaj, Kirsti M. J. Lagerspetz, and Ari Kaukiainen. 1992. Do Girls Manipulate And Boys Fight? Developmental Trends in Regard to Direct and Indirect Aggression. *Aggressive Behavior* 18:117–27.

Bjorkqvist, Kaj. 1994. Sex Differences in Physical, Verbal and Indirect Aggression. *Sex Roles* 30:177–88.

Borgquist, Alvin. 1906. Crying. *American Psychology* 17:149–205.

Campbell, Anne, and Steven Muncer. 1987. Models of Anger and Aggression in the Social Talk of Men and Women. *Journal of the Theory of Social Behavior* 17:489–511.

Campbell, Anne, and Steven Muncer. 1994. Sex Differences in Aggression: Social Representations and Social Roles. *British Journal of Social Psychology* 33:233–40.

Campbell, Anne, Steven Muncer, and Edward Coyle. 1992. Social Representation of Aggression as an Explanation of Gender Differences: A Preliminary Study. *Aggressive Behavior* 18:95–108.

Campbell, Anne, Steven Muncer, and Bernard Gorman. 1993. Gender and Social Representations of Aggression: A Communal-agentic Analysis. *Aggressive Behavior* 19:95–108.

Campbell, Anne, Steven Muncer, I. C. McManus, and David Woodhouse. 1999. Instrumental and Expressive Representations of Aggression: One Scale or Two? *Aggressive Behavior* 25:435–44.

Campbell, Anne, and Steven Muncer. 2008. Intent to Harm or Injure? Gender and the Expression of Aggression. *Aggressive Behavior* 34:282–93.

Cohen, Dov, and Richard E. Nisbett. 1996. Self-protection and the Culture of Honor: Explaining Southern Violence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 20:551–67.

Driscoll, Helen, Ann Zinkivskay, Kelly Evans, and Anne Campbell. 2006. Sex Differences in Social Representations of Aggression: The Phenomenological Experience of Differences in Inhibitory Control? *British Journal of Psychology* 97:139–53.

Else-Quest, Nicole M., Janet S. Hyde, H. Hill Goldsmith, and Carol A. Van Hulle. 2006. Gender Differences in Temperament: A Meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin* 132:33–72.

Frey, William H. 1985. Crying: The Mystery of Tears. Minneapolis, MN: Winston.

Gilbert, Paul. 1998. What Is Shame? Some Core Issues and Controversies. In *Shame: Interpersonal Behaviour, Psychopathology and Culture*, ed. Paul Gilbert and Bernice Andrews, 3–38. New York: Oxford University Press.

Harris, Mary B. 1996. Aggressive Experiences and Aggressiveness: Relationship to Ethnicity, Gender, and Age. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 26:843–70.

Holland, Dominique, Jane L. Ireland, and Steven Muncer. 2009. Impulsivity, Attribution and Prison Bullying: Bully-category and Perpetrator-victim Mutuality. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry* 32:84–91.

Lombardo, William K., Gary A. Cretser, Barbara Lombardo, and Sharon L. Mathis. 1983. Fer Cryin' Out Loud – There Is a Sex Difference. *Sex Roles* 9:987–95.

Markus, Hazel R., and Shinobu Kitayama. 1991. Culture and Self: Implications for Cognition, Emotion and Motivation. *Psychological Review* 98:224–53.

Muncer, Steven, and Anne Campbell. 2004. Confirmatory Factor Analysis and the Factor Structure of Expagg in Context: A Reply to Forrest et al., 2002. *Aggressive Behavior* 30:146–57.

O'Connor, Daryl B., John Archer, and Frederick W.C. Wu. 2001. Measuring Aggression: Self-reports, Partner Reports and Responses to Provoking Scenarios. *Aggressive Behavior* 27:79–101.

Owens, Laurence. 1996. Sticks and Stones and Sugar and Spice: Girls' and Boys' Aggression in Schools. *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counselling* 6:45–55.

Puyat, Joseph H. 2001. The Social Representation of Aggression among Student Groups in UP Diliman: An Exploratory Study. *Aggressive Behavior* 27:256–57.

Ramirez, J. Martin, J. Manuel Andreu, and Takehiro Fujihara. 2001. Cultural and Sex Differences in Aggression: A Comparison between Japanese and Spanish Students Using Two Different Inventories. *Aggressive Behavior* 27:313–22.

Reinisch, June M., and Stephanie A. Sanders. 1986. A Test of Sex Differences in Aggressive Response to Hypothetical Conflict Situations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 50:1045–49.

Richardson, Deborah S., and Pascal Huguet. 2001. Beliefs about and Experience with Aggression in the United States and France. In *Cross-Cultural Approaches to Aggression and Reconciliation*, ed. Deborah S. Richardson and J. Martin Ramirez, 73–97. Huntington, NY: Nova Science.

Scheff, Thomas J., and Don D. Bushnell. 1984. A Theory of Catharsis. *Journal of Research in Personality* 18:238–64.

Tangney, June P. 1996. Conceptual and Methodological Issues in the Assessment of Shame and Guilt. *Behaviour Research and Therapy* 34:741–54.

Thanzami, VanLal. 2004. Beliefs about Aggression from a Cross-cultural Perspective. Ph.D. diss., University of Central Lancashire, United Kingdom.

Thanzami, VanLal, John Archer, and Cath Sullivan. 2011. A Qualitative Investigation into Beliefs about Aggression in an Indian Sample. *Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research* 3:199–209.

Thanzami, VanLal, and John Archer. 2005. Beliefs about Aggression in British Students from Individualist and Collectivist Cultures. *Aggressive Behavior* 31, 350–58.

Thanzami, VanLal, and John Archer. 2013. Beliefs about Aggression in an Indian sample *Psychological Studies* 58 (2): 133–43.

Van Goozen, Stephanie H. M., Nico H. Frijda, Merel Kindt, and Nanne E. Van de Poll. 1994. Anger Proneness in Women: Development and Validation of the Anger Situation Questionnaire. *Aggressive Behavior* 20:79–100.

Vingerhoets, Ad J. J. M., and Marleen C. Becht. 1997. International Study on Adult Crying: Some First Results. Poster presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychosomatic Society, Santa Fe, NM.

Vingerhoets, Ad J. J. M., Ali J. M. L. Van Geleuken, Miranda A. L. Van Tilburg, and Guus L. Van Heck. 1997. The Psychological Context of Crying Episodes: Toward a Model of Adult Crying. In *The (Non)Expression of Emotions in Health and Disease*, ed. Ad J. J. M. Vingerhoets, F. J. Van Bussel, and A. J. W Boelhouwer, 323–36. Tilburg, the Netherlands: Tilburg University Press.

Williams, D. G., and Gabrielle H. Morris. 1996. Crying, Weeping or Tearfulness in British and Israeli Adults. *British Journal of Psychology* 87:479–505.

Appendix

The 12 scenarios used in the study

1. Imagine this: you are in the school playground [you come into work] one morning and you see a group of students [your colleagues] standing together looking at you and laughing. You know they don't like you and that they are talking about you. What would you do? Rate how likely or unlikely you are to respond with the following behaviors along the five-point scale provided where:
   1 = very unlikely
   2 = quite unlikely
   3 = neither likely nor unlikely
   4 = quite likely
   5 = very likely

1) Get angry and respond with physical aggression, like hitting out at them	1	2	3	4	5
2) Yell at them	1	2	3	4	5
3) Leave and sulk	1	2	3	4	5
4) Cry	1	2	3	4	5
5) Control your feelings and remain calm	1	2	3	4	5
6) Feel like crying but wait until you are alone	1	2	3	4	5
7) Let those around you know you are angry	1	2	3	4	5
8) Express your anger towards an object, such as kicking a wall or slamming a door	1	2	3	4	5
9) Go and tell your friends bad things about them	1	2	3	4	5

   Imagine that you became extremely outraged in the situation described, and you responded with physical aggression, like hitting out. How would you feel afterwards? Please tick one or more of the following alternatives:
   1) That it would be ok or acceptable
   2) I would feel ashamed of myself
   3) I would feel ashamed for my family
   4) I would feel that I had lost control
   5) I would feel embarrassed for myself/family
   6) I would feel the other person asked for it
   7) It would have been wrong to do so
   8) I would feel guilty and regret my actions
   9) Any other feelings

2. Imagine this: you are on a night out with friends and a stranger who appears to be drunk walks up to you and starts verbally abusing you. What would you do? Rate how likely or unlikely you are to respond with the following behaviors along the five-point scale provided where:

3. Imagine this: you and a friend[colleague] are working on a project at school[work] when another student [colleague] challenges you to a physical fight and calls you a "coward" when you try to back out. What would you do? Rate how likely or unlikely you are to respond with the following behaviors along the five-point scale provided where:

4. Imagine this: your mother has asked you to tidy your room for the past week but you still haven't got around to doing that. You are watching TV and she comes in and switches it off and asks you again to tidy your room. What would you do? Rate how likely or unlikely you are to respond with the following behaviors along the five-point scale provided where:

5. Imagine this: you are hanging out with your friends and having a good time when they start teasing you about some issues they know you are sensitive about, and you start getting annoyed. What would you do? Rate how likely or unlikely you are to respond with the following behaviors along the five-point scale provided where:

6. Imagine this: a group of people you don't like much have been verbally harassing your close relative for some time and threatening physical harm. One evening you are hurriedly summoned and told that your relative was in a fight with this gang. What would you do? Rate how likely or unlikely you are to respond with the following behaviors along the five-point scale provided where:

7. Imagine this: you are at a social gathering having a great time when you overhear a group of people you know (but don't really like much) saying nasty things about you, what would you do? Rate how likely or unlikely you are to respond with the following behaviors along the five-point scale provided where:

8. Imagine this: you are at school [work]when your teacher [boss]accuses you of doing something wrong when it wasn't you. How would you react? Rate how likely or unlikely you are to respond with the following behaviors along the five-point scale provided where:

9. Imagine this: you and your friends are hanging out and having general discussions about different things when the conversation leads onto one of your relatives. Your friends start being insulting towards your relative. What would you do? Rate how likely or unlikely you are to respond with the following behaviors along the five-point scale provided where:

10. Imagine this: you are in school [work] and your teacher [boss] tells the whole class [your colleagues] about a mistake you made in your test [project] implying that you are silly and careless. What would you do? Rate how likely or unlikely you are to respond with the following behaviors along the five-point scale provided where:

11. Imagine this: you are at a family get-together and your mother starts comparing you to some of your successful cousins and tells everyone how you would never be successful as you are too lazy to succeed. What would you do? Rate how likely or unlikely you are to respond with the following behaviors along the five-point scale provided where:

12. Imagine this: your parents have accused you of doing something wrong when you know that it wasn't you. What would you do? Rate how likely or unlikely you are to respond with the following behaviors along the five-point scale provided where:

VanLal Thanzami
vthanzami@uclan.ac.uk

John Archer
jarcher@uclan.ac.uk