Layperson Definitions of Aggression

- We commonly use the word aggression to mean:
  - assertive
  - competitive
  - Forward/“fresh”
  - risk-taking
  - dominant, powerful
  - angry
- Factors that predict aggression are different from factors that predict these behaviors
Working Definition

• Social psychologists define *aggression* as:
  *intent to harm another*

• Problems with this:
  – hard to measure intention, so why don’t we just say “Doing harm to others?”
    • Harming without intent *shouldn’t* be called aggression
    • Not harming, but intending to do so, *should* be called aggression

Three Theoretical Perspectives on Aggression

• Psychodynamic (Freud)
• Sociobiological (Lorenz)
• Learning
  – I. Two-factor theory (Berkowitz)
  – II. Social learning (Rotter, Bandura)
  – III. GAM: General Aggression Model; (Anderson)
Freud’s Psychodynamic Perspective

- We all possess an *innate* drive for sex and aggression. They are *inescapable*.
- Society functions to inhibit direct expression of these urges, so we seek socially acceptable means to express them
  - sex: creativity, the arts
  - aggression: sports, competition
- *Hydraulic Model*: aggressive tendencies build up over time and must be released (catharsis)
- Can achieve catharsis vicariously: *watching violence can release pent-up aggressive tendencies*

Sociobiological Perspective:
Lorenz

- Aggression is innate, necessary *and adaptive*
  - Genes for aggression are passed along, whereas genes for passivity are not.
- Situational or environmental cues interact with genetic predispositions:
  - *Arousal* caused by hormones, etc.
  - A situational cue or trigger: *hard wired, not learned*
- The case of the “stickleback fish”
Learning I: Two factor theory of aggression (Berkowitz)

• We are *not* born with innate tendencies to be aggressive
• Two factors must co-occur in order to produce aggression:
  – Arousal (could be hormonal, could be externally induced)
  – External cue (learned to be associated with aggression)
Origins of 2-factor theory

• Originally stems from the “frustration-aggression hypothesis”

“Frustration, and only frustration, causes aggression, and only aggression”

Research Example:
• Children building blocks with desk-shaking button

---

Problems with the Frustration-Aggression Hypothesis

• But, hypothesis overly strong and generally not supported, because:
  – Many things can instigate aggression
    • heat, insult, modeling or conformity
  – Frustration causes other feelings and behaviours
    • helplessness, perseverance, reactance
Two-factor Theory

- *Internal arousal* +
- *External cue*, which is learned (via classical conditioning)
  
  *Both must be present*

- Examples
  - Rifle study (lab)
  - Dunking booth study (field)
  - Horn-honking studies (field)

The Presence of a Gun

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Insult</th>
<th>Insult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Gun</strong></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gun</strong></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Badminton Racquet</strong></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Amount of Aggression as defined by intensity of shocks*
The Presence of a Gun

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Insult</th>
<th>Insult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Gun</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gun</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badminton Racquet</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Amount of Aggression as defined by intensity of shocks*

The Dunking Booth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Insult</th>
<th>Insult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pasture Backdrop</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guns &amp; Saloon backdrop</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Amount of Aggression as defined by number of bean bags thrown*
The Dunking Booth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Insult</th>
<th>Insult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pasture Backdrop</strong></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guns &amp; Saloon</strong></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Amount of Aggression as defined by number of bean bags thrown*

Learning II: Social learning

- Aggression is learned, not innate
- We learn
  - either directly through reinforcement of aggressive behaviors; OR
  - by modeling others who are behaving aggressively
    - aggressive behavior must be rewarded
    - aggressive behavior must be seen as real
Bandura’s Bobo Doll Studies

- Participants were normal children
- Watched violent TV episode or various “control” episodes that were not violent
- Manipulated whether aggressor in video was rewarded or not
- Observed children in play area after they watched video
- Aggression defined as number of times the children hit the bobo doll

Results indicate that...

- Viewing *rewarded* violence increases violent behaviors in children.
- Viewing *unrewarded* violence does not necessarily increase violence
- Choice of control groups are very important when conducting this research
- So, what are the effects of watching violence? Catharsis or modeling?
Media Effects on Suicide

• U.S. suicides increase after publicized suicide stories
• the more publicity given to the suicide story, the higher the suicide rate thereafter; and
• the rise occurs mainly in the geographic area where the suicide story is publicized

Additionally, automobile fatalities also increase just after publicized suicide stories;
• the more publicity given to the stories, the greater the increase in automobile fatalities, and
• the increase occurs mainly in the area where the story is publicized.
Media Effects on Suicide

• Also, single-car crash fatalities increase more than other types, and
• the driver in these crashes is significantly similar to the person described in the suicide story, while the passengers are not.
• THEREFORE:
  – suicide stories appear to elicit additional suicides, some of which are disguised as auto accidents

Media Effects on Homicide
Phillips

• What sort of media-depicted homicide would be modeled?
  – Rewarded
  – Made exciting
  – Perceived as real
  – Culturally Justified
• What is shown on TV that fits these criteria?
  Heavyweight Prizefighting
Media Effects on Homicide  
Phillips

• Across U.S., homicide rates increased by 12.5% following highly publicized prize fights.
• The more publicized the fight, the greater the increase in the rate.
• The relationship between prize-fight and homicide rate persisted after statistically controlling for day of week, seasons, and other extraneous variables.

Media Effects on Homicide  
Phillips

• Hypothesis 1:
  – Prize fighting triggers an increase in gambling, which in turn provokes anger, fighting, and murder.
  – However, increased homicide rate did not occur following the Super Bowl. Therefore, not supported.
• Hypothesis 2:
  – Prize fight merely precipitated a murder that would have occurred anyway, even in the absence of the prize fight.
  – Found no evidence of any dip in homicides soon after the peak. Therefore, not supported.
• Hypothesis 3:
  – Social learning / modeling hypothesis. Was there victim modeling? -- is a person more likely to aggress against a target victim if his target is similar to the victim? This hypothesis was supported.
Media Effects on Homicide
Phillips

• White-loser prize fights are followed by significant increases in young, white male homicides; in contrast, Black-loser prize fights do not seem to trigger young, white male homicides

• Black-loser prize fights are followed by significant increases in young, Black male homicides. White-loser prize fights do not trigger significant increases in Black male homicides.

Violence in Japanese TV:
Personal Observations

• Japan has (or had) extraordinarily low violent crime rate

• Japan has explicit violence/nudity on TV, even on Sunday mornings

• How can this be?
  • Offenders NOT rewarded
  • The consequences of the violence are shown, not ignored. Grieving widows, children, etc.