GAP INDIAN JOURNAL
OF FORENSICS AND BEHAVIOURAL SCIENCES
(ISSN – 2582-8177)
Globally peer-reviewed and open access journal.

AGGRESSION AND IMPULSIVITY AMONG PRISON INMATES: A CORRELATIONAL STUDY

Ms. Heena Sehgal, Dr. Nitesh Kumar Jha

Department of Psychology, Khalsa College, Amritsar (Punjab)
Contact: +91 7888707704 , Email: heenasehgxl@gmail.com

Department of Psychology, Bharti Mandan College, Rahika, Madhubani (A Constituent Unit of LNMU, Darbhanga)
Contact: 8725965541, Email: niteshkumar.jha0@gmail.com

Abstract

Background: *Aggression is understood as a behavior intended to harm others. Impulsivity is considered as a behavior characterized by lack of deliberate thought and loss of behavioural control. Both constructs have been consistently linked with offending behaviour in forensic and criminal psychological research, yet there is a contradictory finding have been observed in the association between aggression and impulsivity among prison inmates. Hence, this study was formulated with* ***aim*** *to examine the correlation between aggression and impulsivity among prison inmates.* ***Method:*** *The study included 50 prison inmates in the age range of 20 to 40 years. They were taken from The Central Jail, Amritsar (Punjab) by utilizing purposive sampling technique. Prison visit guidelines were followed for conducting research on prison inmates. The Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire and the Barratt Impulsiveness Scale, Version 11 were administered on the participants to measure the constructs.* ***Results and conclusion:*** *Verbal aggression, anger, and hostility dimensions of aggression were significantly correlated with attentional impulsiveness, and the anger dimension of aggression was additionally associated with motor impulsiveness. Insignificant correlation coefficients were found between verbal aggression and hostility subdomains of aggression with motor impulsiveness and non-planning impulsiveness, between anger and non-planning impulsiveness, and between physical aggression and impulsivity subdomains (attentional, motor and non-planning impulsiveness). In* ***conclusion****, aggression dimensions, namely Verbal aggression, anger, and hostility, show a significant correlation with attentional impulsiveness. Notably, only the anger dimension of aggression exhibits a significant correlation with one of the impulsiveness dimensions i.e. motor impulsiveness.* ***Implications:*** *The study has implications for understanding criminal behavior, specifically in designing therapeutic interventions. Also, forensic psychologists can utilize the insights from this study in risk assessment, and development of profiles of offenders involved in violent and impulsive crime.*

Key words: *Prison inmates, Aggression, Impulsivity, Correction and Rehabilitation*

INTRODUCTION

Aggression is outlined as a deliberate behaviour intended to harm another individual who does not desire to be harmed. It is a social behaviour involving at least two people, with the purpose of causing extreme physical harm, such as injury or death (Bushman & Huesmann, 2010). Aggression is observed as a form of behaviour, not as an emotion, a motive, or an attitude. The term aggression has often been dedicated to negative or undesirable emotions such as anger, hostility, animosity or ill feelings to deliberate motives such as the intent or desire to harm other individuals (Baron, 1977). Aggression is categorized in different forms on the basis of the ways it is expressed and the functions it serves.

The aggression ranges from comparatively minor acts, such as sarcastic comments, using passive-aggressive language, shouting or yelling, threatening, humiliating or mocking someone in public to more serious aggressive acts like punching, hitting, stabbing, vandalism etc. Emotional dysregulation and exposure to violence can aggravate hostile tendencies. Aggression can be manifested in various forms based on the mode of expression and its basic intent. Those forms of aggression are categorized as physical and verbal aggression, social aggression, displaced aggression, direct and indirect aggression, overt and covert aggression, active and passive aggression, reactive and proactive aggression.

Physical aggression involves behaviour intended to inflict physical harm. For example, hitting, kicking, punching etc. Verbal aggression involves the use of words and language to harm others. For example, yelling, shouting, name-calling etc. (Allen & Anderson, 2017). Social aggression is a form of aggression which is indirect and non-physical. It aims to harm others' social reputation and interpersonal relation. For example, spreading false rumours, engaging in cyberbullying etc. (Young et al., 2010). Displaced aggression is the form of aggression in which hostility or the aggression is expressed towards a substitute who is innocent rather than the actual source of aggravation. For example, behaving aggressively with colleagues due to frustration with a higher authority.

GAP INDIAN JOURNAL
OF FORENSICS AND BEHAVIOURAL SCIENCES
(ISSN – 2582-8177)
Globally peer-reviewed and open access journal.

Direct aggression is the form of aggression in which the victim is present. For example, striking or physically assaulting someone. Indirect aggression is the opposite to the direct aggression in this the victim is absent. This form of aggression is manifested through behaviour like damaging property and purposeful exclusion. Overt aggression is a form of aggression which is explicit and visible. This form of aggression is manifested through mocking, humiliating or physically assaulting another individual. Covert aggression is generally indirect, and hidden beneath antisocial behaviours such as lying, manipulating or cheating. Active aggression is overt, intentional and often externalized through threats, shouting and other harmful behaviour. Passive aggression is covert and indirect. It is manifested through procrastination, sarcasm, or backhanded compliments (Bushman & Huesmann, 2010) (Allen & Anderson, 2017). There is another categorization of aggression that is reactive aggression and proactive aggression. Reactive aggression is a form of aggression which is generally the response of the individual to a perceived threat or provocation. Proactive aggression is a form of aggression which is planned, and generally for personal gain for the individual.

Psychoanalytic Theory of Aggression regarded aggression as an innate and instinctual drive. According to his dual-instinct theory, human behaviour and its variations stem from two rudimentary instincts: Eros (life instinct) and Thanatos (death instinct). Eros promotes survival, love, and creativity, and the Thanatos fuels aggression, destruction, and self-harm. This theory also view aggression as a psychic energy that stem from one basic drive, particularly libido. Libido (life drive, sex drive) is considered as a creational force, having its origin in the biological composition of an individual. Any sort of blocking or inhibition of libidinal drive results in hostile or aggressive behaviour. (Freud, 1915). Lorenz's ethological theory consider aggression as an innate and evolutionary survival instinct found in both human and animal species and is directed against members of the same species (Lorenz, 2021). Behaviourist Theory of Aggression considers Aggression as an acquired or learned behaviour. According to these postulates, the behaviour of people is resolute and conditioned by the environment, not the innate psychological traits or unconscious instincts (Drndarević, 2021).

Impulsivity can be understood as propensity toward swift, unintended reactions to internal or external stimuli without regard to the undesirable consequences of these reactions to the impulsive individual or to others. Being impulsive involves behaviour often without foresight, deliberation, or consideration of potential risks or long-term effects. Impulsivity, as a multidimensional construct, has been widely acknowledged by researchers and experts, with each dimension contributing to different forms of impulsive behaviour. Those forms of impulsivity can be categorized as cognitive impulsivity, behavioural impulsivity, functional impulsivity and dysfunctional impulsivity.

Cognitive impulsivity is a form of impulsivity which reflects the tendency of the individual to involve in action without proper consideration of possible consequences. In this form of impulsivity, the individual experience difficulties in delaying gratification. They also find hard in making cautious decisions. They lack in sustaining attention, planning and monitoring their immediate reactions. Behavioural impulsivity involves the lack of rational thinking and prior planning. This form of impulsiveness often leads to undesirable consequences. According to Evenden (1999) this form of impulsivity is linked with an impairment in motor responses that subsequently lead to maladaptive outcomes in everyday functioning.

Dysfunctional impulsivity, can be understood as the inclination to act with reduced foresight. The behaviour of the individual with dysfunctional impulsivity leads to difficulty in their functioning. According to Dickman (1990) dysfunctional impulsivity is often associated with behavior without consideration of adequate thought, and it has also been reported that it is negatively associated with the individual's overall functioning and well-being. Functional impulsivity is viewed as adaptive aspect of impulsivity. This form of impulsivity is defined as the tendency of the individual to act or make swift decisions with minimal foresight. A positive association has been reported between functional impulsivity and eagerness, venturesomeness, extroversion, and even narcissism traits of personality, and it can facilitate effective and goal-oriented behaviour (Smillie & Jackson, 2006) (Jones & Paulhus, 2011).

Impulsivity, the process of acting without thinking has been the central attention among the researchers of the field of criminology and forensic psychology to provide a substantial evidence for explaining why some individual engage in criminal behaviour and others don't (Martin et al., 2019). Among the several psychological influences linked to crime, aggression and impulsivity stand out as two significant dimensions persuading violent and antisocial conduct. These characteristics impact the likelihood of engaging in criminal acts as well as the brutality, persistence, and nature of offenses.

Five-Factor Model of Personality provides a comprehensive basis to comprehend the several intellections of impulsivity. It reflects numerous alleyways like, negative and positive urgency, premeditation and planning, perseverance and sensation seeking that are linked with impulsive behaviour. (Whiteside & Lynam, 2001). Eysenck's Theory of Personality postulates that impulsivity is allied to both Extraversion and Psychoticism traits. Impulsivity is often regarded as a constituent of Extraversion, encompassing amiability, risk-taking, decreased attention and planning. Further, it has strong association with Psychoticism, particularly traits like aggressiveness and negligence (Eysenck, 2012). According to Gray's Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory, Impulsivity is arbitrated by the Behavioural Approach System. The behavioural approach system is a psychobiological system regulates motivation and behaviour in the pursuit of goals and rewards cues. This

theory posits that individuals who exhibit high impulsivity tend to seek novelty and stimulation. Such individuals prefer immediate gratification of rewards, exhibit non-planning and risk-taking behaviour.

Srinivasan et al. (2022) conducted a descriptive correlational study on 179 male delinquent adolescents residing in observation homes in Bihar (India) to examine the link between impulsivity and aggression. On the basis of the findings, they reported a significant positive relationship between aggression and impulsivity. Higher impulsivity associated with greater anger, hostility, physical and verbal aggression. Overall, it was highlighted that aggression and impulsivity are interrelated risk factors for delinquent behavior. According to Martin et al. (2019) impulsivity and aggression are significantly associated. Both the constructs predict recidivism. The study highlighted that higher levels of impulsivity increased the likelihood of aggressive behavior, which in turn elevated the risk of reoffending. Critchfield et al. (2004) analysed the relationship between impulsivity and aggression. The authors suggested based on their findings that both of these interrelated traits reinforce one another in shaping antisocial or criminal behavior. It further emphasized the coexistence of these two increase the risk of criminal behavior.

Stattin and Magnusson (1989) analysed that aggressive behaviour at a young age is a significant indicator of delinquency in later years. The authors incorporated various studies which reveals that adolescents who were perceived as being highly aggressive by their classmates or instructors were significantly more inclined to engage in crimes in the future. These investigations, which were carried out on a variety of groups, consistently found that childhood aggression has been linked to greater incidence, severity, and variety of offenses in adulthood.

Early aggressive behaviour, particularly among boys, is clearly linked to later criminal behaviour, according to one study, which monitored 1,027 Swedish youngsters from the ages of 10 to 26. Boys with high aggression levels were more inclined to engage in violent crimes, commit repeated offenses, and cause harm to property. Serious crimes have been committed by almost half of the individuals with the highest aggression levels. The exact same patterns were observed in girls, specifically when hostility was noted approximately at early aggression was particularly indicative of confrontational and destructive acts, and aggressive children frequently displayed a variety of criminal tendencies.

In a research investigation on the neurological bases of violent and criminal conduct, Reddy et al. (2018) emphasize neurotransmitter irregularities and deficiencies in frontal lobe function. It draws attention to study findings from neuropsychological and neuroimaging investigations that suggests individuals who have diminished frontal lobe activity, particularly in the prefrontal cortex, exhibit poor impulse control, make poor decisions, and act more aggressively. The review addresses the relationships between neurotransmitter systems, particularly serotonin and dopamine, which are linked to aggression and antisocial behavior.

The physiological and neurological fundamentals for aggression and criminal conduct have been investigated in the Israel and Ebstein (2010)' study on twins. Identical and adopted twin studies demonstrate that up to 50% of violent personality traits can be attributed to genetic components, underscoring the fact that aggressiveness can surface from hereditary as well as environmental factors. Substantial genes that contribute to impulsivity and aggressiveness include serotonin-related polymorphisms and the monoamine oxidase A (MAOA) gene. Also, the study emphasizes how anatomical brain modifications, such as deficiencies in prefrontal cortex functioning, and neurotransmitter dysfunction, including in serotonergic systems, impact antisocial behavior. It indicates that the risk of committing violent crimes is significantly raised by low-functioning variations of the MAOA gene, especially when paired with abuse during early childhood.

Researchers have examined the behavioral outcomes of biological and genetic predispositions, including impulsive aggression, conduct disorder during adolescence, and antisocial personality disorder. The incidence of these behaviors designates a strong link between criminal behavior and genetic structure.

Swann et al. (2002) discovered two key models of impulsivity in their study. It includes rapid-response impulsivity i.e. the propensity to act swift and with less forethought and reward-delay impulsivity i.e. the predilection for instant, smaller rewards over larger, delayed ones. The research findings highlighted that rapid-response impulsivity was more strongly correlated with psychiatric disorders, such as mood and personality disorders, and was more meticulously allied with trait impulsivity.

Individuals with higher levels of impulsivity, particularly in the rapid-response domain displayed increased signs of personality disturbances and Axis I/II psychopathologies. The patterns found are extremely pertinent to understand criminal behaviour, as impulsive decision-making, poor reaction inhibition, and increased risk-taking frequently play a crucial role. This is true even though the study was focussed on parents of teenagers with disruptive behaviour disorders. According to the research, rapid-response impulsivity may be a more reliable indicator of criminal tendencies and behavioural dysregulation than delay-based impulsivity, underscoring the significance of differentiating between impulsivity types to better understand and treat violent or antisocial people.

Bechara et al. (1997) demonstrated that people often make moral decisions through somatic markers or non-conscious emotional signals. Individual with impaired ventromedial prefrontal cortex have decreased level of gut feelings which leads to impulsivity, poor judgement and risk-taking behaviour. Wendel et al. (2022) findings revealed that dysfunctional impulsivity is a tendency to act or behave without forethought, results in poor and adverse outcomes and found to be significantly correlated with criminal behaviours, school deviance, and

substance use. In contrast, functional impulsivity was found to be not suggestively linked to criminality; however, it did correlate with substance use. This discrepancy signifies that not every form of impulsivity is innately detrimental or associated with antisocial behaviors or deviance. From a criminological standpoint, this investigation validates the idea that dysfunctional impulsivity is a more resilient element of deviance.

Derefinko et al. (2011) examined the association between several facets of impulsivity and determined two different forms of aggression: intimate partner violence and general violent behaviour. According to the study, general violent behaviour had a significant association with lack of premeditation and sensation seeking, which integrates behaviors like risk taking and exhibiting poor hindsight that are frequently associated with illicit behaviours like fighting, using weapons, and thievery. The most significant indicator of intimate partner violence, even after accounting for neuroticism and autonomic arousal, was urgency, or the propensity to act swiftly when feeling intense emotions. This indicates that violence is more emotionally driven. These findings encourage focused interventions in forensic and clinical settings by emphasizing the fact that impulsivity is not a monolithic feature and that its various categories significantly impact aggression and deviance.

RATIONALE OF THE STUDY

The present research is formulated with the aim to better understand the relationship between aggression and impulsivity in the context of criminal behaviour. Both of these constructs have considerable individual and societal consequences. Examining the relationship between these traits in prison inmates will further explain their corelation and the components that might exacerbate violent tendencies. Eventually, this research purposes to contribute to a deeper understanding of the relationship between aggression and impulsivity. The present study is designed with following aim, and objectives:

Aim

To examine the correlation between variables of aggression and impulsivity among prison inmates.

Objectives

1. To study the relationship between physical aggression and attentional, motor and non-planning impulsiveness among prison inmates.
2. To study the relationship between verbal aggression and attentional, motor and non-planning impulsiveness among prison inmates.
3. To study the relationship between anger and attentional, motor and non-planning impulsiveness among prison inmates.
4. To study the relationship between hostility and attentional, motor and non-planning impulsiveness among prison inmates.

Hypotheses

1. There will be significant relationship between physical aggression and attentional, motor and non-planning impulsiveness among prison inmates.
2. There will be significant relationship between verbal aggression and attentional, motor and non-planning impulsiveness among prison inmates.
3. There will be significant relationship between anger and attentional, motor and non-planning impulsiveness among prison inmates.
4. There will be significant relationship between hostility and attentional, motor and non-planning impulsiveness among prison inmates.

METHODS

Sample

The study employed a purposive sampling strategy to employ a total of 50 prison inmates including males and females, comprising 37 convicted and 13 undertrials individuals from the Central Jail, Amritsar, following the requisite permissions obtained from the ADGP Prisons and the Prison Headquarters, Punjab. The individuals included in the study were charged with a diverse range of criminal offences from minor theft, snatching, fraud, drug related offence etc. to more severe offences such as murder, rape, kidnapping, illegal possession of weapons etc. Educationally some of the individuals were illiterate or lower level of academic background and others were having 10th and +2 academic level, a few of the inmates were possessing postgraduate education as well. Descriptive Statistics of Prison-inmates under different Age categories are presented in the table below:

Table: 1. Descriptive Statistics of Prison-inmates (Convicted and Undertrial) under different Age Categories (N=50: Convicted (n= 37); Undertrial (n=13))

Prison Inmates				
Age Range	Convicted (n= 37)		Undertrial (n=13)	
	Male (n=22)	Female (n=15)	Male (n=08)	Female (n=05)

GAP INDIAN JOURNAL
OF FORENSICS AND BEHAVIOURAL SCIENCES
(ISSN – 2582-8177)
Globally peer-reviewed and open access journal.

	f	%	*f*	%	*f*	%	*f*	%
21-23	4	18	0	0	3	37	0	0
24-26	2	9	5	33	2	25	0	0
27-29	5	23	1	7	1	13	2	40
30-32	4	18	4	27	0	0	1	20
33-35	1	5	2	13	2	25	2	40
36-38	4	18	1	7	0	0	0	0
39-41	2	9	2	13	0	0	0	0
Mean	**3.14**	**14.29**	**2.14**	**14.29**	**1.14**	**14.29**	**0.71**	**14.29**
SD	**1.46**	**6.58**	**1.77**	**11.73**	**1.21**	**15.05**	**0.95**	**19.02**

Psychological Tools Used

In this research standardized psychological tools were used to measure aggression and impulsivity of prison inmates. A brief description of the tools is provided below:

1. Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire (BPAQ; Buss and Perry, 1992): It is an extensively used self-report questionnaire that assesses individual levels and forms of aggression. The BPAQ consists of 29 items, distributed across four subscales, which assess different components of aggression:

- **Physical Aggression**: This form of aggression involves the use of behavioural force or violence such as hitting, kicking, pushing etc. These actions often intend to cause harm to another individual.
- **Verbal Aggression**: This form of aggression involves the use of words and language which are hostile, insulting or threatening in nature and it also intends to harm the other individual. It is a form of aggressive behavior that does not involve physical contact but can have significant psychological and emotional impacts on the recipient.
- **Anger**: Anger is an intense emotional state involving a strong, uncomfortable and non-cooperative response to a perceived provocation, hurt, or threat.
- **Hostility**: 'Hostility' is defined as antagonistic behavior or unfriendly opposition toward someone or something, often marked by ill will or conflict.

The subject is asked to respond on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from: 1 (Extremely uncharacteristic of me) to 5 (Extremely characteristic of me). All items are scored in the definite direction, and total scores can be calculated for each subscale, as well as an overall total aggression score. The BPAQ is stated to have good psychometric characteristics, with high reliability and validity, and is extensively used in clinical, forensic, and research settings for assessing aggressive traits (Buss & Perry, 1992).

2. Barratt Impulsiveness Scale- Version 11 (BIS-11; Patton, Stanford, & Barratt, 1995): The Barratt Impulsiveness Scale, Version 11 (BIS-11) was originally established by Ernest S. Barratt and later revised by Patton, J.H., Stanford, M.S., and Barratt, E.S. in 1995. It is one of the most used self-report inventories designed to evaluate the personality/behavioural construct of impulsivity. The BIS-11 consists of 30 items, and responses are given on a 4-point Likert scale, ranging from: 1 (Rarely/Never) to 4 (Almost Always/Always). This scale includes three subscales based on the factor analysis of impulsivity traits.

- **Attentional Impulsiveness**: Attentional impulsiveness is the inability to focus or concentrate, leading to thoughts being easily distracted or interrupted by irrelevant stimuli, often described as a lack of sustained attention or a cognitive instability that makes it hard to maintain focus on a task.
- **Motor Impulsiveness**: Motor impulsiveness is the tendency to act on the spur of the moment without forethought, such as blurting out an answer without waiting to be called on or acting without considering the negative consequences.
- **Non-Planning Impulsiveness**: Non-planning impulsiveness is a dimension of impulsivity characterized by a lack of foresight and a focus on the present moment, rather than carefully considering future consequences.

The participant's total impulsivity score is derived by summing scores across all items, and subscale scores can be evaluated independently. Several items are reverse scored, as specified in the scoring manual. The BIS-11 is stated to have good internal consistency, reliability and construct validity. It is extensively used in research and clinical practice to measure impulsivity in both normal and clinical populations (Patton et al., 1995).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

The results obtained on applying Pearson's Product Moment Correlation on the data obtained on domains of Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire and Barratt Impulsiveness Scale- Version 11 from prison inmates are presented in the table 2.

Table: 2. Correlation coefficients between Aggression and Impulsivity among Prison inmates (N= 50: Convicted (n= 37); Undertrial (n=13))

	Impulsivity

GAP INDIAN JOURNAL
OF FORENSICS AND BEHAVIOURAL SCIENCES
(ISSN – 2582-8177)
Globally peer-reviewed and open access journal.

		Attentional Impulsiveness	Motor Impulsiveness	Non-Planning Impulsiveness	Total Impulsivity
Aggression	Physical Aggression	0.217	0.218	0.121	0.233
	Verbal Aggression	0.292*	0.079	0.172	0.066
	Anger	0.325*	0.367**	0.213	0.273
	Hostility	0.318*	0.203	0.074	0.163
	Total Aggression	0.235	0.216	0.169	0.190

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

DISCUSSION

The correlation analysis examined the relationship between aggression and different dimensions of impulsivity among prison inmates. The correlation coefficients between domains of aggression and impulsivity shown in table 2 shows that specific components of aggression are significantly related to certain facets of impulsivity.
Verbal aggression and attentional impulsiveness were significantly correlated ($r = 0.292$, $p < 0.05$), suggesting that higher verbal aggression such as shouting or insulting others in the prison inmates linked to attentional impulsiveness like poor attentional control. Anger and attentional impulsiveness were positively correlated ($r = 0.325$, $p < 0.05$), indicating that heightened anger in the prison inmates is linked with attentional impulsiveness like the individual having difficulty in maintaining attention which is a kind of reflection of premature cognitive responses. A significant positive correlation was found between anger and motor impulsiveness ($r = 0.367$, $p < 0.01$). This suggests that individuals who experience higher levels of anger tend to show attentional impulsiveness in the form of poor inhibitory control and acting on impulses without sufficient restraint. Hostility and attentional impulsiveness also showed a significant positive association ($r = 0.318$, $p < 0.05$), implying that hostile attitudes and suspiciousness are often accompanied by impulsive lapses in attention. Physical aggression did not significantly correlate with any form of impulsivity, though weak positive associations were observed. Non-planning impulsiveness showed no significant relationship with any aggression dimension, suggesting that a general disregard for future consequences may not directly predict aggressive behaviours in this sample. At the overall construct level, total aggression and total impulsivity shared only a weak, non-significant correlation ($r = 0.190$).
A study carried out by Srinivasan et al. (2022) on 179 male delinquent adolescents residing in observation homes in Bihar concluded that higher impulsivity associated with greater anger, hostility, physical and verbal aggression. The findings of the present study are partially aligned with the findings of the study conducted by Srinivasan et al. as their findings reports that physical and verbal aggression, anger, and hostility all these forms of aggression are shown to have significant positive correlation with impulsivity, and the findings of this study reveals verbal aggression, anger and hostility are shown to have significant positive correlation with only attentional impulsivity, and anger has only significant positive correlation with motor impulsiveness.
Intercorrelation between all the other variables of aggression and impulsiveness are insignificant. This inconsistencies in the findings may be due to the differences in the age of sample and their demographic features. Also, crime categories under which the inmates have been institutionalized under prison and observation homes may led to have the differences in the observed findings between the studies. A study conducted by Martin et al. (2019) also revealed that impulsivity and aggression are significantly associated, and both constructs play a critical role in predicting recidivism. However, the study by Martin et al. was carried out on prisoners with antisocial personality disorder. The differences in the findings between Martin et. al.'s study and present study again may be due to the sample features. Further, this study highlights a one-to-one correlation with variables of aggression with the variables of impulsiveness and direct the future research to incorporate the one-to-one intercorrelation.

CONCLUSION

Verbal aggression, anger, and hostility dimensions of aggression were significantly correlated with attentional impulsiveness, and the anger dimension of aggression was additionally associated with motor impulsiveness. Insignificant correlation coefficients were found between verbal aggression and hostility subdomains of aggression with motor impulsiveness and non-planning impulsiveness, between anger and non-planning impulsiveness, and between physical aggression and impulsivity subdomains (attentional, motor and non-planning impulsiveness). In conclusion, aggression dimensions, namely Verbal aggression, anger, and hostility,

show a significant correlation with attentional impulsiveness. Notably, only the anger dimension of aggression exhibits a significant correlation with one of the impulsiveness dimensions i.e. motor impulsiveness.

IMPLICATIONS

The study has implications for understanding criminal behaviour, specifically in designing therapeutic interventions. Also, forensic psychologists can utilize the insights from this study in risk assessment, and development of profiles of offenders involved in violent and impulsive crime. Findings from research conducted by Martin et al. (2019), Srinivasan et al. (2022) and others revealed that impulsivity and aggression are significantly associated. Both the constructs predict crime and recidivism. Researchers consistently emphasized on the importance of assessment and evaluation of aggression and impulsiveness of the prison inmates in order to expose them in intervention like self-control skill training and aggression management. Researchers recommended aggression and impulsiveness traits focused correctional interventions can be effective in reducing rates of reoffending. Prison counsellor or correctional psychologist may impart training- the skills to the inmates which are essential in controlling anger, hostility, verbal and physical aggression. They can also impart training that enhance cognitive skills like staying concentrated and attentive on a task at hand. To control motor impulsiveness, they can be taught the skills to think properly, consider consequences before acting in any circumstances to avoid negative or adverse consequences of their action. Non-planning impulsiveness can be targeted in order to foster foresight to calculate and consider future consequence. Overall, the present study has greater implications in criminal correction.

REFERENCES

[1] Allen, J. J., & Anderson, C. A. (2017). Aggression and violence: Definitions and distinctions. *The Wiley handbook of violence and aggression, 1*, 1-14.
[2] Baron, R. A. (1977). Aggression: Definitions and Perspectives *Human Aggression* (pp. 1-38). Boston, MA: Springer US.
[3] Bechara, A., Damasio, H., Tranel, D., & Damasio, A. R. (1997). Deciding advantageously before knowing the advantageous strategy. *Science, 275*(5304), 1293-1295.
[4] Bushman, B. J., & Huesmann, L. R. (2010). Aggression. *Handbook of social psychology*.
[5] Buss, A. H., & Perry, M. (1992). The aggression questionnaire. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 63*(3), 452.
[6] Corr, P. J. (2002). JA Gray's reinforcement sensitivity theory: Tests of the joint subsystems hypothesis of anxiety and impulsivity. *Personality and Individual Differences, 33*(4), 511-532.
[7] Critchfield, K. L., Levy, K. N., & Clarkin, J. F. (2004). The relationship between impulsivity, aggression, and impulsive-aggression in borderline personality disorder: an empirical analysis of self-report measures. *Journal of personality disorders, 18*(6), 555-570.
[8] De Fruyt, F., Van de Wiele, L., & Van Heeringen, C. (2000). Cloninger's psychobiological model of temperament and character and the five-factor model of personality. *Personality and Individual Differences, 29*(3), 441-452.
[9] Derefinko, K., DeWall, C. N., Metze, A. V., Walsh, E. C., & Lynam, D. R. (2011). Do different facets of impulsivity predict different types of aggression? *Aggressive behavior, 37*(3), 223-233.
[10] Dickman, S. J. (1990). Functional and dysfunctional impulsivity: personality and cognitive correlates. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 58*(1), 95.
[11] Drndarević, N. (2021). Psychological theories of aggression. *Zbornik Instituta za kriminološka i sociološka istraživanja, 40*(2-3), 91-104.
[12] Eysenck, H. J. (2012). *A model for personality*: Springer Science & Business Media.
[13] Freud, S. (1915). Instincts and their vicissitudes: SE XIV.
[14] Israel, S., & Ebstein, R. P. (2010). Aggression and Criminal Behaviour. *eLS*.
[15] Jones, D. N., & Paulhus, D. L. (2011). The role of impulsivity in the Dark Triad of personality. *Personality and Individual Differences, 51*(5), 679-682.
[16] Lorenz, K. (2021). *On aggression*: Routledge.
[17] Martin, S., Zabala, C., Del-Monte, J., Graziani, P., Aizpurua, E., Barry, T. J., & Ricarte, J. (2019). Examining the relationships between impulsivity, aggression, and recidivism for prisoners with antisocial personality disorder. *Aggression and violent behavior, 49*, 101314.
[18] Patton, J. H., Stanford, M. S., & Barratt, E. S. (1995). Factor structure of the Barratt impulsiveness scale. *Journal of clinical psychology, 51*(6), 768-774.
[19] Reddy, K. J., Menon, K. R., & Hunjan, U. G. (2018). Neurobiological aspects of violent and criminal behaviour: deficits in frontal lobe function and neurotransmitters. *International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences, 13*(1).
[20] Smillie, L. D., & Jackson, C. J. (2006). Functional impulsivity and reinforcement sensitivity theory. *Journal of Personality, 74*(1), 47-84.

[21] Srinivasan, P., Rentala, S., & Kumar, P. (2022). Impulsivity and Aggression Among Male Delinquent Adolescents Residing in Observation Homes—A Descriptive Correlation Study from East India. *Journal of Indian Association for Child and Adolescent Mental Health, 18*(4), 327-336. doi:10.1177/09731342231171305

[22] Stattin, H., & Magnusson, D. (1989). The role of early aggressive behavior in the frequency, seriousness, and types of later crime. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology, 57*(6), 710.

[23] Swann, A. C., Bjork, J. M., Moeller, F. G., & Dougherty, D. M. (2002). Two models of impulsivity: relationship to personality traits and psychopathology. *Biological psychiatry, 51*(12), 988-994.

[24] Wendel, B. E., Rocque, M., & Posick, C. (2022). Rethinking self-control and crime: Are all forms of impulsivity criminogenic? *European Journal of Criminology, 19*(4), 523-541.

[25] Whiteside, S. P., & Lynam, D. R. (2001). The five factor model and impulsivity: Using a structural model of personality to understand impulsivity. *Personality and Individual Differences, 30*(4), 669-689.

[26] Young, E. L., Nelson, D. A., Hottle, A. B., Warburton, B., & Young, B. K. (2010). Relational aggression in schools: Information for educators. *East West Highway, Suite, 402*.