

Comparative Study on Aggression among Persons Deprived of their Liberty

Ecaterina Popa¹, Valentina Beatrice (Moisa) Munteanu²

Abstract: The article is a comparative study that aims to highlight the role of aggression among persons deprived of liberty, to identify the psychological mechanisms involved in their aggressive behavior, as well as the psychological consequences on their personality. Notions such as aggression, violence, personality and human behavior are extremely complex, which is why it requires great attention in addressing various theoretical, contextual, individual, group, institutional, legislative and moral perspectives. The article aims to observe the changes that occur from a behavioral point of view in both young people and adults in prison.

Keywords: behavior; personality; aggression; detainees; deprivation of liberty; prison environment

Aggression is one of the main traits due to which one part of individuals become victims, and the other part, aggressors, become criminals. “*The main characteristic of the personality of criminals is aggression*” (Butoi, 2008).

There is no crime that does not have a dose of aggression at the base. Frustration is considered an important cause of aggression, which can be material, family, social, etc.

Aggression is a central behavior of the human species, present in various cultures and historical eras McCall & Shields, (2008). The word aggression has its roots in Latin: ad (means “towards”) and gradus (means “step”) (Ferguson & Dyck, 2012).

According to modern psychology, aggression is the quality of living organisms, extremely useful in the fight for survival, adaptation, evolution and development, a

¹ PhD in progress, Free International University of Moldova, Republic of Moldova, Address: Vlaicu Pârcălab 52 Str., Chisinau, Republica Moldova, Corresponding author: popaecaterina71@yahoo.com

² Master student, Andrei Saguna Faculty, Clinical Psychology, Constanta, Romania, Address: 13 Alexandru Lăpuşneanu Blvd., Constanța 900196, Romania, E-mail: munteanumoisa_vb@yahoo.com

mechanism for defending and conditioning the existence of life, meeting vital needs, such as providing food and perpetuating the species. This is why the idea that aggression includes innate components, which provide protection in case of danger, meeting the need for food and others acquired through education, in nosological entities or through induction, is currently accepted. It seems that much of the behavior we observe in animals is programmed. The fundamental processes are programmed and are expressed through manifest behavior. The development of these programs depends on the interaction between genetically determined structures and experience.

It is considered that “similar developmental processes take place in humans” Gilbert, (1989). “*Natural selection has probably brought some concordance between programmed behavior and environmental and cultural demands*” (Aaron Davis, Freeman, 2019).

Today, aggression has become a social, fundamental problem of man and humanity because the threat of this scourge looms over the whole world. Until recently, there was a discussion about the aggression of the human being or about aggression in the world, and today there is also a discussion about a world of aggression. The behaviors that people practice to meet these needs are not innate, but learned, which means that there are very large differences between individuals (Maslow, 1954).

Human aggression is an intrinsic individual characteristic, but the mode of manifestation, as well as its dosage, as well as the choice of the moment of action and its justification depend on several aspects that can constitute frequent triggering situations, such as: a disagreement or a conflict, an accumulation of frustrations, the other person's refusal to submit to his (especially sexual) needs, a desire for independence, autonomy from the other, a misunderstanding, a separation conflict or a refusal to contact after a separation, emotional dependence on the partner; extremely exaggerated respect for one's own needs; use of tranquilizers and / or alcohol; the tendency to commit suicide; hallucinations, insomnia; severe agitation, anxiety, nervousness; confused thinking and lack of concentration, lack of a job, their belonging to an inappropriate group, attempt to manipulate adults, lack of honesty and motivation, loneliness, depression, etc.

Thus, we can define aggression “*as a set of hostile behaviors that can manifest consciously, unconsciously or phantasmatic in order to destroy, degrade, coerce, deny or humiliate a person, an object invested with social significance or self-*

directed (self-aggression), such as self-destructive behaviors encountered in some mental disorders or even outside them (rational suicide)” (Gorgos, 1987).

Ferrington (1992) settles the relationship between antisocial behavior and low capacity for abstract thinking. According to these data, research should clarify whether it is the inability to think abstractly or rather a preference for concrete thinking, which would justify linking this behavior with the stylistic dimension abstract-concrete.

Reine (1993) explains the antisocial and aggressive behavior by the presence in people with such behavior of dysfunctions of the left hemisphere, which would lead to deficits in communication.

Davidson and Jouniss (1991), in Colby and Damon, (1992) note that moral development (whose level influences the emergence of antisocial behaviors) is found to be supported by an open, generative, self-reflective style of interaction with others, so that moral actions to unite in a stable and flexible system.

In both humans and animals, aggression leads to the delimitation of individual boundaries, but also to the boundaries between groups and to the establishment of social hierarchy within groups. Territorial aggression has guided the spread of the human being throughout the earth and leading to the colonization of arid lands where some groups have been pushed to live in enclaves by other more aggressive groups. Understanding the sometimes-abominable effects of aggressive manifestations and the circumstances or factors that induced them may cause and amplify fear, anxiety, and emotional insecurity. Regardless of the value for survival, in more austere conditions, such as the prison environment, some patterns of development in the process of human evolution are problematic in today's culture, because they interfere with the personal goals of the prisoner, or contravene group norms. Development strategies for obtaining prey from competition can ensure survival in primitive conditions, unsuitable for the social environment, and lead to antisocial personality disorder. When challenged, people also depend on their own abilities. Among the predominant instincts we have: competition, attachment, attraction, protection, defense, criticism, control.

The manifestations of human aggression are multiple and have different levels: instinctual, affectogenic, attitudinal, behavioral, we notice how the area of aggression is much wider than that of violence.

Aggression is not to be confused with antisocial behavior, delinquency and criminality, and not every antisocial behavior, including criminal, can be characterized by aggression. In many cases, aggressive behavior also becomes violent, but there are also cases of aggressive behavior only in nonviolent forms.

Aggression has as an effect the tendency towards individuals, towards things, or it can even be directed towards oneself with the intention of producing moral, physical and equally material damages, or it leads to a psychological injury. It can also be characterized as *“the tendency to attack the other or any object likely to stand in the way of the immediate satisfaction of a need,”* or as the personality of *“an individual who has a habit of behaving aggressively.”* (The Great Dictionary of Psychology, 2006).

Dominant aggressive reactions can be unleashed depending on the ostentatious nature and aggressive behaviors such as gestures, pantomime and mime, but words can also acquire a provocative character through insults, threats, insults or evils, ironies and sarcasm (Turliuc, Huțuleac & Dănilă, 2009).

Human existence, shaped socio-culturally, involves an anti-entropic struggle between the tendencies or needs of the person always re-designed by mental processes and self-awareness and the norms, values and expectations of others, assimilated by internalizing educational models and interpersonal relationships. The meaning and intensity of aggression can destructively guide the configurations of psycho-behavioral processes through which the frustrating motivations of the personality are projected (Murphy & Eckhardt, 2005).

Theoretical approaches to aggression derive from biological, ethological, sociological, psychological and psycho-sociological theories.

According to the annotations of the specialists we distinguish the following opinions:

The view that aggression is learned, as the APA statements on youth violence inform, is supported in particular by the personal beliefs of many scientists. This view seems to disregard remarkable evidence for genetic elements Ferguson, (2010), Rhee & Waldman, (2002), neurobiological Kumari et al., (2006), neuroendocrine, Carre, McCormick, & Hariri, (2011) and some elements biologics that facilitate aggressive behavior Beaver (2010). Although it is clear that the environment can increase aggression (Ferguson et al., 2008), it is not clear that learning is the main mechanism by which the environment influences aggression. Moreover, we have considerable

evidence that environmental stress, rather than learning, is a key variable (Barash & Lipton, 2011).

Gilber and Daffern (2010) warn us that in understanding aggression the following ideas are striking: a) Aggression is a behavior, not an attitude, motivation or emotion; b) There is an intention to cause harm to the victim; c) The victim is a living being; d) The victim is motivated to avoid that damage.

The number of explanatory theories developed over time on the etiology of aggressive behaviors and the responsible factors involved is quite large. According to G. Moser, there are four major conceptions of aggressive behavior: instinctual theories, reactive theories, learning theories, human behaviors, which include also the aggressive ones are under the control of a number of 18 different instincts.

According to Freud, aggression is an instinct, people are born with the instinct to aggress and be violent. Freud's theory is unifactorial: aggression arises naturally from physiological tensions, and needs to be manifested because the individual must relax.

Social - Psychological Theories of Aggression

1. The “frustration-aggression” theory. It considers the phenomenon of frustration. After researching aggressive acts, but also violent acts, it turns out that any aggressive behavior is triggered every time the individual hits an obstacle or a social barrier and blocks him in order to meet personal needs and goals, thus triggering a frustration.

The phenomenon of frustration precipitates distinctly according to the inter-structural distortions of the individual. The relationship between frustration and aggressive behavior is well known, and we identify it from the earliest writings of Freud. As early as 1939, five researchers at Yale University in the United States, Dollard, Doob, Miller, Mowrer, and Sears, advanced this hypothesis as their “theory” by publishing the famous book “Frustration and Aggression.” In the classic statement, the “frustration-aggression” theory argues as the universal causal relationship between frustration and aggressive behavior: that there is no aggression that does not underlie a frustration and there is no frustration that is not resolved by aggression. It follows that aggressive behavior is necessarily generated, sanctified by frustration; frustration that can go unnoticed, which does not prove its non-existence, as long as there is an aggression. According to these authors, aggression

exists, being unmanifested on the outside, but can be directed, indirect, or can be directed at oneself.

As a result, it turns out that: any aggression is a consequence of frustration; and any frustration generates a form of aggression.

Dollard and his collaborators prove the existence of a relationship between frustration and aggressive behavior. Thus, they define aggression as “*a behavior or sequence of behavior, the purpose of which is to injure another or his substitute,*” and frustration as “*any action that prevents the individual from achieving a goal that he has proposed.*” (Dollard, Doob, Miller, Mowrer, Sears, 1939).

Affective frustrations are significant elements in assessing and understanding certain behaviors of detainees.

2. The “index-excitation” theory. Leonard Berkowitz receives the idea from the “frustration-aggression” theory and introduces between aggression and frustration, an intermediate link, namely: the appropriate environmental conditions for aggression.

3. The theory of social learning. Albert Bandura elaborates the theory of social learning of aggression having as a starting point the orientation that aggression represents a learned social behavior. The focus is on the individual's learning experiences, direct or indirect.

The approach of the emotional dimension in the study of human aggression aimed at anger as the main dimension involved in the manifestation of aggression. The concept of anger was approached from certain angles. We have as follows:

- **Anger**- as an emotion that can acquire both a positive and a negative aspect. We distinguish it from aggression because anger is an emotional response to a threat, injustice, pain or frustration and its occurrence is conditioned by the desire to condemn or damage the alleged source, a well-known example is when the husband discovers his wife in bed with another, and controlled by anger kills him, and aggression is a behavior that results in injuries, physical, psychological or verbal trauma.
- **Anger as a state** is a subjective and psychobiological experience, which is conditioned by a specific situation that shows variations over time according to the situations experienced, as intensity: starting from a state of moderate irritation or annoyance, reaching intense anger and anger.

Following the research of the sources of anger, the following types can be noticed:

- **Irritation**, is the state of anger that is accumulated continuously, low / medium intensity;
- **Jealousy** is the anger triggered if the loved one is physically absent, the aggression being oriented towards that person, but the respective context is also considered (it can be another person, activity, place);
- **Violent outbursts**, is intense anger, which erupts from inside the person (boils and comes to the surface in extreme situations) and is expressed in harsh, aggressive, high-pitched words, with agitated gestures; anger accumulated inside over time and discharges when a trigger occurs or does not appear;
- **Anger expressed calmly**, in the form of personal demands, or the expression of rights, the expression of disagreement in clear and concise words, using a controlled, calm and polite tone;
- **Anger expressed directly**, and uncontrolled represents the emotion manifested by a high tone, presenting accusations, using harsh, emotional language and body language specific to anger;

Cold anger, when anger is repressed inside, and a barrier / cold / retreat hits the surface.

The definitions formulated later, highlight the multidimensionality of anger as an emotional state generated by cognitions and accompanied by physiological and behavioral reactions (Deffenbacher, 1993; DiGiuseppe & Tafrate, 2007; Kassinove & Tafrate, 2002; Novaco, 1975).

According to Averill's (1991) socio-cognitive theory, anger originates in emotional schemas, requiring a specific individual experience in relation to society.

Forms of aggression. Due to the major degree of complexity of this psychosociological phenomenon, the conceptual approaches in trying to compose a taxonomy of forms of aggression encounter greater or lesser difficulties. The classification criteria are highlighted directly or indirectly from the analysis of the coordinates for defining aggression.

Regarding the topic approached in the present research, we distinguish the criterion related to the aggressive behavior adopted by the aggressor, and thus results, the aggressiveness of the young person and the aggressiveness of the adult.

Research Methodology. Research Objectives. Research Hypotheses.

The sample of the investigation consists of 40 detainees who committed violent crimes and disciplinary offenses during the execution of the custodial sentence. The choice of these detainees was random.

The experimental group made up for the present research is composed of 40 participants, 20 of them aged between 18 and 21 years and 20 of them over 21 years, detainees who committed violent crimes and disciplinary offenses during the execution of the custodial sentence. of freedom.

Investigation tools: DHP Inventory - demographics, personal history and indicators of deprivation of liberty, Big Five © plus Inventory, Zuckerman-Kuhlman Personality Questionnaire (ZKPQ).

Before applying the Big Five © plus Inventory, anamnesis, observation, analysis of documents, personal file, semi-structured interview was used. The Big Five model comprises five major personality factors or dimensions, used in the description of the human personality. These are: openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness and neurosis. Currently, 6 facets have been validated for each of the super factors. In the present research we will refer to Neurosis and its facets. The high N rating shows a lower self-control over the instinctual level, a subject with difficulties in managing stressful situations. The six facets of Neurosis are: Anxiety, Anger, Depression, Shyness, Exaggeration, and Vulnerability. Anxiety is the predisposition of the individual to experience various fears, worries, anxieties, but also nervousness, as well as to present a free anxiety, not fixed on certain contents. In some situations, anxiety can be accompanied by a neurotic state, or a state of anxiety can be accompanied by many other symptoms ranging from situations of physical infirmity, to psychotic conditions or character disorders.

Anger-Hostility signifies the tendency towards frequent states of anger, states of frustration, ferocity. The opposite pole is the tendency not to get angry easily, and to present a prevalent state of mental comfort.

Vulnerability, especially targeting the degree of resistance to stress that can be felt in different situations by subjects. Vulnerability is a dominant feature in young people; the mental aspects of this trait refer to the vulnerability to stress to which they are subjected. We have in opposition the inability to cope with stress, with the tendency to become addicted, panicked, hopeless in emergencies. The low score pole leads to self-esteem of competence and mastery in the face of stress. We have as an example the conclusions reached by researchers in the field. They believe that individuals who become drug users, especially young people, have a degree of personality vulnerability prior to the onset of use. *“They seem to lack the necessary resources to cope with the demands of everyday life, they are unstable in terms of feelings, they disagree with society and the authorities. Many of them accuse depressive states, of anxiety, but it is not certain if these are the causes or consequences of drug addiction”* (Rășcanu, 2004).

The Zuckerman-Kuhlman Personality Questionnaire (ZKPQ-Zuckerman-Kuhlman Personality Questionnaire) is intended to assess five factors that make up the dimensions of the Alternative Five-Factor Model (AFFM): impulsive sensation-seeking, sociability, neuroticism-anxiety, aggression-hostility and activity. Aggression - Hostility measures two constructs: items that assess aggression, describe the predisposition to express aggression, especially verbally, and items that measure hostility refer to rudeness, antisocial behavior, revenge and enmity, a volcanic temperament and impatience in interpersonal relationships.

Using the biographical data sheet, we observe at the level of the experimental group the following particularities:

- 20 young detainees up to 21 years old representing 50%;
- 20 adult detainees over the age of 21 representing 50%.

The independent variables of the investigation are: the length of detention, age, the commission of violent crimes and disciplinary offenses during the execution of the custodial sentence.

Dependent variables are the variables that change after changing the first group of variables: the level of aggression.

Intermediate variables are: anxiety, anger, vulnerability, and the level of unconditional acceptance of oneself that can mediate the manifestations of aggressive antisocial tendencies of both young people and adults.

The general objective of this scientific paper is to identify the personality traits that generate aggression in detainees in prison.

Identifying the psychological mechanisms involved in aggressive behavior in young people.

We assume that there are statistically significant relationships between personality traits and the factor of aggression in detainees in prisons.

We assume that there are statistically significant relationships between personality traits and the aggressiveness factor of detainees in prisons, with a higher predominance of young detainees aged 18 to 21 years.

Specific hypotheses:

1. *It is assumed that there is a significant correlation between the variables age and aggression for the respondents.*

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
aggressiveness	40	47,00	70,00	59,6500	5,49591
Valid N (listwise)	40				

The ZPKQ questionnaire, regarding the aggression factor, was answered by a number of 40 subjects, thus obtaining an average score of 59.65 and a standard deviation of 5.49591. The minimum score was 47 and the maximum was 70.

Table 2. Group Statistics

	Age	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
aggressive	young	20	2,0000	,00000	,00000
	adults	20	1,3000	,47016	,10513

The mean values between young people aged 18 to 21 years are $M = 2.00$ and $SD = 0.00$, and $M = 1.30$ and $SD = .47$ for adults over 21 years of age are different and statistically significant. We find increased aggression in young people compared to adults.

Table 3. Age-Aggression Correlation

Correlations			
		age	aggression
age	Pearson Correlation	1	-,694**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000
	N	20	20
aggression	Pearson Correlation	-,694**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	
	N	20	20

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

We state that the difference regarding the age-aggression correlation is statistically significant because Sig. (2-tailed) = ,000. It turns out that young people are more aggressive compared to adults. Lack of life experience, impatience, the fact that they act impulsively, that they are more explosive and do not think about the consequences of making decisions without thinking long, make them more aggressive. Pearson Correlation = -,694, indicates that there is a strongly significant negative correlation. The hypothesis is confirmed.

2. *It is assumed that there is a significant correlation between the variables age and vulnerability for the respondents in the experimental group.*

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Vulnerability	40	1,00	5,00	3,1250	1,23632
Valid N (listwise)	40				

We formulated this hypothesis to observe the increased degree of vulnerability in young detainees. It is observed according to Tab. 4 the existence of a significant difference and we have $M = 3.1250$ and $SD = 1.236$, with values between a minimum of 1.00 and a maximum of 5.00, for the facet vulnerability of the neurosis factor obtained in the Big Five Inventory © plus.

Tabel 5. Group Statistics

	age	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
vulnerability	young	20	1,8500	,36635	,08192
	adults	20	1,1000	,30779	,06882

Table 5. indicates the situation of mean values and standard deviations for the two groups of this research as follows: for the first group of 20 in which participants are

under 21 years and 20 participants over 21 years, in the experimental group and we have for young people $M = 1.8500$ and $SD = .36635$, and for adults $M = 1.1000$ and $SD = .30779$, to the facet vulnerability from the neurosis factor obtained in the Big Five © plus Inventory.

Table 6. Vulnerability Age Correlation

Correlations		age	vulnerability
age	Pearson Correlation	1	-,680**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000
	N	40	40
vulnerability	Pearson Correlation	-,680**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	
	N	40	40

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

We state that the difference between the two averages is statistically significant because Sig. (2-tailed) = ,000. Young people are a vulnerable category compared to adults in prison. $0.00 < 0.05$ The strongly negative correlation justifies the fact that young people are vulnerable, while detainees over the age of 21 along with the acquisitions gained from their experiences are less vulnerable to conflict situations. The hypothesis is confirmed.

3. *It is assumed that there is a significant correlation between the age and anger variables for the respondents.*

Table 7. Comparison between Age and Anger Variables

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
fury	40	1,00	5,00	2,7625	1,37098
Valid N (listwise)	40				

We formulated this hypothesis to see whether there are significant differences between the variables age and anger in the subjects in the experimental group. According to Tab. 7 a minimum = 1.00 and a maximum = 5.00 are observed, with $M = 2.7625$ for the anger variable.

Table 8. Group Statistics

	age	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
angry	young	20	1,5500	,51042	,11413
	adults	20	1,3000	,47016	,10513

In Tab. 8 we observe for the variable anger a significant difference resulting for young people $M = 1.5500$ and for adults $M = 1.3000$.

Table 9. Anger Age Correlation

Correlations		age	rage
age	Pearson Correlation	1	-,227*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,043
	N	40	40
rage	Pearson Correlation	-,227*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,043	
	N	40	40

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

It correlates moderately to significantly negative. Pearson Correlation = -, 227, Sig. = 0.043. We conclude that the hypothesis is confirmed, and the difference between the two age groups in the experimental sample is moderately significantly negative and that detainees under the age of 21 have a higher than average level of anger compared to detainees with age over 21 years. From a psychological point of view, adult detainees can control their negative emotions; they are less angry compared to young people who express their anger faster. The hypothesis is confirmed.

4. *It is assumed that there is a significant correlation between anger level and variation in scores for the anxiety factor for respondents.*

Table 10. Anxiety-Anger Correlations

		Anxiety	anger
anxiety	Pearson Correlation	1	,823**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000
	N	40	40
anger	Pearson Correlation	,823**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	
	N	40	40

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

Table 11. Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
anxiety	40	1,00	2,00	1,4500	,50063
anger	40	1,00	2,00	1,4375	,49921
Valid (listwise)	N40				

Tab. 11 indicates anxiety values between min = 1.00 and max = 2.00, with an M = 1.4500 and SD = ,50063, and anger values are min = 1.00 and max = 2.00, with a M = 1.4375 and SD = .49921.

The correlation of anxiety and anger is a strong one, a correlation confirmed by the values in Tab. 10 in which we observe Pearson Correlation = ,823, and Sig. 2-tailed = ,000. Young people are more anxious, they get angrier when they are provoked. We find that in this case, the hypothesis is confirmed.

5. *It is assumed that there is a significant correlation between the level of aggression and the variation of scores for the anxiety factor in responding subjects.*

Table 12. Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
anxiety	40	1,00	2,00	1,4500	,50063
aggression	40	1,00	2,00	1,6750	,47133
Valid N (listwise)	40				

In Tab. 12, we have for anxiety M = 1.4500 and for the variable aggressiveness M = 1.6750, in conclusion there are insignificant differences.

Table 13. Aggression Anxiety Correlation

Correlations			
		anxiety	aggression
anxiety	Pearson Correlation	1	,038
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,741
	N	40	40
aggression	Pearson Correlation	,038	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,741	
	N	40	40

Given the values in Table 13 Pearson Correlation = .038, and Sig.2-tailed = .751, $p > 0.05$, the hypothesis regarding the correlation between the level of aggression and

the variation of the scores for the anxiety factor in the responding subjects is NOT CONFIRMED.

Research Results and Their Interpretation

In the study, statistical analysis and graphical representations were performed using the SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) program.

SPSS is a modular line of fully integrated products for the analytical process - planning, data collection, access, data preparation and management, analysis, reporting and presentation of results.

Regarding anxiety, in young detainees (even if the hypothesis is insignificant, and we passed it as statistically unconfirmed), there is an average difference equal to 1,550, while in detainees over 21 years is 1,300, it turns out that young people under the age of 21 scored higher on anxiety. We notice that young detainees aged between 18 and 21 are fearful people, constantly worried that something bad will happen, they live in fear and anxiety even without a concrete reason, these disturbing their sleep. They are tense and insecure and easily panic in the face of unexpected situations.

Mature inmates scored lower on anxiety, although not statistically significant, which shows that they are generally calmer and more confident, rarely experiencing feelings of fear and anxiety. They worry less, and are confident that they will cope with conflicts successfully, and somehow things will be resolved. Detainees over the age of 21 tend to underestimate the seriousness of dangers or sometimes the negative consequences of difficult situations.

In the variable anger, young detainees under the age of 21 obtained higher scores compared to detainees over the age of 21. This variable indicates that young detainees get slightly annoyed whenever things are not the way they wanted them to be, and revolt if they feel wronged, obstructed or criticized. In conflict situations, young detainees openly express their frustrations, shouting loudly, slamming and threatening. Compared to young people, mature detainees over the age of 21 have a lower level of anger. They get harder to get angry. They are perceived as calmer, remaining relatively detached even in tense, conflict situations. The more experience they gain, the more they try to avoid aggressive detainees and do not react quickly in difficult-to-manage situations.

Compared to mature detainees, young detainees under the age of 21 scored higher on vulnerability, which shows that they can hardly cope with the stress generated by the prison environment and experience confusion, helplessness or even panic whenever they are under pressure. They avoid extreme situations, feeling vulnerable in the unforeseen and difficult to control. Mature detainees scored lower on vulnerability and were less affected by external pressures. They cope well with stress, as well as their ability to mobilize and concentrate in conflict situations.

Conclusions

It is a thematic necessity of the emotional dimension regarding the study of human aggression, an approach that also aims at neurosis as the main process involved in the manifestation of aggressive behavior.

Regarding the manifestation of aggressive tendencies, they take the form of an increased egocentrism, with an accentuation of their own desires and needs, to the detriment of others, compensating for a certain fragility of the Ego. Awareness of this leads to a specific inner transformation of the participants, to a maturation and increase of the unconditional acceptance of oneself and others. We can note that aggression itself is not a negative phenomenon that must be automatically reduced or annihilated. It includes a major potential by mediating the defense of the individual and by energizing the behavior. This potential, which is a natural resource of any normal individual, needs to be reasonably aware, organized, managed and controlled. In certain environments such as the military, sports, defense, which functionally uses means with violent effects specific to the action taken, we observe a “permitted aggressiveness” of defense, using in a positive sense the term combat. Aggression is also used in order to build the image of power and invulnerability that in threatening environments, such as theaters of operations, can be a means of defense.

References

- *** (2006). *Larousse The Great Dictionary of Psychology*. Bucharest: Trei.
- Aaron T.; Beck, Arthur Freeman & Denise D. Davis (2019). *Cognitive Therapy of Personality Disorders*. ASCR Publishing House Romanian Cognitive Sciences Association. Cluj-Napoca, p. 23.
- Allport, G. (1961). *Schultz*, pp. 28; 197.
- Averill, J. R. & Thomas-Knowles, C. (1991). *Emotional creativity*. In Strongman, T. (Ed.) (1991). *International review of studies on emotion*, Vol. 1, pp. 269-299. London: Wiley.
- Butoi Badea, T. (2008). *Judicial psychology University treatise - theory and practice*. Bucharest, p. 57.
- Deffenbacher; DiGiuseppe; Tafrate; Kassinove; Tafrate & Novaco (May, 2006). Anger Treatment for Adults: A Meta - Analytic Review. *Clinical Psychology Science and Practice* 10 (1), pp. 70- 84.
- Dollard, J.; Doob, L.W.; Miller, N.E.; Mowrer, O.H. & Sears, R.T. (1939). *Frustration and Aggression*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Eysenck, H. J. & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1975). *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (Junior and Adult)*. Kent, UK: Hodder & Stoughton, pp. 9-10.
- Ferguson, C. J.; San Miguel, C. & Hartley, R. D. (2009). A multivariate analysis of youth violence and aggression: The influence of family, peers, depression and media violence. *Journal of Pediatrics*, 155 (6), pp. 904-908.
- Gorgos, C. (1987). *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Psychiatry*. Bucharest: Ed. Medical, pp. 110–111.
- Murphy, C. M. & Eckhardt, C. I. (2005). *Treating the Abusive Partner: An Individualized Cognitive-Behavioral Approach*. New York: Guilford.
- Neveanu-Popescu, P. (1978). *Dictionary of psychology*. Bucharest: Ed. Albatross, p. 888.
- Rășcanu, R. (2004). *Alcohol and drugs: "virtues" and traps for young people (psychosocial approach)*. University of Bucharest Publishing House.
- Turluc M. N.; Karner Huțuleac, A. & Dănilă O. (2009). *Domestic violence. Theories, particularities and specific interventions*. Iasi: "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University Publishing House, pp. 7-9.