

# RUSSIAN ADOLESCENTS' READINESS FOR AGGRESSION AS A RESULT OF FAMILY UPBRINGING

Natalya N. Kalatskaya<sup>1\*</sup>, Roza A. Valeeva<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1\*</sup> Institute of Psychology and Education, Kazan (Volga region) Federal University, Kazan, Russia.

Email: <sup>1\*</sup>kalazkay@mail.ru, <sup>2</sup> valeykin@yandex.ru

Article History: Received on 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2020, Revised on 24<sup>th</sup> May 2020, Published on 14<sup>th</sup> June 2020

## Abstract

**Purpose of the study:** The object of this paper is to study the influence of the nature of family relationships and parenting practices on the Russian teenagers' readiness for aggression.

**Methodology:** The fundamental basis of this study includes three surveys. The most commonly used by Russian parents parenting styles and methods are investigated by the Retrospective Inventory of Child Rearing Practices (RICRP). The most common parenting styles are identified with the use of Retrospective questionnaire of parenting styles (RQP). Both tools rely on retrospective reflection. The interpersonal behaviors inventory (IBI) enabled identifying three forms of the respondents' readiness for aggression among. The overall level of readiness for aggression (RA) was calculated as an arithmetic mean of the three forms of readiness for aggression N=237 young people (110 females and 127 males) aged 18-24 took part in this study after being randomly selected. The following statistical methods for data processing were used: descriptive statistics, Spearman's rho criterion, Analysis of Variances ANOVA and MANOVA, Linear regression analysis.

**Results:** Several forms of Russian adolescents' readiness for aggression were identified: girls mostly have Emotional-Impulsive Readiness (E-IR), and boys have Habitual-Cognitive Readiness (H-CR). Various parenting styles and practices were studied as well as the similarities and differences in youth aggression taking into account respondents' socio-economic status and gender. Statistically significant correlation between parenting methods and styles and some forms of readiness for aggression was established.

**Applications of this study:** The findings of the significant correlation between parenting methods and styles and some forms of readiness for aggression can be used as a theoretical basis for the development of correctional programs and methodology to improve the educational level and psychological competence of parents in raising children. The revealed similarities and differences in youth aggression could be of interest for psychological counseling and in the work of educational institutions. The identified forms of the Russian adolescents' readiness for aggression can be used in the global-scale comparative analysis.

**Novelty/Originality of this study:** The scientific novelty of this research is in integrating two of the most pressing social issues – parenting practices and aggression along with its causes. It presents the complex impact of parenting on the Russian adolescents' increasing readiness for aggression.

**Keywords:** *Readiness for aggression, Parenting style, Upbringing, Youth, Parents.*

## INTRODUCTION

Mass media constantly bombards us with news about growing violence among young people including cases of extreme severity and cruelty, vandalism and bullying. These socially dangerous outbursts, which are usually directly linked to the concepts of aggression and aggressiveness, are a serious cause for concern. The notion of aggression has a relative nature – it is measured against a socially accepted

norm which is specific for a particular socio-historic moment (Olshanskaya, 2000). Longitudinal studies show that aggressiveness developed in childhood becomes a prominent personality characteristic that persists throughout the whole life of a person (Huesmann, 1988; Olweus, 1977; Pulkkinen, 1987).

Teenagers lean towards different types of aggression as they mature: physical and verbal aggression, negativism. In

addition aggression is manifested differently in boys and girls (Buss & Durkee, 1957). For example, boys display less physical and verbal aggression with age whereas these types of aggression seem to increase in girls with age. Some argue that aggression lacking in personal animosity can be a positive factor for social adaptation and can benefit personal development and constructive 'renewal of one's environment' (Ammon, 1981). Constructive aggression implies having a highly developed ability for empathy, a wide range of interests and vivid imagination. Constructive aggression relates to an ability to openly express one's own feelings and emotions, it can be a foundation for learning and development, for a creative transformation of one's own environment. Scholars are looking for various methods to transform aggressive behavior into a constructive form (Solobutina, 2014; Drozdikova-Zaripova, Kostyunina & Kalatskaya, 2015; Akishina et al., 2017; Gimaliev et al., 2018; Zyubina et al., 2019; Biktagirova et al., 2020; Rassolov et al., 2020).

Family life and upbringing defines the process of children developing readiness for aggressive behavior (Khukhlaeva, 2003). For children, their family is their foundation for social adaptation – it impacts how children deal with social problems (Fromm, 1993). If parents display aggressive forms of behavior (verbal and physical aggression), use corporal punishment and don't discourage their child's aggression, then it is more likely that this child will adopt the same behavioral patterns and aggression will become their personality trait (Kholod, 2005).

It was established that there is a relationship between a child's aggressiveness and parenting styles (Gippenreiter, 1995; Trapeznikova, 1998). Authoritarian parents raise aggressive children who are unable to maintain healthy relationships with others. Aggressive and indifferent attitudes of parents provoke children's persistent aggressive behavior and anxiety (Korytchenkova, 2000). Emotional neglect and hyper-protectiveness equally contribute to destructive teenage aggressiveness (Koreneva, 2014).

Apart from conscious and deliberate parenting influence any child is also affected by an overall family atmosphere, family practices, home conditions, parents' socio-economic status, their occupation, education level, and value systems (Ryś, 2001). For this reason any family deformation may lead to negative consequences for child personality development. Research shows that using punishments in order to prevent undesirable behavior can have a great impact on the trajectory of the child's development and leads to antisocial, aggressive and criminal behavior at the later stages of life (Patterson & Stouthamer-Loeber, 1984; Chao & Willms, 2002; Mestre, 2014; Grusec & Hastings, 2015).

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

#### Aggression, Aggressiveness, Readiness for Aggression: Exploring the Terms

A.A. Rean (1996) suggested a clear distinction between aggression and aggressiveness. He defines aggression as a deliberate action aimed at causing harm to another person, a group of people or an animal. At the same time aggressiveness is defined as a personality trait which manifests itself through aggression. Aggressiveness has qualitative and quantitative aspects. As any trait it can be viewed as a spectrum going from total absence to an extreme end. Aggressiveness can be considered as an integrative personality trait which includes stubbornness, inflexibility, vindictiveness, and intolerance towards the views of others (Ilin, 2014). It is generally (Furmanov, 1996; Khukhlaeva, 2003; Mutavchi et al., 2018; Ovsyanik et al., 2020) accepted that all people have at least some level of aggressiveness. When this level does not exceed 'the norm' it is considered socially acceptable and even necessary. A total lack of

aggressiveness leads to compliancy, suggestibility, and passiveness.

There are three main groups of theories related to aggression (Furmanov, 1996; Buss, 1961). The first group understands aggressiveness as an innate instinctive characteristic of a person (this group includes psychoanalytical theories) (Lorents, 1994; Fromm, 2004). The second group describes aggression as a behavioral reaction to frustration (Dollard et al., 1939; Berkowitz, 1962). The third group consists of theories which view aggression as an aspect of behavior which is developed / learned over time (behavioral theories) (Bandura, 1973; Buss & Durkee, 1957). A.H. Buss and M. Perry (1992) focused on specific characteristics of aggressiveness – physical aggression, verbal aggression, anger, indirect aggression, resentment, and suspiciousness.

The term 'readiness for aggression' was first introduced into scholarly literature by A. Frączek (2002). He hypothesized that aggressive behavior regardless of its form and function can be regulated by various inner mechanisms. Readiness for aggression is defined as a constellation of intrapsychic processes and structures that underlie and/or regulate aggressive behavior (Frączek, 2002). At the core of this concept is an understanding that people can behave similarly but for very different reasons. In some cases a specific mechanism can be set in motion (readiness) that have been developed in the process of socialization triggering similar aggressive reactions. That is why when looking at a certain behavior it is impossible to tell what the underlying reason behind it is. A. Frączek (2002) identified three forms of readiness for aggression: emotional-impulsive, habitual-cognitive and personality-immanent. Emotional-Impulsive Readiness (E-IR) is often used as a means to attract attention, as a way to elicit emotional response from others. In order to achieve this, people generally express their aggressive emotions in a very conspicuous manner (they loudly yell, fight, throw things away, etc.). When people use this form of aggression their actions do not last long, they happen in the moment and are not characterized by cruelty. More often than not this form of readiness for aggression is manifested through physical (direct and indirect) aggression (Frączek, 2008). Research shows that E-IR is related to neuroticism (Smulczyk, Frączek & Grzegółowska-Klarkowska, 2009), emotional reactivity (Smulczyk, 2008), anger and animosity (Konopka et al., 2009).

Habitual-Cognitive Readiness (H-CR) describes specific habits, scenarios, and beliefs related to aggressive behavior. This form of readiness implies using aggression in order to achieve one's goals (getting a promotion, winning a competition, etc.) (Frączek, 2008). An aggressive person views this behavior as a means to accomplish specific tasks and fulfill specific functions related to his/her social status. Research shows that H-CR is positively related to psychoticism (Smulczyk, Frączek & Grzegółowska-Klarkowska, 2009), anger and animosity (Konopka et al., 2009), direct physical aggression (37 %) which is not characterized by cruelty (Khuzeeva & Smirnova, 2001).

Personality-Immanent Readiness (P-IR) refers to a constant and immanent need for aggressive behavior because it provides positive emotions (satisfaction) (Frączek, 2008). High PIR is formed under particular developmental conditions in which aggressive behavior at early stages of development leads to an improved self-esteem and lowered sense of uncertainty and ambiguity. P-IR positively correlates with psychoticism (Smulczyk, Frączek & Grzegółowska-Klarkowska, 2009). There is a moderate relationship between P-IR and aggression (both physical and verbal); there is also a weak relationship with anger and animosity (Konopka et al., 2009). Studies on readiness for aggression that took place in Poland showed more than once that girls and women are more likely to have a higher level of

E-IR than boys and men. At the same time, boys and men are more likely to have a higher level of HCR and PIR (Frączek, Konopka & Dominiak-Kochanek, 2016). In other words, at least in Poland female aggression is mostly regulated by emotional states, whereas male aggression is mostly determined by cognitive schemes and scenarios as well as by particular needs.

### Parenting as an Aggressiveness Factor

Parenting is commonly defined as a combination of all interactions between parents and children which help children develop their consciousness, feelings, and will. These interactions facilitate the process of acquiring behavioral experience, independent living, as well as psychophysical, moral and spiritual development. Thus, the methods of parenting are the interactions between parents and children aimed at character building.

Psycho-pedagogical research shows that there is no commonly accepted classification of parenting methods. Nevertheless, there have been scholarly attempts to identify the most significant (main) as well as less significant (additional) parenting methods. Both parents and educators use the same set of pedagogical methods. For instance, there is the following classification of upbringing methods (Tchetchet, 2015):

1. *Consciousness building methods* (conversations, explanations, suggestions, examples).
2. *Behavior building and activity organization methods* (training, exercising, direct demands (instructions, orders, warnings), indirect demands (advice, request, trust, approval, hints, reminders), commission).
3. *Activity stimulation methods*: encouragement (praise, gratitude, appreciation, positive feedback, friendly eye contact, physical contact: stroking, hugging, handshaking, setting tasks, gift giving, financial rewards); punishment (criticism, warning, delayed conversations, keep promises but with a delay, braking promises, reserved attitude, denying requests, depriving of usual entertainment, temporary isolations, moralizing); forgiveness, competition (incentivizing).

It is worth considering the classification of parenting methods proposed by Polish scholars (Spera, 2005; Dominiak-Kochanek, Frączek & Konopka, 2012). Huesmann & Eron (1986) identified the following educational methods: punishments (of different forms and severity), refusals (as a way to demonstrate disapproval), care (attending to child's needs and ensuring physical and psychological wellbeing). Thus, according to the Polish scholars, some methods are affirmative as they do not involve the use of violence. These methods include explanations, praise, expressing concerns, and setting positive example. The second group of parenting methods is punitive. These methods may involve play time reduction, various limitations, home arrest, method of inevitable outcomes, food deprivation, enforced sleep and other methods. These punishments are enforced in response to misbehaving. Aggressive methods include both physical (spanking, for instance) and psychological punishments (emotional detachment, physical contact withdrawal – kisses and hugs get withdrawn, verbal aggression (yelling and insulting children)).

Parenting methods have impact on the development of children (Baumrind, 1971). Research shows that moderately controlling methods facilitate high levels of learning activity and social development in children aged 5-7. Moreover, there is a positive relationship between the levels of punishment severity and the levels of children's aggressiveness (Eron et al., 1963). The same relationship is visible in the situations when parents punish children for being aggressive. In other words, punishing children harshly for being aggressive is counterproductive. In addition, over the course of a

longitudinal study it was found that the levels of punishment severity experienced by children at age 8 correlated with the levels of aggressiveness they displayed when they became adults aged 18 and 30 (Eron et al., 1963). Another study showed that among 18-year-old males the least aggressive were those who experienced moderate levels of punishments as children (Lefkowitz et al., 1977). These authors concluded that when parents were either too harsh or too lenient with their punishments, their sons became more predisposed to aggression than their peers. It is important that teachers and parents are aware of what methods are psycho-traumatic and therefore unacceptable: physical force, verbal aggression, nutritional deprivation, rudeness, humiliations, accusations, public shaming, threatening, mocking, separation punishment (when child gets partly deprived of parental love), and prohibitions.

### Parenting Styles and their Classifications

According to A.L. Venger (2005), parenting styles are a system of interrelationships which is characterized by the degree of control, care, close emotional contact between parents and their child, the nature of the child's behavior and how it is influenced by adults and their prohibitions. G. Krai and D. Bokum (2005) identified four main parenting styles that reflect two key parameters – parenting controls and relationship closeness: authoritative style (a high level of control and close relationship), authoritarian style (a high level of control and cold distant relationship), liberal/permissive style (a low level of control and close relationship), indifferent/uninvolved style (a low level of control and cold relationship).

M. Ryś (2004) developed another classification and established the following styles: democratic (authoritative) style is characterized by kind and trust-based family relationships. At the same time, this style has a high level of control. Parents are always open for discussion; they aspire to talk through all issues with their children. Under the autocratic (authoritarian) style parents are very strict and harsh. They give their children orders to obey. These families maintain rigid rules and high expectations. Children are supposed to follow the rules without questioning them. If there is any misbehavior children endure harsh punishments. Their opinion is disregarded. The liberal-affectionate and liberal-indifferent styles have several common features – children enjoy a high level of autonomy which helps their overall development. When parents follow these styles they are very permissive and never set any limits. The main difference between these styles is the level of emotional connection of parents with their children. While the liberal-affectionate style is characterized by care and affection towards the child, the liberal-indifferent style is demonstrated through indifference and emotional neglect. Research shows that the authoritative (democratic) style is the best parenting approach as it effectively helps foster children's mental health and psycho-social development. Children who had authoritative parents are more likely to grow up to be independent, kind, assertive, and able to work in a team (Baumrind, 1966; Baumrind, 1971). These children usually perform well academically and have a high level of academic motivation.

### PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Our study attempts to gain new insights into the nature of aggression. We aim to investigate how family relationships and parenting methods influence the levels of the Russian teenagers' aggressiveness. In order to achieve this goal we focus on the following research questions:

- 1) What forms of readiness for aggression are most prevalent among the Russian youth (and to test if there are any gender differences)?

## Russian Adolescents' Readiness For Aggression As A Result Of Family Upbringing

- 2) What parenting styles and methods are most commonly used by Russian parents?
- 3) What are the main similarities and differences when measuring the readiness for teenagers' aggression taking into account their gender and socio-economic status?
- 4) How do parenting styles and methods relate to the levels of readiness for teenagers' aggression?

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

#### Participants

This study involved 237 randomly selected participants aged 18-24 ( $M=20.4$ ,  $SD=1.44$ ) (Figure 1). 110 of the participants

were female (46.4%) and 127 were male (53.6%). None of the respondents came from a single parent household. All of them lived in the Republic of Tatarstan, Russian Federation. In regards to the educational levels of the respondents' parents, the majority of them had the secondary vocational education level – 46.8% of fathers and 37.6% of mothers. 41.4% of fathers and 35% of mothers held university degree. 11.8% of fathers and 23.2% of mothers had general secondary education. 4.2% of mothers had basic general (compulsory) education. More details are available in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Information about participating males ( $n=127$ ) and females ( $n=110$ )

Participants	Occupation						Location			
	Serving in the army	Unemployed and not studying	Working teenager who is not studying	University student working part-time	Unemployed	High school student	Rural area	Suburban localities (Population: 5000-1000)	Town (Population: 10000-50000)	City (population over 50000)
All, %	0.4	1.7	11	2.5	84	0.4	18.6	18.6	25.7	37.1
Males, %	0.8	3.1	11.8	0	83.5	0.8	16.5	17.3	28.3	37.8
Females, %	0	0	10	5.5	84.5	0	20.9	20	22.7	36.4

#### Measures

In the course of this study we conducted a survey. In order to investigate what parenting styles and methods are most commonly used by Russian parents, we employed Retrospective Inventory of Child Rearing Practices (RICRP) (prepared by M. Dominiak-Kochanek & E. Kulawska on the basis of the Dimension of Discipline Inventory (Straus & Fauchier, 2007). RICRP is designed for young participants (aged 18-24). This methodological tool required respondents to recollect and reflect on the parenting methods their mothers and fathers used when respondents were 12 (mothers' and fathers' methods are considered separately). RICRP consisted of 21 questions. When analyzing the responses we divided the questions into three groups in accordance with three main groups of parenting methods: affirmative methods (The Cronbach's alpha value of this subscale's reliability is  $\alpha=.85$ ), punitive methods (The Cronbach's alpha value of this subscale's reliability is  $\alpha=.83$ ) and aggressive methods (The Cronbach's alpha value of this subscale's reliability is  $\alpha=.66$ ). Each group of methods has its own scales. Participants were asked to answer each question using the scale from 0 to 5.

In addition to that, we identified the most common parenting styles with the use of Retrospective questionnaire of parenting styles (RQP) (Ryś, 2004). This tool consisted of two parts. The first part (34 questions) is used to describe the mother's behavior when the respondent was 12. The second part (34 questions) is used to describe the father's behavior. With this methodology it is possible to assess the level of intensity of the parenting style most commonly used within a family: democratic style (authoritative style), autocratic style (authoritarian style), liberal-loving style (indulgent style), and liberal-nonloving style (neglectful style). The respondents indicated their replies with the use of a four-point scale in which 3 points were added for 'definitely yes' and 0 points were scored for 'definitely no'. In view of the fact that this tool has a retrospective nature, the respondents also had an opportunity to choose an additional (fifth) option when answering ('I can't say' – 1.5 points). The biggest score that each participant could score was 30 points for each subscale (1-9 points – very low level, 10-19 points – low level, 20-23 moderate level, 24-26 high level, 27-30 – very high level).

Both tools rely on retrospective reflection. The authors of these tools argue that it is important to conduct studies with

the use of these tools among young people (aged 18-24). The focus on this particular age group is based on the fact that by this age people have already gone through puberty and emerged into adulthood forming their identity and settling on fixed patterns of behavior. At the same time they still have clear memories of their early family life – of the parenting methods their mother and father used.

The third tool, the interpersonal behaviors inventory (IBI) (Frączek, Konopka & Smulczyk, 2013) enabled us to identify three forms of readiness for aggression among the respondents (E-IR – emotional-impulsive readiness for aggression; H-CR – habitual-cognitive readiness for aggression; P-IR – personality-immanent readiness for aggression). The overall level of readiness for aggression (RA) was calculated as an arithmetic mean of the three forms of readiness for aggression. Moreover, our study took into account the following socio-demographic variables: parental education levels and home address.

#### Analyses Plan

The following statistical methods for data processing were used: descriptive statistics, Spearman's rho criterion, Analysis of Variances ANOVA and MANOVA, Linear regression analysis. The statistical analysis was conducted with the use of IBM SPSS Statistics 23. It has to be noted that the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test revealed that the values of all the tested variables did not follow the normal distribution ( $p \leq .05$  for all tests). In view of this, the correlation significance was then tested with the use of nonparametric Mann-Whitney U test.

### RESULTS

#### Readiness for Aggression

Overall, we see that E-IR type aggression dominates within our sample ( $M=8.9$ ,  $SD=2.3$ ), H-CR ( $M=4.1$ ,  $SD=2.2$ ), P-IR ( $M=3.1$ ,  $SD=1.8$ ), RA ( $M=11.6$ ,  $SD=4.6$ ). Table 2 provides the details on how we used Mann-Whitney U test in order to identify differences among female and male participants. These results indicate that among female participants E-IR type aggression was most common (average rank 133.65 for females, 106.31 for males). However, among the male participants H-CR type aggression was most prevalent (average rank 108.92 for females, y 127.73 for males).

**Table 2.** Mann–Whitney rank sum U test to determine the differences in various forms of readiness for aggression by sex

Variable	Average range		Rank sum		Mann–Whitney U	Z	p
	Females (n=110)	Males (n=127)	Females (n=110)	Males (n=127)			
E-IR	133.65	106.31	14701.5	13501.5	5373.5	-3.086	.002
H-CR	108.92	127.73	11981	16222	5876	-2.130	.033
R-IR	111.65	125.36	12282	15921	6177	-1.555	.120
RA	119.44	118.62	13138	15065	6937	-.091	.927

**Parenting Methods in Russian Families**

First of all, we analyzed the collected data with the use of Retrospective inventory of child rearing practices (RICRP). These results (Table 3) show that the mothers (Average range = 243.91) used positive parenting methods more frequently

than the fathers (Average range=221.08) ( $p = .009$ ). At the same time the mothers (Average range=254.89) also used punitive more frequently than the fathers (Average range=220.11) ( $p=.006$ ).

**Table 3.** Mann–Whitney rank sum U test to determine the differences in preference for parenting methods among fathers and mothers

Parenting methods	Mothers (n=237)		Fathers (n=237)		Mann–Whitney U	p
	Average range	Rank sum	Average range	Rank sum		
aggressive methods	243.91	57807.5	231.09	54767.5	26564	.306
punitive methods	254.89	60409	220.11	52166	23963	.006
affirmative methods	253.92	60178	221.08	52397	24194	.009

**Parenting Styles in Russian Families**

The results of the Retrospective questionnaire of parenting styles (RQP) indicated that there are significant differences in preference for parenting methods among parents. The results are detailed in Table 4. Adolescents believed that their parents used the democratic style on a low level. At the same time, young people noted that almost half of the total number of mothers and fathers adopted the democratic style on moderate and high levels.

Low and very low levels of authoritarian style, according to the young people, was exercised by their parents, especially by the mothers. The survey results also indicated that the parents did not actively employ the liberal-loving style. The participants marked this style being on a low level of use. Liberal-nonloving parenting style was also ranked on a low level. Interestingly, children considered that their mothers used the liberal-nonloving parenting style on a very low level while their fathers practiced this style on very low and low levels in equal measures.

**Table 4.** Parenting styles as perceived and reported by young people (percentage distribution for fathers and mothers)

Parenting styles		Parents			
		Mothers (n=237)		Fathers (n=237)	
		n	%	n	%
<b>Democratic style (authoritative style)</b>					
	Very low	1	0.4	11	4.6
	Low	118	49.8	137	57.8
	Moderate	70	29.6	54	22.8
	High	33	13.9	25	10.6
	Very high	15	6.3	10	4.2
<b>Autocratic style (authoritarian style)</b>					
	Very low	155	65.4	107	45.1
	Low	77	32.5	123	51.9
	Moderate	5	2.1	6	2.6
	High	0	0	1	0.4
	Very high	0	0	0	0
<b>Liberal-loving style (indulgent style)</b>					
	Very low	7	3	9	3.8
	Low	197	83.1	190	80.2
	Moderate	28	11.8	34	14.3
	High	5	2.1	4	1.7
	Very high	0	0	0	0
<b>Liberal-nonloving style (neglectful style)</b>					
	Very low	151	63.7	115	48.5
	Low	86	36.3	119	50.2

## Russian Adolescents' Readiness For Aggression As A Result Of Family Upbringing

Moderate	0	0	3	1.3
High	0	0	0	0
Very high	0	0	0	0

Next, we identified whether there were gender differences in the choice of parenting styles. The Mann-Whitney rank sum U was used (Table 5). The results of the statistical analysis showed that adolescents viewed mothers as more democratic (Average range=259.9) compared to fathers (Average

range=215). According to the participants, their fathers adopted more autocratic (Average range=269.2) and liberal (neglectful) (Average range=261.8) parenting styles in comparison with their mothers (Average range=205.7 and Average range=213.1 respectively).

**Table 5.** Mann-Whitney Rank Sum U Test to Determine the Differences in Parenting Styles of Mothers and Fathers

Parenting style	Parents	Average range	Rank sum	Mann-Whitney rank sum U
Democratic style (authoritative style)	Mother	259.9	61614.5	22757.5***
	Father	215	50960.5	
Autocratic style (authoritarian style)	Mother	205.7	48766.5	20563.5***
	Father	269.2	63808.5	
Liberal-loving style (indulgent style)	Mother	246.9	58530	25842***
	Father	228	54045	
Liberal-nonloving style (neglectful style)	Mother	213.1	50524	22321***
	Father	261.8	62051	

Note. Intercorrelations for fathers are above the diagonal and for stepfathers are below the diagonal.

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

### Correlation Analysis

Spearman's rank correlation was run to identify how parenting styles and methods are interrelated. We considered only moderate and strong links between the coefficients. Statistical analysis indicated a moderate negative correlation between the following variables: mother's democratic parenting style and mother's autocratic parenting style ( $r = -.369, p \leq .001$ ); mother's democratic parenting style and mother's liberal-nonloving parenting style ( $r = -.595, p \leq .001$ ); father's democratic parenting style and father's liberal-nonloving parenting style ( $r = -.529, p \leq .001$ ). There was a moderate positive correlation between the following variables: mother's democratic style and father's democratic style ( $r = .422, p \leq .001$ ); mother's autocratic style and mother's liberal-nonloving style ( $r = .692, p \leq .001$ ); mother's autocratic style and father's autocratic style ( $r = .491, p \leq .001$ ); mother's autocratic style and father's liberal-nonloving style ( $r = .415, p \leq .001$ ); mother's liberal-loving style and father's liberal-loving style ( $r = .402, p \leq .001$ ); mother's liberal-nonloving style and father's autocratic style ( $r = .446, p \leq .001$ ); mother's liberal-nonloving style and father's liberal-nonloving style ( $r = .476, p \leq .001$ ); father's autocratic style and father's liberal-nonloving style ( $r = .536, p \leq .001$ ). There was a moderate positive statistically significant correlation between father's autocratic style and father's punitive methods ( $r = .371, p \leq .001$ ).

Statistically significant correlation has also been established between parents' choices of parenting methods: mother's affirmative methods and father's affirmative methods ( $r = .603, p \leq .001$ ); mother's punitive methods and mother's aggressive methods ( $r = .311, p \leq .001$ ); mother's punitive methods and father's affirmative methods ( $r = .272, p \leq .001$ ); mother's punitive methods and father's punitive methods ( $r = .636, p \leq .001$ ); mother's punitive methods and father's aggressive methods ( $r = .301, p \leq .001$ ); mother's aggressive methods and father's aggressive methods ( $r = .508, p \leq .001$ ); father's affirmative methods and father's punitive methods ( $r = .428, p \leq .001$ ); father's punitive methods and father's aggressive methods ( $r = .581, p \leq .001$ ). Strong positive correlation was found between such variables as father's democratic style and father's liberal-loving style ( $r = .753, p \leq .001$ ).

### Regression Analysis

Multiple regression analysis was performed to find out which parenting styles and methods had a greater impact on different forms of aggressive behavior. Independent variables were parenting styles and methods. Dependent variables were adolescents' readiness for aggression (regression equations were composed separately for each form of readiness for aggression).

**Table 6.** Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Predicting Correlation between Emotional-Impulsive Readiness (E-IR) for Aggression and Parenting Methods and Styles

Model and Predictor Variables	R <sup>2</sup>	ΔR <sup>2</sup>	B	SE B	β	p
Model 1	.033	.029				
Autocratic style (fathers)			.082	.029		.005
Constant			3.630	.338	.181	.000

Multiple correlation coefficient for this model is  $R = .181$  which indicates the absence of correlation between the given variables. Value of  $R^2 = .033$  itself shows that 3.3 % of variable variance of E-IR are determined by the influence of predictors. Standard regression coefficients  $\beta$  are statistically significant which allows to interpret relative degree of the predictor's influence on a dependent variable ( $\beta = .181$ ). The predictor in this case is autocratic parenting style. This

independent variable influences in a way the estimation of a dependent variable and positively correlates with it. Multiple correlation coefficient is statistically significant ( $F = 7.928, p = .005$ , Durbin-Watson coefficient = 1.763) which is why the multiple regression model can be interpreted meaningfully, although the results cannot be accounted for due to a low  $R^2$  index.

**Table 7.** Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Predicting Correlation between Habitual-Cognitive Readiness (H-CR) and Parenting Methods and Styles

## Russian Adolescents' Readiness For Aggression As A Result Of Family Upbringing

Model and Predictor Variables	R <sup>2</sup>	ΔR <sup>2</sup>	B	SE B	β	p
Model 1	.044	.040				
Affirmative methods (mothers)			.100	.030	.209	.001
Constant			1.980	.659		.003
Model 2	.094	.086				
Affirmative methods (mothers)			.107	.030	.225	.000
Democratic style (fathers)			-.100	.028	-.224	.000
Constant			3.627	.789		.000
Model 3	.113	.102				
Affirmative methods (mothers)			.106	.029	.223	.000
Democratic style (fathers)			-.088	.028	-.198	.002
Autocratic style (mothers)			.068	.030	.141	.026
Constant			2.881	.850		.001

R=.336, R<sup>2</sup>=.113, F=9.889, p=.0001. Durbin-Watson coefficient = 1.892. This model can be interpreted meaningfully, although the results cannot be accounted for.

**Table 8.** Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Predicting Correlation between Personality-Immanent Readiness (R-IR) and Parenting Methods and Styles

Model and Predictor Variables	R <sup>2</sup>	ΔR <sup>2</sup>	B	SE B	β	p
Model 1	.070	.066				
Aggressive methods (fathers)			.113	.027	.265	.000
Constant			1.398	.409		.001
Model 2	.098	.090				
Aggressive methods (fathers)			.102	.027	.239	.000
Liberal-nonloving style (fathers)			.064	.024	.169	.008
Constant			.973	.434		.026
Model 3	.129	.118				
Aggressive methods (fathers)			.084	.027	.198	.002
Liberal-nonloving style (fathers)			.069	.023	.183	.003
Affirmative methods (mothers)			.072	.025	.182	.004
Constant			-.356	.627		0.57
Model 4	.146	.131				
Aggressive methods (fathers)			.091	.027	.213	.001
Liberal-nonloving style (fathers)			.060	.024	.160	.011
Affirmative methods (mothers)			.115	.032	.290	.000
Affirmative methods (fathers)			-.066	.031	-.172	.036
Constant			.051	.651		.938

R=.382, R<sup>2</sup>=.146, F=9.897, p=.0001. Durbin-Watson coefficient = 1.973. This model can also be interpreted meaningfully, although the results cannot be accounted for.

### Analysis of Variance

A two-way ANOVA 2x4 (gender x place of residence) was used to study the influence of such variables as 'gender' and 'place of residence' on a dependent variable 'readiness for aggression' (different forms). Separate calculations were performed for each of the forms of readiness for aggression according to this criterion.

### Results According to the Forms of Readiness for Aggression

The 'gender' variable was found to have a statistically significant effect on the E-IR variable distribution (Levene Statistic =.898, p=.509). Statistically significant interaction at a high level of statistical significance was also established between the independent variables 'gender' and 'place of residence', F (3, 236) = 5.326, p <0,001, η<sup>2</sup> = 0,065. It can be argued that girls living in rural areas and big cities have a higher level of E-IR for aggression than boys. It was found that the 'gender' variable had a statistically significant effect (Levene Statistic =1.709, p=.108) on the distribution of a dependent variable H-CR, F (1,236) = 4.145, p <0,05, η<sup>2</sup> = 0,018, i.e. this form of aggression pertains to teenage boys. As for the third form of readiness for aggression, R-IR, there was no statistically significant effect of independent variables 'gender' and 'place of residence' on the distribution of the

dependent variable R-IR. In addition, we could not identify a statistically significant effect of independent variables 'mother's level of education' and 'father's level of education' on the dependent variable 'readiness for aggression' (for all the three forms).

Next, we set to identify which factors (adolescents' gender, place of residence, parents' education level) influenced parents' choice of parenting styles and methods. The calculations were performed using a single-factor analysis ANOVA. It was found that a place of residence had a statistically reliable direct influence on mothers opting for the democratic parenting style (Levene Statistic =1.177, p=.319), F (3,236)=3.857, p=.01. The results indicated that women residing in villages use a democratic parenting style more than women residing in towns and small cities.

Further, we established that a place of residence had a statistically reliable influence on mothers' choosing affirmative parenting methods (Levene Statistic =1,595, p=0,191, F (3, 236) =3.124, p=0.027). Nonetheless, multiple comparisons of pairs using Sheffe's method did not allow to determine what size of a settlement had a statistically significant influence on the fact that mothers chose affirmative parenting methods.

The level of education was also found to have a statistically significant influence (Levene Statistic =0.394, p=0,675, F

(2,236) = 3.124,  $p=0.016$ ) on fathers' choice of affirmative parenting methods. It can be argued that fathers who hold a higher education degree are more likely to use affirmative parenting methods toward their children.

### DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Similar research was conducted in a number of different countries, including Russia. Scholars examined the relationship between parenting styles and the level of school children's aggressive behavior (Korytchenkova, 2000); personality and gender-specific traits of aggressive adolescents (Furmanov, 1996); forms and types of aggression as pertains to people of different age: pre-school children, primary school children, teenagers, high school students, children with troubled behavior and etc. Nonetheless, to date, there are almost no studies that holistically explored the influence of parenting praxis (both parenting styles and methods) on the development of adolescents' aggression.

Our research revealed that girls mostly have Emotional-Impulsive Readiness (E-IR), and boys have Habitual-Cognitive Readiness (H-CR). These findings are in line with the previous research (Frączek, Konopka & Dominiak-Kochanek, 2016). Along with the Polish researchers' findings we discovered that girls, as a rule, express their aggressive emotions very strongly (they shout, swear loudly, throw things around). Girls living in rural areas and big cities were found to have E-IR more often than boys.

At the same time, boys demonstrate higher levels of H-CR (in the research by A. Frączek, K. Konopka and M. Dominiak-Kochanek (2016) the same result was found for boys' levels of P-IR). Adolescent boys reach their goals utilizing this form of aggression, for example, to outperform a contestant or to move up the career ladder, and etc. Adolescent boys experience positive emotions only after they have achieved results but not at the moment of aggressive actions. Boys tend to act purposefully and on their own. Unlike teenage girls, teenage boys do not seek to gain attention.

Scholars underline that certain factors have the capacity to empower the reinforcement of aggressive behavioral patterns: parents' education, parenting methods (Riza, 2012), control and consistency in parenting, parenting styles (Gippenreiter, 1995; Trapeznikova, 1998), and other factors. We were unable, however, to identify statistically a significant effect that independent variables 'mother's level of education' and 'father's level of education' had on a dependant variable 'readiness for aggression' (all three forms).

We have also established statistically significant correlation between parenting methods and styles, on the one hand, and some forms of readiness for aggression, on the other hand. Adolescent boys perceive mothers as more democratic compared to fathers who, according to their children, adopt autocratic and liberal-nonloving styles. This distribution can be explained by a commonly held opinion in Russia that mothers are homemakers, and it is mostly their task to bring up children. Fathers are commonly viewed as breadwinners, and therefore, their task is to support the family financially. On the one hand, fathers are expected to be strict towards their children, and children are expected to obey their parents unquestionably and show them respect. Many fathers, on the other hand, step back from parenting as they do not consider that a male domain. The fact that women living in rural areas use the democratic parenting style more often than women living in small and medium-sized cities is also of interest.

Our results partially confirm the results obtained by European researchers (Olivari et al., 2015) who, it should be noted, studied boys' and girls' opinions separately. Albeit that was not the task of the current research, we might consider making such distinctions in future studies. The existing research shows that in Sweden, Italy and Greece

both girls and boys consider democratic (authoritative) to be the main parenting style of fathers as well as mothers. Another interesting conclusion is that adolescents perceived their mothers as more authoritative, authoritarian and liberal than fathers. As for the authoritarian parenting style, Swedish adolescents pointed out that their parents do not adopt that style as often as Greek and Italian parents do, according to their children.

Within the current research we have also examined relationship between parents' level of education and the parenting styles they used. Unlike our colleagues (Bronfenbrenner, 1958; Chen, Dong & Zhou, 1997; Von der Lippe, 1999) we did not find any statistical correlation between these variables. Researchers discovered that parents holding higher education degrees were more authoritarian than parents with lower levels of education in Sweden, Italy and Greece. On the contrary, M.G. Olivari et al. (2015) reported that parents with a low level of education were not perceived as more authoritarian than parents with a high level of education.

Researchers also focus a lot on examination of parenting methods. We identified which parenting methods in particular are used by parents in Russia. According to the research results, mothers used mostly affirmative and punitive methods which can be defined as the sort of the golden mean in the carrot and stick approach to upbringing. These results partially support the previous research findings by G. Margolin and G. Patterson (1975) who reported that fathers opt for corporal punishment while mothers incline towards indirect and psychological impact on their children. In addition, the results of this study indicated that fathers holding higher education degrees employed affirmative parenting methods. Fathers with higher education degrees might take a special interest in issues related to their children's upbringing and education which is why they might study didactic materials and pedagogical literature. That accounts for why they consider that persuasion, conversations and other positive parenting methods are important in raising the younger generation. In our following studies we will try to disclose whether there are differences in the choice of parenting methods among girls and boys since similar studies were also conducted by scientists. It would be interesting to compare the results with the Russian sample.

Focusing on types of parenting methods we can speak of the following hierarchy. Both mothers and fathers put such affirmative methods as explanation, examples, encouragement (praise, reward for exemplary behavior) to the forefront. Such methods as controlling, prohibition, compromise (parents let their children to misbehave given that the child would answer for the actions in the long run) are used less often. These methods were put the last in the hierarchy. As for the punitive methods, mothers and fathers most often used such parenting methods as psychological actions (for instance, a child was made to apologize for a bad behavior), giving additional tasks, grounding a child, restriction on activities, deprivation of toys and other privileges. The most often employed aggressive parenting methods are verbal reprimand (shouting, insulting the child (for example, calling the child lazy, silly, negligent, and etc.), psychological actions (the mother drove the child to the feelings of shame and guilt for some wrongdoings), corporal punishment (slapping, belting).

It is considered that adolescents' aggressive behavior can be provoked by the nature of family relationships, parental relationship and methods used to raise and educate children. In view of this, we addressed the fourth research problem – defining the role of parenting methods and styles in relation to the intensity of different forms of readiness for aggression. With that in mind we constructed three regression equations.



Albeit the reliability of equations is not ensured, we can draw certain conclusions. We can assume that the Emotional-Impulsive Readiness (E-IR) is most likely caused by other various factors (an absolute term of an equation has a rather large value of 3.63) rather than single autocratic style adopted by fathers. Admittedly, social factors, the child's environment, personality traits, cultural experiences might also influence a high value of E-IR, which should be additionally examined. High values of Habitual-Cognitive Readiness (H-CR) are the result of mothers' use of affirmative parenting methods together with an autocratic style and of fathers' nonuse of a democratic style. At the same time, this form of readiness for aggression is also conditioned by some other factors, which also need to be studied in further research, since an absolute term is 2.881. With low probability we can claim that Habitual-Cognitive Readiness (H-CR) is formed due to fathers' liberal-nonloving parenting style, punitive methods and failure to use affirmative methods. H-CR is most likely formed by mothers' use of affirmative methods.

### LIMITATION AND STUDY FORWARD

There are several study limitations. We acknowledge that the results may contain distorted answers due to the retrospective study design. Participants were asked to recollect situations that happened to them over a decade ago. Resentment fades away with time, and people start looking at their parents differently, to some extent justifying their actions and decisions. Besides, some participants might not remember certain details of their childhood. Scholars, however, believe that such memory distortions are not significant and cannot affect research results (Frączek, 2002). Thus, in future studies we plan to interrogate both young people and their parents in order to get more unbiased data. We intend to continue our research. It might be necessary to increase the research sample (there were 237 participants in this study). In addition, factor analysis can be applied to identify reliable relationships between variables.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University

### AUTHORS CONTRIBUTION

The authors affirmed that there is no conflict of interest in this article. Natalya N. Kalatskaya carried out fieldwork and wrote the manuscript, statistical analysis procedures, testing hypothesis and interpretation of the results. Roza A. Valeeva refined the write-up in methodology and analysis.

### REFERENCES

1. Akishina E.M., Sudakova Y.E., Prokopyev A.I., Yakubenko K.Y., Solovyeva N.A., & Korzhuev A.V. (2017). System of cultural experience development of humanities students in modern information media conditions. *Man in India*, 97(14), 115-127.
2. Ammon, G. (1981). *Gruppendynamik der aggression*. München: Kindler.
3. Bandura, A. (1973). *Aggression: A Social Learning Analysis*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
4. Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of Authoritative Parental Control on Child Behavior. *Child Development*, 37(4), 887-907. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1126611>
5. Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 4, 1-103. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0030372>
6. Berkowitz, L. (1962). *Aggression: A social psychological analysis*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
7. Biktagirova, G. F., Valeeva, R. A., Kostyunina, N. Yu., Kalatskaya, N. N., & Drozdikova-Zaripova, A. R. (2020). The phenomenon of "victimization" in modern domestic and foreign studies. *Obrazovaniye i samorazvitiye - Education and Self-Development*, 15(1), 104-115.
8. Bronfenbrenner, U. (1958). *Socialization and social class through time and space*. In E. C. Maccoby, T. M. Newcomb, & E. L. Hartley (eds.), *Readings in social psychology*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
9. Buss, A. (1961). *The psychology of aggression*. New York: Wiley.
10. Buss, A. H., & Durkee, A. (1957). An inventory for assessing different kinds of hostility. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 21, 343-349.
11. Buss, A. H., & Perry, M. (1992). The aggression questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63(3), 452-459.
12. Chao, R. K., & Willms, J. D. (2002). The effects of parenting practices on children's outcomes. In J. D. Willms (ed.) *Vulnerable Children: Findings from Canada's National Longitudinal Study of Children and Youth*. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press.
13. Chen, X., Dong, Q., & Zhou, H. (1997). Authoritative and authoritarian parenting practices and social and school performance in Chinese children. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 21, 855-873.
14. Dollard, J., Doob, L. W., Miller, N. E., Mowrer, O. H., & Sears, R. R. (1939). *Frustration and aggression*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
15. Dominiak-Kochanek, M., Frączek, A., Konopka, K. (2012). *Psychologia Wychowawcza*, 1-2, 66-85
16. Drozdikova-Zaripova, A. R., Kostyunina, N. Y., & Kalatskaya, N. N. (2015). Prevention of Student Youth's Victim Behavior. *Journal of Review of European Studies*, 7(4), 88-92.
17. Eron, L. D., Walder, L. O., Toigo, R., & Lefkowitz, M. M. (1963). Social class, parental punishment for aggression and child aggression. *Journal of Child Development*, 34, 849-867.
18. Frączek, A. (2002). O naturze i formowaniu się psychologicznej regulacji agresji interpersonalnej. In I. Kurcz & D. Kądziaława (eds.). *Psychologia czynności*. Nowe Perspektywy (pp. 45-64). Warsaw: Scholar.
19. Frączek, A. (2008). Studies on interpersonal aggression – description of behavior or understanding its intrapsychic mechanisms (conceptual consideration). *Paper presented at the 18th ISRAWorld Meeting*, Budapest.
20. Frączek, A., Konopka, K., & Dominiak-Kochanek, M. (2016). Patterns of readiness for interpersonal aggression: cross-national study on sex difference. In H. Liberska & M. Farnicka (eds.). *Aggression as a challenge: Theory and Research: Current Problems*. Berlin: Peter Lang Publishing.
21. Frączek, A., Konopka, K., Smulczyk, M. (2013). Sex and country related specificity of readiness for aggression among adolescents. *Educational Research Review*. 17 (2), 87-97
22. Fromm, E. (1993). *Psychoanalysis and ethics*. Moscow: Respublika.
23. Fromm, E. (2004). *Anatomy of a person's destructiveness*. Moscow: AST.
24. Furmanov, I. A. (1996). *Children's aggressiveness: psychological assessment and intervention*. Minsk: Iiin V.P.
25. Gimaliev V.G., Prokopyev A.I., Makarova E.V., Abdulkhakova K.R., Kozin M.N., & Fazylyzanova G.I. (2018). Personality features and values orientations of university students with manipulative behavior. *Espacios*,

## Russian Adolescents' Readiness For Aggression As A Result Of Family Upbringing

- 39(20), 14.
26. Gippenreiter, U. B. (1995). *Communicating with a child. How?* Moscow: Mass-Media.
27. Grusec, J. E., & Hastings, P. D. (2015). *Handbook of Socialization: Theory and Research*. New York: Guilford Publications.
28. Huesmann, L. R. (1988). An information processing models for the development of aggression. *Journal of Aggressive behavior, 14*, 13-24.
29. Huesmann, R.L., Eron, L. (1986). *Television and the Aggressive Child: A Cross-national Comparison*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc Publishers.
30. Ilin, E. P. (2014). *Psychology of aggressive behavior*. Saint-Petersburg: Piter.
31. Kholod, N. I. (2005). Influence of mass media on children's aggressive behavior. *Yaroslavl Pedagogical Bulletin, 4*, 72-74.
32. Khukhlaeva, O. V. (2003). *Intervention in pre-school and primary school children's psychological breakdowns*. Moscow: Akademiya.
33. Khuzeeva, G. R., & Smirnova, E. O. (2001). Psychological peculiarities of aggressive children. *Mental health issues for children and adolescents, 1*, 27-32.
34. Konopka, K., Frączek, A., Smulczyk, M., Grzegołowska-Klarkowska, H., & Kirwil, L. (2009). *Readiness for Interpersonal Aggression vs. the Buss-Perry Diagnosis of Aspects of Aggression*. Bodrum: Poster presented at the 28th CICA International Conference.
35. Koreneva, A. A. (2004). *Interconnection of parenting and adolescents' aggression*: Doctoral Dissertation. Moscow: Moscow Pedagogical State University.
36. Korytchenkova, N. I. (2000). *Influence of family relationship styles on a child's aggressiveness*: Doctoral Dissertation. Novosibirsk: Novosibirsk State Pedagogical University.
37. Korytchenkova, N. I. (2000). Vliyanie stilei semeinykh otnoshenii na agressivnost' lichnosti rebenka. Diss. kand. psikh. nauk [The Influence of styles of family relations on aggression of the child's personality. Cand. psychol. Sci. Diss.]. Novosibirsk.
38. Krai, G., & Bokum, D. (2005). *Developmental psychology*. Saint-Petersburg: Piter.
39. Lefkowitz, M. M., Eron, L. D., Walder, L. O., & Huesmann, L. R. (1977). *Growing to be violent: A longitudinal study of the development of aggression*. New York: Pergamon Press Inc.
40. Lorents, K. (1994). *Aggression*. Moscow: Progress.
41. Margolin, G., & Patterson, G. (1975). The differential consequences provided by mothers and fathers for their son and daughters. *Journal of Developmental Psychology, 11*, 537-538.
42. Mestre, M. V. (2014). Desarrollo prosocial: crianza y escuela. *Revista Mexicana de Investigación en Psicología, 6*(2), 115-134.
43. Mutavchi E.P., Prokopyev A.I., Kostyleva G.V., Blinov L.V., Fedorov V.V., & Polichka A.E. (2018). Scientific - methodical resource of student training and vocational motivation development in university. *Espacios, 39*(20), 15.
44. Olivari, M. G., Wahn, E. H., Maridaki-Kassotakic, K., Antonopoulou, K., & Confalonieri, E. (2015). Adolescent Perceptions of Parenting Styles in Sweden, Italy and Greece: An Exploratory Study. *Europe's Journal of Psychology, 11*(2), 244-258.
45. Olshanskaya, E. V. (2000). *Adolescent aggression as a factor of social adaptation*: Doctoral Dissertation. Moscow: Moscow Order of Friendship of Peoples State Linguistic University.
46. Olweus, D. (1977). Aggression and peer acceptance in adolescent boys: Two short-term longitudinal studies of ratings. *Child Development, 48*, 1301-1313.
47. Ovsyanik, A.I., Sidorenko, G.G., Prasolov, V.I., Aleksandrova, N.S., Mashkin, N.A., Pozdnyakova, I.R., & Makarova, E.V. (2020). Remote education in modern university: Potential opportunities, quality or availability? *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation, 24*(4), 5027-5034.
48. Patterson, G. R., & Stouthamer-Loeber, M. (1984). The correlation of family management practices and delinquency. *Journal of Child development, 55*(4), 1299-1307.
49. Pulkkinen, L. (1987). Longitudinal study of adolescents' expectations of the future. *Personality psychology and lifestyle, 5*(6), 153-158.
50. Rassolov, I.M., Chubukova, S.G., Mokhov, A.A., & Shagieva, R.V. (2020). Genetic information and personal data under conditions of digital transformation. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation, 24*(7), 284-292.
51. Rean, A. A. (1996). Aggression and a person's aggressiveness. *Psychological Journal, 5*, 3-18.
52. Riza, B. M. (2012). Vliyanie metodov semeinogo vospitaniya na poznavatelnoye i sotsialnoye razvitiye detei 5-7 let. Dokt. Diss. *Influence of parenting on cognitive and social development of 5-7-year old children*: Doctoral Dissertation. Dushanbe: Sadridin Aini Tajik State Pedagogical University.
53. Ryś, M. (2001). *Systemy rodzinne. Metody badań struktury rodziny pochodzenia i rodziny własnej*. Warszawa: Centrum Metodyczne Pomocy Psychologiczno-Pedagogicznej.
54. Ryś, M. (2004). *Systemy rodzinne. Metody badań struktury rodziny pochodzenia i rodziny własnej*. Nazwa: Centrum Metodyczne Pomocy Psychologiczno-Pedagogicznej.
55. Smulczyk, M. (2008). Functions of emotional reactivity and perseverativeness in intrapsychic mechanisms of interpersonal aggression. *Poster presented at the 18th ISRA World Meeting*, Budapest.
56. Smulczyk, M., Frączek, A., & Grzegołowska-Klarkowska, H. (2009). Patterns of Readiness for Interpersonal Aggression versus Eysenck's PEN. *Poster presented at the 28th CICA International Conference*, Bodrum.
57. Solobutina, M. (2014). Personal leadership is a factor of youth social activity. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 141*(25), 1244-1248. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.05.214>
58. Spera, C. (2005). A review of the relationship among parenting practices, parenting styles, and adolescent school achievement. *Educational Psychology Review, 17*, 125-146.
59. Straus, M. A., & Faucher, A. (2007). *Manual for the dimensions of discipline inventory (DDI)*. Durham: Family Research Laboratory, University of New Hampshire.
60. Tchetchet, B. B. (2015). *Family pedagogics: study guide*. Minsk: BGPU.
61. Trapeznikova, T. M. (1998). *Development of a child's personality in the family. Person: individuality, arts, life*. Saint-Petersburg: SpB University publishing house.
62. Venger, A. L. (2005). *Developmental psychology. Psychological vocabulary*. Moscow: PER SE.
63. Von der Lippe, A. L. (1999). The impact of maternal schooling and occupation on child-rearing attitudes and behaviours in low income neighbourhoods in Cairo,

*Russian Adolescents' Readiness For Aggression As A Result Of Family Upbringing*

Egypt. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*,  
23, 703–729.

64. Zyubina, I.A., Dzyubenko, A.I., Borisenko, V.A., Popova, O.V. & Prokopyev, A.I. (2019). Implicit linguopragmatic strategies of speech behavior of English-speaking prosecutors. *XLinguae*, 12(4), 92-102.