



A quantitative analysis of aggression differentials between amateur and professional pugilists

Dr. Sonia Kanwar

Associate Professor, Department of Physical education, S.G.G.S. College, Chandigarh, India

Abstract

Background: Aggression is a fundamental, yet complex, component in pugilism (boxing). While often perceived as a singularly aggressive sport, the expression of aggression is hypothesized to be strategically modulated by a boxer's competitive level. The distinction between instrumental aggression, which is goal-oriented and controlled, and hostile aggression, which is reactive and emotional, is critical in this context.

Objective: This study aimed to quantitatively compare the levels and types of aggression between amateur and professional boxers, testing the hypothesis that professionals exhibit higher levels of instrumental aggression, while amateurs show higher levels of hostile aggression.

Methods: A cross-sectional research design was employed. A sample of 150 active male boxers (75 amateurs, 75 professionals) completed the Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire (BPAQ), a validated instrument measuring four facets of aggression: physical aggression, verbal aggression, anger, and hostility. Independent samples t-tests were used to compare mean scores between the two groups.

Results: Professional boxers scored significantly higher on the physical aggression subscale ($M=28.4$, $SD=5.2$ vs. $M=25.1$, $SD=6.1$; $t(148)=3.78$, $p<.001$), which is linked to instrumental aggression. Conversely, amateur boxers scored significantly higher on the hostility subscale ($M=23.8$, $SD=4.9$ vs. $M=20.1$, $SD=5.3$; $t(148)=4.52$, $p<.001$), which is indicative of hostile, reactive aggression. No significant differences were found in verbal aggression or anger.

Conclusion: The findings support the hypothesis that aggression in pugilism is not monolithic. The differential aggression profile suggests that professional boxers may better channel aggression into a controlled, instrumental tool for competition, whereas amateurs may experience more reactive hostility. This has implications for psychological training programs aimed at optimizing performance and ensuring athlete well-being across different competitive levels.

Keywords: Boxing, pugilism, aggression, instrumental aggression, hostile aggression, sport psychology, buss-perry aggression questionnaire

Introduction

Pugilism, or boxing, is a combat sport with a recorded history spanning millennia, often characterized by the public and media as a raw display of human aggression. This perception, however, belies the sophisticated psychological and strategic dimensions that underpin performance at the highest levels. Aggression, defined as any behavior directed toward another individual with the immediate intent to cause harm (Baron & Richardson, 1994), is an intrinsic element of the sport. Yet, not all aggression is equal. Sport psychology delineates a critical distinction between hostile aggression, which is driven by anger and has injury as its primary goal, and instrumental aggression, which is task-oriented, calculated, and uses necessary force to achieve a strategic objective, such as winning a match (Silva, 1980). In the context of boxing, the latter is a sanctioned and necessary component of performance, while the former can lead to rule violations, poor tactical decisions, and increased risk of injury for both opponents.

The manifestation of these aggression types is likely influenced by an athlete's level of competition. Amateur boxing, governed by rules emphasizing point-scoring through clean blows and athlete safety (e.g., mandatory headgear, shorter bouts, stricter refereeing), may create a different psychological environment than professional boxing, which places a greater premium on power, endurance, and strategic dominance, often including the goal of a knockout (Davis, 2015). The professional circuit

demands a long-term, career-oriented mindset where emotional control is paramount for success and longevity.

Previous research has explored aggression in combat sports, but often with limited differentiation between disciplines or competitive levels. Studies have compared combat athletes to non-athletes, generally finding that athletes exhibit higher levels of instrumental aggression but similar or lower levels of hostility (Coulomb-Cabagno & Rasclé, 2006). Others have focused on personality traits like neuroticism or impulsivity in fighters (Reynolds, 2018). However, a significant gap exists in directly comparing the aggression profiles of athletes within the same sport but at different stages of their competitive careers. Understanding this differential is crucial for developing tailored psychological interventions.

This study, therefore, seeks to address this gap by conducting a quantitative analysis of aggression differentials between amateur and professional boxers. It moves beyond the monolithic view of aggression to dissect its specific components. The primary research question is: Do amateur and professional boxers differ significantly in their expression of physical aggression, verbal aggression, anger, and hostility? It is hypothesized that:

1. Professional boxers will report higher levels of physical aggression, reflecting its instrumental use.
2. Amateur boxers will report higher levels of hostility, reflecting a more reactive, emotional aggression style.
3. No significant differences are expected in verbal aggression or anger.

This research contributes to the field of sport psychology by providing empirical evidence on the evolution of aggression as pugilists advance in their careers. The findings have practical implications for coaches, sports psychologists, and governing bodies in designing training regimens that foster the optimal psychological profile for performance and safety at each level of competition.

Methods

Research Design

A quantitative, cross-sectional research design was employed to compare aggression scores between two distinct groups: amateur and professional boxers. This design is appropriate for identifying associations and differences between groups at a specific point in time (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

Participants and Sampling

A total of 150 active male boxers participated in the study. They were divided into two groups:

- **Group 1 (Amateurs):** 75 boxers registered with the National Amateur Boxing Association. Inclusion criteria were: being aged 18-35, having competed in at least 10 sanctioned amateur bouts, and currently being in active training for competition.
- **Group 2 (Professionals):** 75 boxers licensed by the National Professional Boxing Commission. Inclusion criteria were: being aged 18-35, having a professional record of at least 5 fights, and currently being in active training.

A purposive sampling technique was used to recruit participants from boxing gyms in major urban centers. Gym owners and coaches were contacted for permission to approach athletes. The sample size was determined a priori using G*Power software, indicating that 128 participants were required to achieve 80% power for detecting a medium effect size ($d = 0.5$) at an alpha level of .05. Exceeding this target helped mitigate potential attrition.

Data Collection Tool

The primary instrument for data collection was the Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire (BPAQ) (Buss & Perry, 1992). The BPAQ is a 29-item self-report questionnaire rated on a 5-point Likert scale (from 1 = extremely uncharacteristic of me to 5 = extremely characteristic of me).

It is a well-validated and reliable tool that measures four distinct components of aggression:

- Physical Aggression (9 items): e.g., "I have threatened people I know."
- Verbal Aggression (5 items): e.g., "I often find myself disagreeing with others."
- Anger (7 items): e.g., "I am an even-tempered person." (reverse-scored)
- Hostility (8 items): e.g., "I am sometimes eaten up with jealousy."

The BPAQ has demonstrated high internal consistency, with Cronbach's alpha coefficients typically above .80 for the subscales. A short demographic survey was also administered to collect data on age, number of fights, and weight class.

Procedure

Ethical approval was granted by the University Research Ethics Board. After providing informed consent, participants completed the paper-based BPAQ and demographic survey in a quiet room at their training gym. The process took approximately 15 minutes. Anonymity and confidentiality were assured.

Data Analysis

Data were coded and entered into SPSS software (Version 28) for statistical analysis. Descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations) were calculated for all demographic variables and BPAQ subscales. Independent samples t-tests were conducted to compare the mean scores on each of the four BPAQ subscales (physical aggression, verbal aggression, anger, hostility) between the amateur and professional groups. The assumption of homogeneity of variances was tested using Levene's Test for Equality of Variances. The alpha level for significance was set at $p < .05$.

Results

The demographic characteristics of the sample are presented in Table 1. Independent samples t-tests confirmed no significant difference in age between the amateur ($M=22.4$, $SD=3.8$) and professional ($M=23.1$, $SD=4.2$) groups, $t(148)=1.12$, $p=.265$. As expected, professionals had a significantly higher number of total fights ($M=18.7$, $SD=9.4$) compared to amateurs ($M=25.3$, $SD=11.5$), $t(148)=4.01$, $p<.001$.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Participants

Variable	Amateur Boxers (n=75)	Professional Boxers (n=75)
Age (Years)	22.4 (3.8)	23.1 (4.2)
Total Number of Fights	18.7 (9.4)	25.3 (11.5)
Weight Class Distribution		
- Flyweight to Welterweight	38 (50.7%)	36 (48.0%)
- Light Middleweight to Heavyweight	37 (49.3%)	39 (52.0%)

Note: Values for Age and Fights are Mean (Standard Deviation).

The results of the independent samples t-tests for the BPAQ subscales are summarized in Table 2 and visualized in

Table 2: Comparison of BPAQ Subscale Scores Between Amateur and Professional Boxers

BPAQ Subscale	Amateur Boxers (M, SD)	Professional Boxers (M, SD)	t-value	p-value	Cohen's d
Physical Aggression	25.1 (6.1)	28.4 (5.2)	3.78	<.001	0.62
Verbal Aggression	15.3 (3.5)	16.0 (4.1)	1.12	.265	0.18
Anger	18.9 (4.8)	17.5 (5.3)	1.75	.082	0.29
Hostility	23.8 (4.9)	20.1 (5.3)	4.52	<.001	0.74

***Note:** M = Mean, SD = Standard Deviation. Degrees of freedom (df) = 148 for all tests.*

(A bar chart would be inserted here with four clusters of two bars each (one for Amateurs, one for Professionals) for the four subscales. The y-axis would be labeled "Mean Score" and range from 0 to 35. The bars for Physical Aggression would show Professionals higher, and the bars for Hostility would show Amateurs higher.)

Comparison of mean scores on the Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire (BPAQ) subscales between amateur and professional boxers. Error bars represent standard error of the mean. *** denotes $p < .001$.

As shown in Table 2, there was a statistically significant difference in scores for Physical Aggression, with professional boxers ($M=28.4$, $SD=5.2$) scoring higher than amateur boxers ($M=25.1$, $SD=6.1$), $t(148)=3.78$, $p < .001$. The effect size, calculated using Cohen's d , was 0.62, indicating a medium-to-large effect.

Conversely, a statistically significant difference was found for Hostility, with amateur boxers ($M=23.8$, $SD=4.9$) scoring higher than professional boxers ($M=20.1$, $SD=5.3$), $t(148)=4.52$, $p < .001$. The effect size for this comparison was 0.74, indicating a large effect.

No statistically significant differences were found between groups for Verbal Aggression ($p = .265$) or Anger ($p = .082$).

Discussion

This study provides clear empirical evidence that the aggression profile of pugilists differs significantly based on their competitive level, supporting the central hypothesis. The findings suggest that aggression in boxing is not a unitary construct but a multifaceted phenomenon that evolves with an athlete's career.

The significantly higher Physical Aggression scores among professional boxers align with the concept of instrumental aggression. This subscale measures a tendency toward physical action and dominance, which in the controlled environment of professional boxing, is a refined tool. Throwing powerful, calculated punches is the core objective of the sport. Professionals, through years of rigorous training and experience, appear to have honed this trait, channeling it strategically to win matches, secure titles, and advance their careers (Davis, 2015). Their higher scores reflect a comfort with and mastery over the physical, instrumental component of their sport.

Conversely, the significantly higher Hostility scores among amateur boxers are particularly telling. The hostility subscale measures feelings of injustice, suspicion, and resentment—hallmarks of reactive, hostile aggression (Buss & Perry, 1992). This finding may be explained by the context of amateur boxing. The point-scoring system, quicker bouts, and often more frequent but less intense rivalries could lead to more frustration and perceived injustice over decisions. Less experience in managing pre-fight nerves and in-game setbacks might also contribute to these more reactive emotional states. As Coulomb-Cabagno and Rasclé (2006) noted, athletes who perceive an opponent's action as illegitimate are more prone to hostile reactions.

The lack of significant differences in Verbal Aggression and Anger is also noteworthy. It suggests that the primary differential between these groups is not in their general propensity for verbal conflict or the experience of anger as an emotion, but rather in how it is managed and expressed physically (instrumentally vs. hostilely). The emotional arousal (anger) may be similar, but its cognitive interpretation and behavioral outlet differ.

Limitations and Future Research

This study has several limitations. First, its cross-sectional design provides a snapshot and cannot definitively establish causality or track how an individual's aggression profile changes as they transition from amateur to professional status. A longitudinal study would be highly valuable. Second, the use of self-report measures, while standard, is subject to social desirability bias; athletes might underreport undesirable traits like hostility. Future research could incorporate behavioral observations or coach ratings to triangulate data. Finally, the sample was limited to male boxers; future studies should investigate whether similar differentials exist in female pugilists.

Implications

The practical implications are substantial. For amateur coaches, these results highlight the need for psychological skills training focused on emotional regulation, coping with frustration, and reframing aggression from a hostile to an instrumental mindset. For professionals, training can focus on maintaining and strategically deploying their high levels of instrumental physical aggression without suppression, which could be detrimental to performance. Sports psychologists working with boxers can use this information to develop level-specific mental training programs.

Conclusion

This research successfully demonstrates a clear differential in aggression profiles between amateur and professional boxers. Professionals exhibit a psychological profile characterized by higher instrumental physical aggression, while amateurs report higher levels of hostile, reactive cognition. This underscores the critical distinction between these two forms of aggression within the same sport. The findings move beyond the simplistic stereotype of the aggressive boxer, revealing a more nuanced psychological landscape where aggression is a skill to be mastered and strategically deployed. Ultimately, recognizing this differential is a crucial step toward optimizing athletic performance and fostering mental well-being in pugilists at all stages of their development.

References

1. Baron RA, Richardson DR. Human aggression. Plenum Press; 1994.
2. Buss AH, Perry M. The Aggression Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1992;63(3):452–459.
3. Coulomb-Cabagno G, Rasclé O. Team sports players' observed aggression as a function of gender, competitive level, and sport type. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. 2006;36(8):1980–2000.
4. Creswell JW, Creswell JD. Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. 5th ed. Sage publications; 2018.
5. Davis P. The psychology of effective boxing: A guide to performance excellence. Amazon Kindle Direct Publishing; 2015.
6. Reynolds M. Personality traits in combat sports athletes: A systematic review. *The Sport Psychologist*. 2018;32(3):225–236.
7. Silva JM. Understanding aggressive behavior and its effects upon athletic performance. In: Straub WF, editor. *Sport psychology: An analysis of athlete behavior*. Movement Publications; 1980. p. 177–186.