

*Research Article***School Bullying among Adolescents in Minia City****Maha A. Hassan, Mohammed H. Abdel Hafeez,****Mohammed Kh. Hamza and Ahmed A. Ahmed**

Department of Rheumatology and Rehabilitation, El-Minia Faculty of Medicine

Abstract

The cognitive neoassociationist model proposed by (Berkowitz, 1993) is intended to be both a general theory of emotion and an explanation of aggressive behavior. The model suggests that whenever an aversive stimulus is encountered, the individual automatically experiences negative affect (Berkowitz, 1993). This negative affect will trigger a variety of lower-order associations, leading to the triggering of aggression-related ('fight') and escape-related ('flight') tendencies (Berkowitz, 1993). These tendencies include aggression and escape-related motor responses, physiological reactions, thoughts, and memories. These two tendencies may be thought of as associative networks. Once one part of the network has been activated (e.g., motor responses) (Berkowitz, 1993). General Aggression Model According to the General Aggression Model (GAM; Anderson & Bushman, 2002), there are many input variables that can influence the likelihood of aggressive behavior. Some are individual difference variables (e.g., trait hostility and attitudes toward violence). Others are situational variables (e.g., the presence of guns or other weapons and pain) (GAM; Anderson & Bushman, 2002). These inputs can influence aggressive behavior through one or more of three routes: cognition (hostile thoughts, aggression scripts), affect (hostile feelings, expressive motor responses), and arousal (physiological, perceived) (GAM; Anderson & Bushman, 2002)

Keywords: School bullying, cognitive neoassociationist, aggressive behavior**Introduction**

In terms of individual factors, bullying perpetration has been associated with callous-unemotional traits (Muñoz, Qualter, & Padgett, 2011; Viding, Simmonds, Petrides, & Frederickson, 2009), psychopathic tendencies (Fanti & Kimonis, 2012), endorsement of masculine traits (Gini & Pozzoli, 2006; Navarro, Larrañaga, & Yubero, 2011), conduct problems (Cook, Williams, Guerra, Kim, & Sadek, 2010), antisocial personality traits (Ferguson, San Miguel, & Hartley, 2009; Vaughn et al., 2010), susceptibility to peer pressure (Monks & Smith, 2006; Pepler, Craig, & O'Connell, 2010), anxiety (e.g., Craig, 1998; Kaltiala-Heino, Rimpelä, Rantanen, & Rimpelä, 2000), and depression (e.g., Ferguson et al., 2009).

At least some students who bully their peers have been found to be higher in social intelligence (Björkqvist, Österman, & Kaukiainen, 2000; Sutton, Smith, & Swettenham, 1999a, 1999b) and social status (Vaillancourt, Hymel, & McDougall, 2003),

with researchers distinguishing between socially integrated and socially marginalized bullies (Farmer et al., 2010; Rodkin, Espelage, & Hanish, 2015).

Being bullied by peers (victimization) has been linked with poor physical health (Gini & Pozzoli, 2013; Knack et al., 2011) and poor school adjustment, including being unhappy, feeling unsafe, being truant, performing poorly and, in some cases, dropping out of school (Card, Isaacs, & Hodges, 2007; Graham, Bellmore, & Juvonen, 2007; Juvonen, Nishina, & Graham, 2000; Konishi, Hymel, Zumbo, & Li, 2010; Slee & Rigby, 1993; Smith, Talamelli, Cowie, Naylor, & Chauhan, 2004).

Subjects and Methods

A written permission was taken from the Education Administration of Minia to carry out the study in selected schools of Minia City in the school year 2018/2019 provided that no invasive maneuvers will be done to the students. In each school, another permission was taken from the school headmaster. In

cooperation with teachers and social workers in the school, all students in the second preparatory grade were explained the aim and nature of the study and the content of the questionnaires in details, and an oral consent was taken from them. All those who accepted to share were recruited to the study.

B. Inclusion Criteria:

(for both the pilot and the actual study)

- 1- All students in second grade of preparatory school.
- 2- Both genders.
- 3- No apparent physical disability nor organ failure by history.
- 4- Student oral consent to participate in this study.

C. Exclusion Criteria:

(for both the pilot and the actual study)

- 1- Students with apparent physical disability, and those with history of major organ failure.
- 2- Students refusing to participate in the study.

D. Sample Design

In governmental schools, total number of students was 350. Among them, 65 students were excluded (10 students were absent in days of carrying out the study, 6 students had apparent physical disabilities, 15 student refused to participate, and 34 students didn't understand the questionnaire and made the same choice in all questions). The total number recruited was 285 students.

1- Socio-demographic Characteristics of the Sample

Table (1): Socio-demographic data of the sample

	Frequency N=521	Percentage
Sex		
Males	252	48.4 %
Females	269	51.6 %
School area		
Northern	236	45.3 %
Southern	285	54.7 %
School type		
Governmental	285	54.7 %
Experimental	135	25.9 %
Private	101	19.4 %

In the experimental school, total number of students was 158. Among them, 23 students were excluded (7students were absent in days of carrying out the study, 6 student refused to participate, and 10 students didn't understand the questionnaire and made the same choice in all questions). The total number recruited was 135 students.

In private schools, total number of students was 111. Among them, 10 students were excluded (8 students were absent in days of carrying out the study, 2 students refused to participate). Total number recruited was 101 students.

Results

The aims of this study were as follow:

- 1- To assess the epidemiology of aggression and bullying among students of preparatory schools in Minia City.
- 2- To assess the relation between aggression and bullying in one hand and behavioral problems in those students on the other hand.

In order to fulfill these aims, the results of the current study will be presented as follow:

- 1- Description of socio-demographic data of the studied groups.
- 2- Comparing incidence of aggression and bullying across different study groups (males vs. females; private schools vs. governmental schools; schools in Southern area vs. schools in Northern area).
- 3- Correlations between incidence of bullying and aggression and behavioral problems.

As regards to the *sex*, males represented 48.4% of the sample (n=252), while females represented 51.6% of the sample (n=269).

Students from schools in Northern areas in Minia City (experimental and private schools) were 236 students (45.3% of the sample), while those from southern areas (governmental schools) were 285 (54.7% of the sample).

More than half of the sample (54.7%) were students from governmental schools, while students from experimental schools represented 25.9% of the sample; the rest of the sample (19.4%) were students from private schools.

Discussion

1.1 Aggression

Our study found that 48.4% (n=252) of student has minimal level of verbal aggression 38% (n=198) of students has mild level, 10.7% (n=56) had moderate level, 2.8% (n=15) had severe levels. Regarding physical aggression, 63.9% (n=333) of student has minimal level, 27.3% (n=142) of students has mild level, 7.3% (n=38) had moderate level, 1.5% (n=8) had severe levels. Among the whole sample, 46.8% (n=244) of student has minimal level of hostility 31.7% (n=165) of students has mild level, 18.8% (n=98) had moderate level, 2.7% (n=14) had severe levels. Regarding anger, 46.1% (n=240) of student has minimal level, 32.8% (n=171) of students has mild level, 18.8% (n=98) had moderate level, 2.3% (n=12) had severe levels.

This is comparable to previous Egyptian studies. Elmasry et al., (2016) in Sharqeya governorate found that physical aggression was severe in 0.7% of the sample, moderate in 8.5%, mild in 39.2%, and minimal in 51.7%. As regards verbal aggression, it was severe in 0.5% of the sample, moderate in 8.0%, mild in 40.5%, and minimal in 51.1% of the sample. Another study in Alexandria governorate by Youssef et al., (1999) found that prevalence of violent behaviors among school children was 39.4%. also Ezz elarab et al., (2007) found that Prevalence of different forms of violence to be 76% in public school and 62% in private schools.

Studies in other countries found wide variability in prevalence rates of school aggression

(Fekkes et al., 2015). For example a study conducted in China, the aggression rates in a school-based sample were 24.4% for verbal type and 27.9% for physical type (Tang et al., 2013). In India, Dutt et al., (2013) found the prevalence rate of physical aggression to be 66.5%. It was also high (56.8%) for verbal aggression among sample population in the same study.

References

1. Adair, V. A., Dixon, R. S., Moore, D. W., & Sutherland, C. M. (2000). Bullying in New Zealand secondary schools. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 35, 207–221.
2. Andreou, E. (2000). Bully/victim problems and their association with psychological constructs in 8–12-year old Greek school-children. *Aggressive Behavior*, 26, 49–56.
3. Barrera, M. J., & Li, S. A. (1996). The relation of family support to adolescents' psychological distress and behavior problems. In G. R. Pierce, & I. G. Sarason (Eds.), *Handbook of social support and the family* (pp. 313–343). New York: Plenum Press
4. Barry, M. (2006). *Youth offending in transition: The search for social recognition*. London: Routledge. Batista, J. M., & Coenders, G. (2000). *Modelos de ecuaciones estructurales [Structural Equation Models]*. Madrid: La Muralla
5. Bearman, R., Wheldall, K., & Kemp, C. (2006). Differential teacher attention to boys and girls in the classroom. *Educational Review*, 58, 339–366 Blum, J., Ireland, M., & Blum, R. W. (2003). Gender differences in juvenile violence. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 32, 234–240.
6. Carroll, A., Hattie, J., Durkin, K., & Houghton, S. (1999). Adolescent reputation enhancement: Differentiating delinquent, nondelinquent, and at-risk youths. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 40, 593–606.
7. Cava, M. J., & Musitu, G. (2002). *La convivencia en las escuelas [Coexistence in the school]*. Barcelona: Paidós. Cillessen, A. (1996). The role of gender in the behavioral basis of children's sociometric status evaluations. In *The biennial meeting of the international*

- society for the study of behavioural development, Quebec City, Canada
8. Emler, M., & Reicher, S. (1987). Orientations to institutional authority in adolescence. *Journal of Moral Education*, 16, 108–116.
 9. Henry, C. S., Sager, D. W., & Plunkett, S. W. (1996). Adolescents' perceptions of family system characteristics, parenta-
dolescent dyadic behaviors, adolescent qualities, and dimensions of adolescent empathy. *Family Relations*, 45, 283–292
 10. Loeber, R. (1996). Developmental continuity, change and pathways in male juvenile problem behaviours and delinquency. In J. D. Hawkins (Ed.), *Delinquency and crime: Current theories* (pp. 28–67). New York: Cambridge University Press.