

AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOR PHENOMENON AMONG TEENAGERS IN SCHOOLS: PREVENTION AND TREATMENT

**Abdul Malek Rahman, Mohamad Nasir, Sabariah Siron, Md. Noor,
Ab. Aziz Yatim, Zulkifli, Muhammad Bazlan, Ahmad Jazimin, Nur Junainah**

Sultan Idris Education University (MALAYSIA)

abdul.malek@fppm.upsi.edu.my, nasir.b@fppm.upsi.edu.my, sabariah@fppm.upsi.edu.my,
mdnor@fppm.upsi.edu.my, aziz@fppm.edu.my, bazlan@fppm.edu, ahmadjazimin@yahoo.com,
junainah@fppm.upsi.edu.my

Abstract

The objective of this study is to examine the phenomenon of aggressive behavior among teenagers; the profile of aggressive teenagers in school; pattern and frequency of aggressive behavior among teenagers in school; measuring psychological preferences in aggressive behavior among teenagers. The number of respondents were 14,520 based on gender, Forms, type of school and area. Male and female students ranging from Form 1, 2 and 4 were taken as samples for the study. The location of the study was divided into five zones i.e. the North Zone, East Zone, Central Zone, South Zone, Zone of Sabah and Zone of Sarawak. Three types of schools involved in the study were the secondary school (SMK), boarding school (SBP) and religious secondary school (SMKA).

Keywords: Aggressive, teenagers, behavior

1 INTRODUCTION

The study of the phenomenon of aggressive behavior stems from the need to review the current scenario of the country in particular aspects of physical, mental, and spiritual development of teenagers. The phenomenon persists year after year. In early January 2007, Malaysia was shaken by the death of a Form 4 student, in a secondary technical school in Bintulu, Sarawak. Methews Mering, 16, was bullied by 18 students, resulting in the victim's death. The victim believed to have been killed in one of the blocks of the school hostel at about 5 pm.

In the middle of 2007, the country again shaken by another tragedy when a Form 3 student was beaten up by students from Sekolah Menengah Kebangsaan Kepala Batas, Alor Star, Kedah on July 4, 2007. Quoted by Harian Metro review news of the incident on July 5, 2007 stated that the victim, Mohd Ahmad Tajudin Zakuan, 15 year-old student of the same school fainted after been beaten up by 20 students from Form 4 and Form 5 around 10.45 am while playing football. The incident was due to a misunderstanding that led 20 students to thrash Mohd Ahmad Tajudin Zakuan.

Within the same month, the action of a student strangling his teacher at Sekolah Menengah Kebangsaan Bandar Kota Tinggi, Johor stole the attention of various parties. Jamil MR (2007) citing comments from Farik Salleh in Utusan Malaysia on July 29, 2007 reported that a student named Daud Nordin, 17, pushed away his teacher's hand, claiming that he had to do 10 push-ups as a fine. The female

teachers involved, Zulfa Ismail, 29, is still traumatized and seeking to transfer to another school. Nordin with 8 other colleagues were fined for making a racket during the teaching and learning session.

Another incident broke out in the same month within the state of Pahang, was more frustrating because a group of female students in Felda settlement did it. *Utusan Malaysia* on August 3, 2007 criticized the girls' action in Felda Keratong 1, Bandar Tun Razak, Pahang on Friday, July 27, 2007. A 16-year-old victim were bullied by the nine girls in an empty house. The victim was punched, slapped and kicked before recorded naked by one of the girls using a mobile phone.

Therefore, this study was designed to look into the aggressive phenomenon among school teenagers. Profiles and patterns of teenagers aggressive behavior were also analyzed one case at a time. The study will also measure the psychological tendency of aggressive behavior among teenagers.

2 THE PROFILE OF TEENAGERS WITH AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOR IN SCHOOLS.

2.1 Sex:

The very aggressive behavior showed the percentage of 2.0 per cent for male and 1.0 per cent for female. While the aggressive behavior showed a higher percentage of male (67 percent) than female (61.5 percent). However, for the less aggressive behavior, female showed a higher percentage (37.6 percent) than male (31 percent).

2.2 Form

Form 4 students showed a higher percentage (2.0 percent) for the very aggressive behavior that that of students from Form 2 (1.3 percent) and Form 1 (1.2 percent). For the aggressive behavior, Form 4 students showed higher percentage (68.6 percent) compared to the percentage of students from Form 2 (64.1 percent) and Form 1 (60.8 percent). While for the less aggressive behavior, the percentage of students in Form 1 was higher (38.0 percent) as compared to the percentage of students from Form 2 (34.6 percent) and Form 4 (29.4 percent).

2.3 School Type

For the very aggressive behavior, religious secondary schools showed higher percentage (2.9 percent) than that of boarding schools (1.8 percent) and secondary schools (1.2 percent). Percentage for the aggressive behavior of boarding and religious secondary schools was high (77.5 percent) as compared to the percentage of secondary school (59.8 percent). While for the less aggressive behavior, secondary schools showed a higher percentage (39 percent) compared to boarding schools (20.7 percent) and religious secondary schools (19.5 percent).

2.4 Location

The very aggressive behavior, according to the location of the schools, showed the percentage of rural schools (1.5 percent), and urban schools (1.4 percent). For the aggressive behavior, rural schools showed a higher percentage (65.9 percent) than the urban schools (63.3 percent). While for the less aggressive behavior, secondary school (35.2 percent) is higher than rural schools (32.6 percent).

3. PATTERNS AND FREQUENCY OF AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOR AMONG TEENAGERS IN SCHOOLS.

3.1 Sex

Patterns of direct aggressive behavior showed the percentage of male students who behaved very aggressive were higher than female students i.e. 0.8 percent compared to 0.3 percent. Patterns of indirect aggressive behavior showed that the percentage of very aggressive behavior level is 3.7 percent for male students,

which is higher than female students, 3.6 percent. Patterns for collective aggressive behavior showed that 1.9 percent of male students behaved very aggressive as compared to 0.5 percent for female students. Patterns of instrumental aggressive behavior revealed that male students behaved very aggressive at 2.3 percent, higher than female students, only 0.9 percent.

3.2 Form

Patterns of direct aggressive behavior showed that the percentage of students who behaved very aggressive at Form 2 and Form 4 are the same and higher i.e. 0.6 percent as compared to Form 1 students which is at 0.5 percent. Patterns of indirect aggressive behavior showed the percentage of Form 4 students who behaved very aggressive is at 4.5 percent higher than that of Form 2 and Form 1, 3.2 percent and 3.5 percent respectively. Patterns of collective very aggressive behavior showed the percentage of Form 4 students to be 1.9 percent higher than Form 2 and Form 1, 1.3 percent and 0.5 percent respectively.

While the patterns of instrumental aggressive behavior showed the percentage of Form 4 students who behaved very aggressive was 2.1 percent higher than the Form 1 and Form 2 students, 1.6 percent and 1.1 percent respectively. This indicates that senior students exhibited more direct aggressive behavior.

3.3 Types

Patterns for direct aggressive behavior showed that boarding schools and religious secondary schools students recorded to behave very aggressive, a high percentage of 0.8 percent compared to the secondary schools, for only 0.5 percent. Patterns for indirect aggressive behavior showed the percentage of students in boarding schools behaving very aggressive was very high i.e. 7.4 percent, as compared to the religious secondary schools (6.8 percent) and secondary schools (2.6 percent). Collectively, patterns for aggressive behavior showed that the percentage of religious secondary school students who behaved very aggressive was high, of 1.9 percent compared to two other schools i.e. secondary schools (1.2 percent) and boarding schools (0.6 percent). While instrumental patterns of aggressive behavior showed that religious secondary school students behaved very aggressive at 3.2 percent higher than secondary schools (1.4 percent) and boarding schools (1.1 percent).

3.4 Location

Patterns of direct aggressive behavior showed that the percentage of students who behaved very aggressive located in the city was 0.6 percent as compared to 0.5 percent of students located in rural areas. Patterns of indirect aggressive behavior revealed that the percentage of students located in the city behaved very aggressive at 3.8 percent compared to students located in rural areas, 3.4 percent. Patterns for collective aggressive behavior showed the percentage of students located in rural areas behaved very aggressive by 1.3 percent compared to urban areas by 1.1 percent. While the instrumental aggressive behavior showed the percentage of students who behaved very aggressive were the same, 1.6 percent in urban and rural areas.

4. THE PSYCHOLOGICAL TENDENCY OF AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOR AMONG TEENAGERS IN SCHOOLS.

Overall, the psychological tendency to behave aggressive among teenagers in general and demographic factors showed significant differences between the same demographic factors. Referring to the findings for gender, male students showed a higher psychological tendency to behave very aggressive, at 3.1 percent, higher than female students, who were at 2.4 percent. Based on the demographic of Forms, the percentage of

students who were at Form 2 and Form 4 were psychologically more likely to behave very aggressive at 2.8 percent, as compared to students in Form 1, 2.7 percent.

The psychological tendency for aggressive behavior among teenagers in schools, by type of schools, showed a higher percentage of students in boarding schools to behave very aggressive, at 4.4 percent higher than that of religious secondary school (3.5 percent) and secondary schools (2.4 percent). Based on the demographic of Area factor, the percentage of students who have the higher psychological tendency to behave very aggressive were students studying in the city, with 2.9 per cent higher than students who attended schools in rural areas, at 2.5 percent.

5. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOR WITH AGGRESSIVE TRAITS AND EQ.

Pearson Correlation test was used to examine the relationship between aggressive behavior with aggressive traits and EQ. The analysis found that there was no significant relationship between aggressive behavior and aggressive traits ($r = 0.47$, $p > 0.01$). Instead, there was a significant relationship between aggressive behavior with EQ ($r = -0.05$, $p < 0.01$). This result presents an impression that if students' EQ is low, it will give an effect in an increase in aggressive behavior.

6. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOR WITH SUB CONSTRUCT OF EQ.

Pearson Correlation was used to examine the relationship between the features found within the emotional intelligence EQ with aggressive behavior. The analysis found that there was a significant relationship between aggressive behavior with the features in EQ namely self-awareness ($r = 0.52$), self-regulation ($r = -0.19$), self-motivation ($r = -0.07$), **empathy ($r = -0.20$)** and social skills ($r = -0.11$). This finding indicates that if students have low self-regulation, self-motivation, empathy and social skills, it will cause aggressive behavior.

7. CONCLUSION

The findings showed that male students behaved more aggressive than female students. Form 4 students behaved more aggressive than Form 1 and Form 2. The study also found that SMKA showed a high percentage of aggressive behavior than SMK and SBP. Percentage of students with aggressive behavior located in rural schools is more than students in urban areas.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abdul Malek Abdul Rahman. (2004). The effectiveness of cognitive behavior group counseling on bullies amongst the secondary schools pupils. PhD thesis not publish. Malaysia National University.
- [2] Azizi Yahaya, Yusof Boon, Shahrin Hashim, Mohammad Sharif Mustafa & Zurhana Muhammad. (2008). *Indeks perlakuan buli di kalangan pelajar-pelajar di sekolah menengah dan rendah di Malaysia*. Research Report. Malaysia University of Technology.
- [3] Burger, J.M (2000). *Personality* (5th ed.). United State: Wadsworth.
- [4] Farrington, D.P. (1993). Understanding and preventing bullying. Dlm. M. Tonry, (pnyt.). *Crime and Justice*. 17: 381-458. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [5] Heinrichs, R.R. (2003). A whole-school approach to bullying: Special considerations for children with exceptionalities. *Intervention in School and Clinic*. 38 (4): 195-204.

- [6] Levinson, K. & Levinson, M. (2005). A general semantics approach to school-age bullying. *et Cetera*, 62 (1) : 4-16.
- [7] Olweus, D. (1978). *Aggression in the schools: Bullies and whipping boys*. Washington D.C.: Hemisphere (Wiley).
- [8] Rigby, K. (1996). *Bullying in the schools and what to do about it*. Melbourne: The Australian Council for Educational Research Ltd.
- [9] Salmivalli, C., Kaukiainen, A. & Voaten, M. (2005). Anti-bullying intervention: Implementation and outcome. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 75, 465–487.
- [10] UNICEF (2007). *Stop violence in schools! The effects of bullying*. http://www.unicef.org/malaysia/UNICEF__Fact_Sheet__Effects_of_Bullying.pdf.