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Although there is a literature related to children aggressive behaviour and its effects on adjustment and self-development, relatively little attention has been paid to the relationship between the factors that contributes to the explanation of aggressive behaviour. In line with this, the study examined the relationship between peer attachment, teacher attachment, antisocial personality, attitude to aggressive behavior, subjective norms to aggressive behaviors, perceived behavioural control and intention of aggressive behaviour. In addition, the study examined the mediating effect of subjective norms to aggressive behaviors, perceived behavioural control on the relationship between antisocial personality and aggressive behaviour among secondary school children in Selangor state, Malaysia.

In this study, data was collected from 426 respondents, and a multistage random sampling techniques was applied to select the respondents from six secondary schools in four districts in Selangor, Malaysia. Data was collected using structured questionnaires. The descriptive analysis, paired sample t-test, Pearson correlation, multiple linear regression and Sobel mediation test were analyzed using SPSS version 20.

The results of this study shown that, there is moderate level of peer attachment, teacher attachment, antisocial personality, attitude towards aggressive behavior, subjective norms to aggressive behaviors, perceived behavioural control, and aggressive behavior among secondary school children studied. Similarly, the result from paired sample t-test shows no significant difference in aggressive behaviour by gender, location, parental status, and age. However, there is significance difference in aggressive behaviour based on race. The result from Pearson correlation indicates that, there is a significant positive correlation between peer attachment and aggressive behavior; and a significant positive correlation between antisocial personality and aggressive behaviour. There is also a significant positive correlation between attitude to aggressive behaviour and aggressive behaviour. There is also a
significant positive correlation between subjective norms to aggressive behaviour and aggressive behaviour. However, the analysis shows that, there is a significant negative correlation between teacher attachment, perceived behavioural control and aggressive behaviour;

Furthermore, the results of the multiple linear regression analysis as a whole (which includes peer attachment, teacher attachment, antisocial personality, attitude to aggressive behavior, subjective norms to aggressive behavior and perceived behavioral control) is significant ($F(6,419) = 18.267, p = .000$). This indicated that the slope of the estimated linear regression model line is not equal to zero. The result generated by the SPSS showed that, about 20.7% variance in aggressive behaviour was explained by the all the predictor variables entered into the regression model. The analysis shows that, the four independent variables were significantly contributed to aggressive behaviour.

The Sobel mediation test furthermore indicates that subjective norms to aggressive behaviour, perceived behavioural control mediates the relationship between antisocial personality and aggressive behaviour. Based on this result, the researcher concluded that, environment, peers socialization and influence in the school has leads to the real aggressive behaviour among secondary school children in Selangor, Malaysia. This study is in line with the previous literature by indicating that, school environment, influence of peers and socialization has the highest significant contribution to children aggressive behaviour. Moreover, some recommendations are forwarded to help secondary schools and families keep their environment free of aggressive behaviour.
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Walaupun terdapat literatur yang berkaitan dengan tingkah laku agresif dan kesannya ke atas penyesuaian dan pembangunan diri kanak-kanak, namun kurang perhatian telah diberikan kepada perhubungan antara faktor-faktor yang menyumbang kepada penjelasan mengenai tingkah laku agresif. Selaras dengan itu, kajian ini meneliti perapatan rakan sebaya, perapatan guru, personaliti antisosial, sikap terhadap tingkah laku agresif, norma subjektif pada tingkah laku agresif, kawalan tingkah laku persepsi dan tingkah laku agresif. Di samping itu, kajian ini juga cuba meneliti kesan pengantara norma subjektif kepada tingkah laku agresif, kawalan tingkah laku yang diperspepsi ke atas hubungan antara personaliti antisosial dan tingkah laku agresif dalam kalangan pelajar sekolah menengah di negeri Selangor, Malaysia.

Dalam kajian ini, data dikumpulkan daripada 426 responden dan teknik persampelan rawak pelbagai peringkat digunakan untuk memilih responden daripada enam buah sekolah menengah di empat daerah di negeri Selangor, Malaysia. Data dikumpulkan menggunakan kaedah soal selidik berstruktur. Analisis deskriptif, paired sample t-test, korelasi pearson, regresi, linear berganda, ujian pengantara Sobel diaplikasikan dengan menggunakan program SPSS versi 20

Keputusan kajian ini menunjukkan bahawa, terdapat tahap sederhana perapatan rakan sebaya, perapatan guru, personaliti antisosial, sikap terhadap tingkah laku agresif, norma subjektif kepada tingkah laku agresif, kawalan tingkah laku yang diperspepsi dan niat tingkah laku agresif dalam kalangan pelajar sekolah menengah yang dikaji. Begitu juga, hasil daripada paired sample t-test menunjukkan tiada perbezaan yang signifikan dalam tingkah laku agresif mengikut jantina, lokasi, status ibu bapa, dan umur. Walau bagaimanapun, terdapat perbezaan yang signifikan dalam niat kelakuan agresif berasaskan kaum.
Hasil daripada korelasi pearson menunjukkan bahawa terdapat hubungan positif yang signifikan antara perapatan rakan sebaya dengan niat tingkah laku agresif; dan korelasi positif yang signifikan antara personaliti antisosial dengan niat tingkah laku agresif. Terdapat juga korelasi positif yang signifikan antara sikap dengan niat sikap dengan tingkah laku agresif.

Terdapat juga korelasi positif yang signifikan antara norma subjektif kepada tingkah laku agresif dengan niat tingkah laku agresif. Walau bagaimanapun, analisis menunjukkan bahawa terdapat hubungan negatif yang signifikan antara perapatan guru, kawalan tingkah laku dipersepsi dengan niat tingkah laku agresif.

Tambahan pula, hasil analisis regresi linear berganda secara keseluruhan (termasuk perapatan rakan sebaya, perapatan guru, personaliti antisosial, sikap tingkah laku agresif, norma subjektif kepada tingkah laku agresif dan kawalan tingkahlaku yang dilihat) adalah signifikan (F ( 6419 ) = 18.267 , p = 0.000 ). Ini menunjukkan bahawa nodel regresi linear yang dianggarkan oleh SPSS menunjukkan, kira-kira 20.7 % varians dalam niat kelakuan agresif telah dijelaskan oleh semua pembolehubah peramal yang dimasukkan ke dalam model regresi. Analisis ini menunjukkan bahawa, keempat-empat pembolehubah bebas telah dengan ketara menyumbang kepada tingkah laku agresif.

Ujian Pengantara Sobel pula menunjukkan bahawa norma subjektif kepada tingkah laku agresif, kawalan tingkahlaku yang dipersepsi menjadi pengantara hubungan antara personaliti antisosial dengan niat tingkah laku agresif. Berdasarkan keputusan ini, penyelidik membuat kesimpulan bahawa persekitaran, rakan sebaya dan pengaruh sosialisasi di sekolah mempunyai petunjuk kepada niat tingkah laku agresif dalam kalangan pelajar sekolah menengah di Selangor, Malaysia. Kajian ini adalah selaras dengan literatur sebelumnya dengan menunjukkan bahawa persekitaran sekolah, pengaruh rakan sebaya dan sosialisasi mempunyai sumbangan penting kepada kanak-kanak untuk mempunyai niat tingkah laku agresif. Selain itu, beberapa cadangan dikemukakan untuk membantu sekolah-sekolah menengah dan keluarga dalam menjaga persekitaran mereka bebas daripada tingkah laku agresif.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

Social psychology is a scientific field that seeks to understand and explain how the thought, feeling and behaviour of individuals are influenced by the actual presence of other human beings (Allport, 1985). Social psychology study the manner in which the personality, attitudes, motivations, and behaviour of the individual influence and are influenced by social groups (McLeod, Wood & Weisz, 2007). Moreover, aggressive behaviour is a topic that has made a vital contribution in social psychology through the development of theories which are now tested with human behavioural and psychological information (Smith, Mulder & Hill, 2001).

The word aggressive behaviour has roots in the Latin ad ‘’to’’ and gradus which simply means ‘’a step’’ and intention of aggressive behaviour is typically framed or perceive in negative term, as an unwanted facet of human behaviour that represent assertiveness (Hawley & Vaugh, 2003; Smith, 2007). Aggressive behaviour was introduced in the early 1920s and 1930s (Frodi, Macaulay & Thome, 1977). Intention of aggressive behaviour in social phenomenon is to hurt someone by harming their self-esteem, self-control, self standing in order to achieve specific goal (Bright, 2005). It has been posited that intention of aggressive behaviour is children’s tendency which involve destruction and killing another person (Buss, 2005). Intention to involve in aggressive behaviour is described as both social and physical behaviour that may arise in many ways and which contributes alone with negative behaviours experienced by school children (Wang, Iannotti & Luk, 2010; Teicher, Samson, Polcari & McGreenery, 2006). Aggressive behavior is generally seen as a behavioral act that results from school children in harming or hurting others (Werner & Crick, 2004).

Further, intention is vital because it is a cognitive aspect whereas aggressive behaviour is an actual behaviour as a result of intention (Ajzen, 1985). Of note, intent and harm is an element that must be present in order for the behaviour to be considered aggressive act (Bartol & Bartol, 2005). Moreover, as Denzler, Forster & Liberman (2009) put it, the goal to aggress increases accessibility of children’s aggressive thoughts and that goal always plays a vital role in any forms of aggressive behaviour. Children’s intention to involve in aggressive behaviour is a negative act that results in harming and hurting people. In addition, intention to act aggressively depends on the situation that encouraged real aggressive behaviour because aggressive behaviour differs seriously based on the situations that surround children in the environment (Werner & Crick, 2004; Meloy, 2006).
Intention to involve in aggressive behaviour both in ultimate and proximate point view intention to harm as necessary in classifying types of aggressive behaviour and proximate goal with regard to their ultimate goal (Anderson & Bushman, 2002). Intention of acting in a harmful way have causal link in children’s mental state and to act aggressively (Astington, 2001; Schult, 2002; Peets, Hodges & Salmivalli, 2008). This is because the outcome of acting-out is a belief or process by which children have tendency that takes place to act aggressively (Smith & Handler, 2006). Clearly, real aggressive behaviour is an intention to hurt, harm, or injure another person, to cause damage, hitting, kicking, biting, shoving, making threats, hurling insults, and name-calling (Murray-Close et al., 2010; Zimmer-Gembeck et al., 2005; Naicker, 2009; Sadock, 2007; Du Plessis, 2010; Passer & Smith, 2007). Real aggressive behaviour is an emotional response made on purpose for the sake of damaging or destroying other things or persons (Kim & Kim, 2007). Aggressive behaviour is a destructive form of behaviour which children are always touch less safe and fewer connected to their environment (O’Brennan, Bradshaw & Sawyer, 2009).

Children’s intention to involve in aggressive behaviour always shows intimidation and coercion that cause harmful psychological effects on individuals. This negative behavior could not be ignored because they affect individual’s social status, self-esteem and happiness in a negative way (Sadock & Sadock, 2007). Similarly, Myburgh & Poggenpoel (2009) added that it is not essentially observable behavior or actions that should be tag as aggressive behavior, but the intention or motivation behind aggressive acts that particularly determines if behavior is aggressive or not, in that sense intention of aggressive behaviour is any kind of action that is seen as harmful and destructive. In fact, intention to involve in aggressive behaviour among boys and girls is certainly not a new issue because inquiries made from Archaeologist show indication of aggressive behaviour from the original ancient eras stressing that intention to involve in aggressive behavior is a basic part of human behaviour (DeWall & Anderson, 2011). Though, there are numerous types of aggression, depending on the intentions of the aggressor and the situation that stimulated the aggressive behavior. This is because, aggressive behavior, and the treatment of aggression, varies greatly according to the intentions surrounding the aggressive behaviour.

To Ajzen (2010) intention of aggressive behaviour is based on attitude to behavior, subjective norm to behaviour, and perceived behavioral control, with each predictor weighted for its importance in relation to the aggressive behavior and population of interest of children’s well-being. And children’s intention predicts aggressive behaviour because the relation between intentions and behaviour are seen as causal (Webb & Sheeran, 2006; Haynes, Bootzin, Smith, Cousins & Stevens, 2006). Intention of aggressive behaviour involves damage, shooting and stabbing, intended to hurt, or kill someone with physical force that has relationship between children. In addition, intention to engage in aggressive behaviour has important implications to harm another boy or girl physically or psychologically (Kynoch, Wu & Chang, 2009; Irwin 2006; Greenwood, 2005; Pich, Hazelton, Sundin & Kable, 2011) and attack on personal attribute such as race, gender, general outlook, and sexual orientation explain how individual involve in aggressive behaviour (Whelan, 2008). Intention to
act negatively is related to real aggressive behaviour which ranges from more moderate to more severe (Ajzen, 2001).

Nowadays, children use various intention cues to predict aggressive behaviour and when trials are shocking or unsatisfactory, children may particularly expected to consider others’ intentions, because accepting of goal takes the abilities that may be developed to influence social interactions in future about blame and penalty, and the ideas of children about aims may change when children faced with behaviour that was unreliable with their expectations (Kalish, 2006; Amsterlaw & Wellman, 2006; Boseovski & Lee, 2006). Meanwhile, intention to involve in aggressive behaviour is a difficult social behaviour that is been planned by social factors and these factors likely to work together as part of a joined system (Siever, 2008; Struber, Luck & Roth, 2008; Bufkin & Luttrell, 2005). Similarly, factors such as negative peer groups, teacher’s inconsistent, low levels of monitoring from teachers seems quite meaningful in explaining intention to involve in aggressive behaviour among school children (Adam & Berzonzy 2006; Mash Barkley, 2007; Aldao, Nolen-Hoeksema & Schweizer, 2010; Kring & Sloan, 2010). Of note, single parent’s homes, high crime, unemployment, vandalism, gender and environment links to aggressive behaviour (Ozmen, 2006; Bradley, Wright & Wesley, 2009). Moreso, children with negative intention in the school are more likely to react aggressively themselves, dislike their school, and skip coming to school (Janosz, Archambault, Pagani, Pascal, Morin & Bowen, 2008). In addition, the belief and actions of peers directly and indirectly influence children’s intention to involve in aggressive behaviour, this is because of the connection between peers socialization and how children feel about their school environment may contribute to real aggressive behaviour (Syvertsen, Flanagan & Stout, 2009).

In other hand, popular children and those with antisocial personality have great social influence to their friend’s intention to involve in aggressive behaviour (Senn, 2008; Young, Boye & Nelson, 2006; Rose & Swenson, 2009; Tremblay& Nagin 2005; Lahey et al, 2008), because antisocial personality specifies disrespectful, deceitful, and unlawful values, like stealing and lying which influence children’s intention to involve in aggressive behaviour (Kempes, Matthys, deVries & van Engeland, 2005; Farrington, 2005; Broidy, Daday, Crandall, Sklar & Jost, 2006; Cote’ et al., 2006). Of note, attitudes to both teachers and the police have been related in turn to aggressive act in schools as well as to more general antisocial personality patterns in adolescent (Tarry & Emler, 2007). Moreover, children’s aggressive behaviour has serious negative effects on social functioning, physical, mental health, and lack of good grade in the school (Janosz et al., 2008; Orpinas & Horne, 2006). Clearly, understanding children intention to involve in aggressive behaviour as an issue that develop gradually, means that it does not imply that school children are unhappy to continued aggressive behaviour, but due to influence of the environment (Wrangham & Glowacki, 2012).

In Malaysia, school children aggressive behaviour could appear in the practice of rule violation like; consumption of cigarrate, alcohol, shoplifting, and truancy (Abd Wahad, 2006). Moreover, number of children that are involved in aggressive
behaviour, particularly school children is increasing which leads to various social ills and aggressive behaviour as one knows today is a serious crime (Utusan Malaysia, 2011). Similarly, Zaman & Nadchatran (2007), and Tee (2009) argued also that most aggressive behaviour among school children in Malaysia are related to experienced taunt and name calling from other children and feeling frustrated, stealing, truancy, rudeness, fighting with friends, or other children (Utusan Malaysia, 2011).

It is also vital to know that problems such as rape, robbery, taking drugs, substance abuse, molest, carrying of weapons, and destruction contribute to children’s aggressive behaviour in secondary schools in Selangor (Hammim, 2010; Letchumanan, 2010). In addition, all these would damage the future generation in leading the country back forwards. Moreover, secondary schools today are known to be safe place for children and notwithstanding, children’s aggressive behaviour has added to the awareness that environment in the school and outside school are not safe again. Intention of aggressive behaviour in the school can have significant impact on the children, and which also will affect their mental health, overall socialization and adaptation (Agnes, Asagwara & Julie, 2009). Relatively, the reason why researcher tests the theory in Malaysia was that none or very little study has done that in Malaysia; mostly their study is focusing only aggressive behaviour and not intention to involve in aggressive behaviour.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

In this modern era, several factors contribute to aggressive behaviour, such as attitude to aggressive behaviour, peer attachment, antisocial personality, perceived behavioural control, coupled with teachers insecure attachment and subjective norms to aggressive behaviour in today’s world (Calvete & Orue, 2011, Haynes, 2006). Aggressive behaviour has posed a serious challenge to relevant authorities and society at large under the social changing situation (Patchin & Hinduja 2006; Aluede, 2006). Nowadays, many boys and girls while in school have being threatened by so called gangs, seeing others slapped, hit, punched, beaten in school, or even outside school environment, age, friends influence related to aggressive behaviour among school children (Lee, Chen & Kaur, 2007; Tee, 2009). Based on statistics, children’s fighting with (6.6%) as well as stealing money with (18.5%) and stolen of vital things from friend (55.0%), and weapon carrying influence their involvement in aggressive behaviour. In addition, peer pressure, dissatisfaction with the school system and poor school attachment is related to aggressive act (The star online, 2014). Also, problems like hitting, hurting, stealing, and vandalism at school environment increase aggressive behaviour (Lee et al, 2007). Statistics shows that school children aggressive behaviour significantly increased from 630 in 2000 to 1,206 in 2007, explaining also that 603 were repeated crimes. Then, in 2009, 6,048 school children criminal cases were recorded compared to 2007, amounting to 5,114 cases respectively (Malaysia Department of Statistics; 2009, 2013; Letchumanan, 2011). Moreover, school children intimidations have added to the reason of involving in aggressive behaviour with age group of 12 -18 years old (MDS, 2010).
Worse still, the consequence expectations are a main inspiring issue in children’s aggressive behaviour since children always like to involve in aggressive act they expect to result in rewarding outcomes (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980; Bandura, 1997, 2001). Notably, intention is expected to capture the motivational causes that influence children’s aggressive behaviour and to show how tough children are eager to try or how much energy they would use to accomplish aggressive behaviour (Ajzen, 1991). Intention predicts aggressive behaviour than desires, and attitudes which has been widely applied in social psychology that met certain criteria for inclusion (Bagozzi’s, 1992). A vital point in the planned behaviour theory is that behaviours other than, attitudes, social pressure, beliefs and goal should act through these variables (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980; Wicker, 1969). Girls express their aggressive behaviour differently than adolescent boys due to they show less physically aggressive behaviour than boys (Ringrose, 2006; Tremblay, Hartup & Archer, 2005). Today, socialization and school environment has been a global problem that influences children’s intention of aggressive behaviour (Koth, Brasdshaw & Leaf, 2008, Webb & Sheeran, 2006; Coûte et al, 2007). The truth is that aggressive behaviour is a negative behavior that leads to negative outcomes (Horn, 2004; Geiger & Fischer, 2006).

Writing on antisocial personality, de Barros & de Padua (2008); and Latalova & Prasko, (2010) argues, antisocial personality is the act that predicts aggressive behaviour. Tremblay & Nagin (2005) and Lahey, et al, (2008); has described the serious effect of most school children difficult temperament and their antisocial personality which leads to aggressive behaviour in the society today. To them, children’s temper can lead to intention on an early continuation of real aggressive behaviour. Antisocial personality is a mental illness that children of today are facing which have been considered by a reckless disregard for social norms, an inability to experience guilt, and which leads to aggressive behavior (Mendez, 2009). Though, there is relationship between antisocial personality and aggressive behaviour among male and female children who are in contact with each other (Meier, Slutskec, Arndt & Cadoret, 2008).

Evidence have shown that peer attachment is critical important issues to aggressive behaviour, this is due to the fact that children’s aggressive behaviour is as a result of peer influence and most school children involve in aggressive behaviour because of negative peer influence and gangsterism which are strong in schools (The Star online, 2014; Utusan Malaysia, 2011). Statistics have shown that cases of aggressive crime went up from 368 in 2012 to 542 last year among school children. School children intimidations have added to the reason of involving in aggressive behaviour with age group of 12 -18 years old. In addition, in 2011, there are 5547 adolescent cases in Malaysia where males involved in 5270 cases while females involved in 277 cases (Department of Social Welfare, 2010, 2013). But relationship between peer socialization effect and aggressive behaviour especially remain essential in the context (Fryer & Torelli, 2005). Moreover, friendship influence and high association with delinquent peers encouraged adolescents to engage in aggressive behaviour. In addition, the worth of relationship in children’s experiences and imitation can turn to aggressive behaviour (Phaik, Maria, Habibah & Jegak, 2010).
According to Nooshin, Siti Nor & Rumaya, (2013) poor teacher and children attachment contributes to higher crime among adolescents from divorced family; family structure like single-parent status was also found to be related with physical fighting among the adolescents, lack of parental control is known to be the key contributing factor (Lee et al,2007). Statistics shows that 10.7% of school children had been involved in a physical fight with other people, theft (4.3%), vandalism (2.7%) and had carried a weapon (2.4%) (Nor Afiah, Hejar, Kulanthayan & Law,2006). Moreover, inappropriate teacher’s behaviour, physical punishment, lack of monitoring/supervision, lack of encouragement affects children’s learning and makes classroom uncomfortable which contributes to aggressive behaviour (Bekiari, Heropoupou & Sakellarion, 2005; Buluc, 2006; Nebbitt, Lombe & Williams, 2008). Similarly, teacher’s negative attitudes like disliking a student or their groups would have effect on their intention to involve in aggressive behaviour in the school (Goldweber, et al, 2011). School environment is related to aggressive behaviour (Azizi et.al 2009b) Negative teacher badly affect student’s psychosocial and behavioural change in schools (Reinke & Herman, 2002). This means that attitudes to teachers have been found to be a stronger predictor to misbehaviours in schools among school children.

Attitude to aggressive behaviour seems also difficult. Hence, one of the most important problems within today’s children is attitude to aggressive behavior (Ajzen, 2001; Crano & Prislin, 2006). In social psychology, attitude always influence aggressive behaviour, because attitude helps children to choose or know if aggressive behaviour is suitable or relevant (Fazio, 2007). In addition, attitude to aggressive behaviour is related to aggressive behaviour because children’s attitude to aggressive behaviour determines their real aggressive behaviour. This condition is caused to formed interactions with friends which may in turn contribute to aggressive behaviour, and also these problems make children’ to have negative perception to their school environment (Bohner, 2001; Fabrigar, MacDonald& Wegener 2005).

The feel of perceived behavioral control also contributes to real aggressive behaviour among children; this is because perceived behavioural control reflects the beliefs of a person about the actual or possible readiness to involve in aggressive behaviour or with others in any situation in the school environment. Moreover, this issue could vary from the actual situation within child’s environment. In addition, this issue has effect on aggressive behaviour because it is when children perceived it ease or difficult in performing a particular behaviour, then it might contribute to aggressive behaviour (Ajzens, 2002; 2005).

Additional issue towards explanation of aggressive behaviour in children is subjective norms to aggressive behavior like spreading the rumor (Bartol, 2005). This condition is caused to have children to accept what important friends want them to do which in turn related to aggressive behaviour. In addition, individual normative beliefs and social influences act to influence children’s aggressive behaviour (Rivis, Amanda, Sheeran & Paschal, 2003). The problem here is that if group members would positively support rumor spreading and if the social aggressor holds their positive support in high regard, then he/she will be motivated to act in accordance
with the group norms and will spread the rumor which may in turn link to aggressive behaviour (Ajzen, 2006; Etcheverry & Agnew, 2004).

Generally in Malaysia, children aggressive behaviour often occur during physical education sessions, recess, bathrooms, hallways, on waiting for school buses, school activities and classes that require group work (Wee & Siong, 2011). This issue is a concern to both teachers and school children in the school environment that may require a solution to the problem (Yahaya & Ahmad, 2006). Though, lack of teacher’s control, denial of love; peer rejection is related to aggressive behaviour (Chen et al, 2005). In other words, teachers monitoring is vital rather than being busy with their work. Similarly, vandalism, truancy, experienced insult and name calling from other school children is also related to aggressive behaviour (Zaman & Nadchatran, 2007; Tee, 2009; Wahad, 2006). Of note, teacher’s inability to function well influence children’s aggressive behaviour because when teachers cannot maintain effective teacher management skills in the face of unpleasant situation, it would certainly have effect on children’s aggressive behavior (Wim et al, 2009; Haines & Case, 2005; Wim, 2009). Moreover, despite few studies on aggressive behaviour in Malaysia, the researcher may see it that people are not interested or they give less focus on the issue. Thus, there is no specific studies which attempt to focus on the levels of peer attachment, teacher attachment, antisocial personality, attitude to aggressive behaviour, subjective norms to aggressive behaviour, and perceived behavioural control which influence aggressive behaviour. As well as showing the mediating effect subjective norms to aggressive behavior, perceived behavioral control on the relationship between antisocial personality and aggressive behaviour amongst school children. Hence this research is to fill the gap and be able to really examine and understand factors that contribute to real aggressive behaviour. Consequently, empirical research evidence is still needed to support the proposed link between peer attachment, teacher attachment, antisocial personality, attitude to aggressive behaviour, subjective norms to aggressive behavior, and perceived behavioural control that contributes in explaining aggressive behaviour. These problems are too numerous and this study has decided to focus on some research questions relating to intention to involve in aggressive behaviour under study.

1.3 Research Questions

The following research questions are as follows:

1. What are the levels aggressive behaviour, peer attachment, teacher attachment, antisocial personality, subjective norms, perceived control, and attitude to aggressive behaviour among school children?
2. What are the relationships between peer attachment, teacher attachment, subjective norms, perceived behavioral control, attitude to aggressive behavior, antisocial personality and aggressive behaviour amongst secondary school children?
3. What is the mediating effect of subjective norms to aggressive behaviour, perceived behavioral control on the relationship between antisocial personality and aggressive behaviour?
1.4 Objectives of the Study

The main objective of this study was to examine the role peer attachment, teacher attachment, subjective norms to aggressive behaviour, perceived behavioral control, attitude to aggressive behaviour, and antisocial personality and aggressive behaviour.

The study has the following research objectives:

1. To describe the levels of aggressive behavior, peer attachment, teacher attachment, antisocial personality, subjective norms, perceived behavioral control, attitude to aggressive behaviour among school children.
2. To determine the relationship between (peer attachment, teacher attachment, subjective norms, perceived behavioral control, attitude to aggressive behaviour, antisocial personality) and aggressive behaviour amongst secondary school children.
3. To examine the mediating effect of subjective norms to aggressive behaviour, perceived behavioral control on the relationship between antisocial personality and aggressive behaviour.

1.5 Research Hypotheses

In this research, the hypotheses are as follows:

\( H_1 \): There is no significant difference between Male and Females on aggressive behaviour.
\( H_2 \): There is no significant difference between age on aggressive behaviour.
\( H_3 \): There is no significant difference between race on aggressive behaviour.
\( H_4 \): There is no significant relationship between peer attachment and aggressive behaviour.
\( H_5 \): There is no significant relationship between teacher attachment and aggressive behaviour.
\( H_6 \): There is no significant relationship between antisocial personality and aggressive behaviour.
\( H_7 \): There is no significant relationship between attitude to aggressive behavior and aggressive behaviour.
\( H_8 \): There is no significant relationship between subjective norms to aggressive behavior and aggressive behaviour.
\( H_9 \): There is no significant relationship between perceived behavioral control and aggressive behaviour.
\( H_{10} \): The regression coefficients for all the independent variables are significant when regressed against the aggressive behaviour.
\( H_{11} \): There is no mediation effect of subjective norms on the relationship between antisocial personality and aggressive behaviour.
\( H_{12} \): There is no mediation effect of perceived behavioral control on the relationship between antisocial personality and aggressive behaviour.
1.6 Significance of the Study

The significant of this study was good due to it provide additional information to existing body of knowledge in real aggressive behaviour which also describe the level of peer attachment, teacher attachment, attitude to aggressive behaviour, antisocial personality, subjective norms to aggressive behaviour, perceived behavioural control and aggressive behaviour among school children which is not many in the existing literature. Findings from this study will benefit relevant authorities such as the Ministry of Education, policy makers, secondary schools teachers, religions leaders and future researchers in this field of studies. For the policy makers the results of study will guide them towards making sustainable way to solve intention to involve in aggressive behaviour among school children.

For the secondary school teachers study findings can provide them with useful guide to organize and coordinate training needs for teachers in the secondary schools in order to boost their competence, confidence, and try to know how they can create time to resolve issues related to children’s aggressive behaviour in the school and as well as address the issue of some teachers negative attitude and behaviour that may led children to get involve in aggressive behaviour. While for the Ministry of Education in the country as this finding would serves as useful reality check for them to know how they are doing in government daily secondary schools. Findings also act as a wakeup call to the Ministry of Education to take appropriate actions such as interventions and increase their knowledge on how to make school children to feel safe while in school and outside school environment and as well as making teaching and learning conducive.

In the same vein, findings will provide direction for future researchers to study more on other aspects of this field or expand the scope to include more variables that might influence aggressive behaviour among school children. The results of this study would be useful in helping members of all the districts to improve their knowledge on how best to solve this aggressive behaviour among school children which children are always engage in, and also provide new ways in making school children have sense of belonging that will show unity and peace with other peers. Moreover, the lessons learned and outcomes could be used as guidelines for policy makers and religious leaders to improve the best possible strategies to make teachers and school children to understand the need of monitoring and steady communication to children in order to be safe from all dangers both in and outside school environment, and as well allowing teachers to have a conducive learning and teaching environment that would be benefited from school children and their teachers. In conclusion, the results the researcher derived from this research will help students of social psychology, economics, and community development to understand another strategies that could be of help to everyone.
1.7 Limitation of the Study

This study was only limited to Selangor only without taking other states into consideration because of lack of funds and problem with time. Secondly, in terms of response biases, instruments used in data collection were self-reported measures. Thus the results are depended greatly on the accuracy, truthfulness, and perception of the respondents. In addition, the instruments required minutes to complete, which might have affected some responses. Another limitation is that there is no study done to examine antisocial personality and intention to involve in aggressive behaviour of school children in the country. Thirdly, the study is only limited to Pertaling Perdana, Hulu langkat, Klang and Gombak districts and the generalization of the findings to other local districts and other cities may not be appropriate. The findings are only true to the children and the schools studied. Moreover, this study explores the factors such as antisocial personality, peer attachment, teacher attachment, attitude to aggressive behaviour, subjective norms to aggressive behaviour and perceived behavioral control and did not include other factors that may have contributed to real aggressive behaviour.

1.8 Theoretical Framework of the Study

Theoretical framework is always essential in the sense that it helps the researcher to understand how hypothesis of a research and its approaches could be answered (Ocholla & Roux, 2011). Consequently, theoretical framework represents a strong holds which guide the theories that related to research work and as well as clarify or describe the basis behind justification of the research study (Khan, 2010). Based on this study, theoretical framework is used to explain the research question that the researcher established to investigate. Also findings based on justification would be on the methods and ideas related to the recommended theories for the study (Ziedler, 2007). In spite of this argument, it has shown that for any research work to be vital should also require logical and systematic end, though understanding of the phenomenon of this study should as well embrace the establishment of model, concepts and theories that is important (Collis & Hussey, 2003).

There are theories that attempt to explain the phenomenon of real aggressive behaviour among school children. It is clear to note that theory is an idea about how research works. In psychology, a theory is an idea about why people acts in a certain way and theories are important because they explain certain phenomena (Silong, 2009). It is true that each of these theories will have its own weakness and strength and be open to criticism. Over time the theories will be refined, removed, and new ones will emerge. But some theories, due to their strength and usefulness will remains for a long period of time. Meanwhile, this section provides a historical review of the theories used as well as a summary of the theoretical linkage between them. These theoretical summaries assist to balance a theoretical diagram for illustration linkage between theories and show the gaps for future research. Figure 1.1 shows a linkage between using theories in this study. Therefore, theories using in this study are as follows:
b. Social Learning theory (Bandura, 1977)
c. Cognitive Dissonance (Leon Festinger, 1957)

1.8.1 Theory of Planned behaviour

The guiding theoretical framework for this study was the Planned Behaviour theory by (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980; Ajzen, 2002). In psychology, planned behavior theory is a theory concerning the link between attitudes and behaviour; this planned behaviour theory model postulates that children’s intention is the most next determinant of aggressive behaviour. Moreover, constructs of attitude to behaviour, subjective norms to behaviour, and perceived behavioral control are postulated to independently effect children’ intention of behaviour. The model seeks to explain that subjective norms or the perceived expectations of others or of peer groups who approve or disapprove of a particular behaviour, along with attitudes toward the behavior are determinants of that behaviour. Subjective norms refer to codes of behavior that have been instilled in the individual, and may be the weakest predictor of intention of behaviour. Subjective norms that come from incorrect assessment of what others do will influence social behaviour (Armitage & Connor, 2001).

In addition, perceived behavioral control is an element that was added to the model, and it accounts for whether a person has control over performing certain behaviour. It is a unique element of the model because it influences not only the intention to perform a behaviour, but also the behaviour itself because even if an individual has the intent to act, they may not have the means to follow through. Perceived behavioral control is composed of two elements: control beliefs and perceived power.
Whereas attitudes are well-established in the field of social psychology, and attitudes are formed by evaluating the response to motivations and subsequent support. This model was established to explain behaviour in different domains. Indeed, it has been successfully used to explain intention of behaviour in many environments (Azjen, 2002). Of note, children’s attitudes act as mediating variables influencing behaviour to the extent that they influence intentions of behaviour (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). Further, this model helps the researcher to know that intention predict aggressive behaviour straight away because the stronger the intention to perform a behavior, the more likely it becomes that the aggressive behaviour will occur. Moreover, researcher’s finding is similar and he confirms that planned behaviour theory can explain the phenomenon of intention to involve in aggressive behaviour in secondary schools in Selangor state.

1.8.2 Cognitive dissonance theory

This theory was developed by Leon Festinger (1957). He argued that school children hold a large number of cognitions at the same time, and these perceptions form inappropriate, in agreement with or unsuitable relationships with one another. He claim also that, the connection between a person’s attitudes and aggressive behaviour is derive by the goal of bringing down dislike or hatred in psychological state, called dissonance, that arises when two cognitions are inconsistence. Moreover, dissonance in a manner of clashing is an aversive motivational state that results when children’s aggressive behaviour is inconsistent with their attitudes. Dissonance creates psychological tension that children are motivated to reduce. It is clear to note that this theory is concerned with the relationships among cognitions. Cognition, for the purpose of this theory, may be thought of as a piece of knowledge and the knowledge may be about an attitude, an emotion, and behaviour. Thus, theory of cognitive dissonance was used to explained antisocial personality.

One good thing in linking these theories to my research work is that the roots of it lie in its concern with the risk factors through environment that increases the likelihood that allows children experience emotion like anger which motivates fitness-enhancing to involve in aggressive behaviour, and that is surely true for humans. Moreover, children’s interaction in the environment is unique because they react differently to these issues and therefore, the manifestation of antisocial personality and intention of aggressive behaviour is certain. Though, peers could influence one another in any environment to which environment always influence children more strongly based on their view of the environment than according to its actual situations.

Thus, in this study, the researcher believes that environment influences antisocial personality and intention of aggressive behaviour to which environment provides the chance for children to get involve in aggressive behaviour they must have learned or observed somewhere such as observation of another persons who behave aggressively and through the observation of models in the environment. Above all, the uniqueness and theoretical contribution of this study lie within the application of
a situational and interactional approach to analyze aggressive behaviour, according to which, the intention to involve in aggressive behaviour is not merely an isolated event, but rather a part of a dynamic interaction of conflict in our environment undergoing increase processes. This approach allows for a fuller, more realistic understanding of this phenomenon, within the social context in which it takes place. Also the important of social learning theory to my research work suggest children imitate intention of aggressive acts through experiences they must see in the environment.

1.8.3 Social Learning Theory

Social learning theory emphasizes the importance to which children imitate and observe intention of aggressive behaviours, attitudes, and angry reactions of people as its focus on learning, observation and modeling. This theory maintains that children can learn behaviors by observing other individuals with a tendency. Thus, learning can be used to explain many factors that contribute to intention to involve in aggressive behaviours among school children (Bandura, 1977). Author claim that children intention of aggressive behaviour is learned and observes through people around the children which form the basis of a new behaviour to be established; as a result it will serve as a guide for their action. He describes children’s intention of aggressive behaviour in terms of continuous reciprocal interaction between cognitive, behavioral, and environmental influences, and this theory has been applied widely to the understanding of aggressive behaviour (Bandura, 1973), and the processes of social learning depend on the child’s forming mental representations of events in the environment. Thus, rewards and punishments for intention of aggressive behavior is represented in the form of expectancies of future intention to involve in aggressive behaviour and the value intention of aggressive behaviour has for the individual (Bandura, 1986). Social learning theory states that children are not born with preformed repertoires of aggressive behaviour; rather children learn them in one way or the other.

Children learn specific behaviours like intention to involve in aggressive behaviour through imitation and reinforcement. Studies also confirmed the role of social learning processes in the development of children’s intention to involve in aggressive behaviour, as well as the treatment and prevention of real aggressive behaviour (Webster-Stratton, Reid & Hammond, 2004). Understanding of social learning theory in intention of aggressive behaviour explains how environmental situations influence school children to be aggressive.

Children’s aggressive behaviour is cause by environmental situation which make them to be aggressive in nature. With this perspective, social learning theory seeks to answer the question as to why children involve in aggressive behaviour. School children involve in aggressive behaviour primarily because of socially associating with others. Group of children influence one another to believe that engaging in real aggressive behaviour is favourable for their own survival. According to Bandura’s social learning theory, intention to engage in aggressive behaviour among children is
a learning process just like in any other behaviour that is developed through association and interaction with peers. The peer group and the school environment are the main source of impact on what children learn. This theory contributes to the understanding regarding the role of environment in influencing intention to involve in aggressive behaviour among school children. Importantly, most studies that based on social learning theory have focused on school-aged children (Alink, 2006). Social learning towards aggressive behaviour is where school children observe those around them and their actions and learn from them. It suggests that all that behaviour is learned, whether it comes from family, friends, and people around. Moreover, school children view intention to involve in aggressive behaviour as a learning process just like in any other behaviour that is developed through association and interaction with peers (Bandura, 1971). Social learning theory argued that school children acquire real aggressive behaviour the same way they acquire other complex forms of social behaviour either by direct experience or by observing others (Bandura 1983, 2001).

In this study, conceptual framework is a clarify concept which propose relationships among the variables in a study. As suggested by Shields, Patricia & Rangarjan (2013) that “conceptual framework is the way ideas are organized to achieved a research project’s purpose”. Similarly, as according to Colander (2013) conceptual framework is defined as an analytical tool with several contexts and variations that are used to make distinctions of concepts and organize idea which is used to capture something real and do this in a way that is easy to remember and apply. As a result, the researcher try to show the link between age, gender, race, antisocial personality, peer attachment, teacher attachment, attitude to aggressive behavior, subjective norms to aggressive behaviour, perceived behavioural control and intention of aggressive behavior. This conceptual framework is aided by several explanations of various aspects surrounding intention of aggressive behaviour of school children and it is used as a guide for the study from the literature that are conceptually mapped and used to set boundaries for the study (Conkin, 2005; Miles and Huberman, 1994). Moreover, antisocial personality is coldly calloused children that often involve in impulsive and aggressive behaviors. Thus, children with antisocial personality tend to engage in cold, calculated, unemotional, and aggressive behavior (Nouvion, Cherek, Lane, Tcheremissine & Lieving, 2007). More so, children with antisocial personality impact peers ability to relate to others socially, but the environmental effects of antisocial personality on one’s social life include damaging relationships with loved ones due to manipulation that may influence others to have intention to involve in aggressive behaviors (Black, 2006). Clearly, antisocial personality is strongly related to intention of aggressive behaviour and it is also associated with substance use, suicide, poor quality of life and self-injurious behavior (Black et al., 2010; Fountoulakis, Leucht & Kaprinis, 2008). Similarly, school children with antisocial personality always like to interact with peers in ways that maintain and support the intention to involve in aggressive behaviour (Farmer and Cadwallader, 2000).

In addition, school children association with antisocial peer groups go through a process of negative training that may influence one to have intention to involve in aggressive behaviour. As a result, these affiliations become stronger and more reinforcing over some years and the antisocial patterns and beliefs become more
resistant to change, and school children who are poorly attached to school, influence of friends may contribute to aggressive behaviour than children who are well attached to school (Henry, 2008). Of note, antisocial personality significantly has relationship to peer attachment which contributes to the mediating link to real aggressive behaviour (Larsen & Dehle, 2007). Similarly, Meier, Slutske, Arndt & Cadoret, (2008) argues, antisocial personality is related to aggressive behaviors of male and female children who are in contact with each other. To Hartup (2005) peer attachment influence children’s intention to engage in aggressive behaviour, and that quality of peers reflects in children experience and in the outcomes of their friendships. Connor (2002) found that children with antisocial personality may find that their beliefs and attitudes are different from those of most other people, and others may find their attitude unusual, unexpected or perhaps offensive and this attitude is often criminal, and aggressive act (NICE, 2009). Moreover, researcher believes that environment contributes to real aggressive behaviour and the relationships can reward and encourage school children’s intention to involve in aggressive behaviour. Figure 1.2 below show that antisocial personality is the independent variable, aggressive behaviour as dependent variable and finally, peer attachment, teacher attachment, attitude to aggressive behaviour; subjective norms to aggressive behaviour and perceived behavioral control serve as the mediator variable of the study. This study supports Howard et al, (2008) who found that children with antisocial personality were more likely to possess higher anger and impulsivity that link to intention to involve in aggressive behaviour. They claim that children with this attitude were quite likely to have been convicted of aggressive crime. Similarly, Lahey et al, (2005) and Buelga, Ravennna, Musitu & Lila, (2006) argues, antisocial personality is related to a major number of false positive predictions, and peers who have desire for popularity, and control influence others the chance to construct the social reputation they always wants which may in turn related to aggressive behaviour.

Figure 1.2: Conceptual Framework of the Study
1.9 Conceptual and Operational Definitions of Variables

The study defined the following term in their conceptual meaning as well as gives their definition in the form they have been applied in this study that is their operational definition. These concepts is been explored to orientate the readers and provide a foundation for the study. These concepts are as follows;

1.9.1 Antisocial Personality

Conceptual definition: Antisocial personality is characterized by a history of continuous behavior in which the rights of others are violated. Antisocial personality is seen as unimportance attitude to other individuals that violate the rights of human being and has a negative impact towards other people surrounding the person (Alloy, Riskind & Manos, 2005; Bartol & Bartol, 2008; Fals-Stewart, Leonard & Birchler, 2005; Hofvander, Ossowski, Lundstrom & Anckarsater, 2009).

Operational definition: Antisocial personality in this study was measured using self-report items developed by Andershed, Kerr & Station, (2002) and Forth, Kosson & Hare, (2003). This instrument was used to measure antisocial personality among school children. The scale is composed of 18 items which measured frequency of participation in antisocial personality. The higher the score, the more antisocial personality is committed.

1.9.2 Aggressive behaviour

Conceptual definition: aggressive behaviour is defined as a situation where a child’s acting out is thought to be the ability of his or her effort which predicts aggressive act (Smith & Handler, 2006). Aggressive behaviour is defined as a repeated and systematic kind of hostility relating to children (Marini, Dane & Bosacki, 2006) and it is an intentional process of hostility that uses unequal power to inflict harm or gain material for social profits (Frey, Hirschstein, Edstron & Snell, 2009).

Operational definition: In this study, aggressive behaviour was measured using aggressive questionnaire developed by (Buss & Perry, 1992). This instrument assesses some aspects of aggressive behaviour among the children respectively. The scale is composed of 34 items which measured frequency of involving in aggressive behaviour. The higher the score, the more often exact aggressive behaviour is committed.
1.9.3 Peer Attachment

**Conceptual definition:** Peer attachment is defined as a helpful care from the children that inspire friends to face challenges better (Hoeve et al, 2012). In contrast, poor attachment with friends leads to aggressive behaviour (Elgar, Knight, Worrall & Sherman, 2003).

Peer attachment is the degree to which a child or children is socially accepted by peers. It includes the level of peer popularity and the ease with which a child or children can initiate and maintain satisfactory peer relationships (Schneider, 2001).

**Operational definition:** In this study, peer attachment is measured using inventory of peer attachment developed by (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987) which researcher used to assess children’s perceptions of the positive and negative affective/cognitive dimension of relationships with their friends.

1.9.4 Teacher Attachment

**Conceptual definition:** Teacher attachment is defined as mutual acceptance, understanding, warmth, closeness, trust, respect, care and cooperation (Good & Brophy, 2000; Krause, Bochner, & Duchesne, 2006). Attachment with teachers is related to low levels of intention of aggressive behaviour among school children (Bogels & Brechman-Toussaint, 2006).

**Operational definition:** In this study, teacher attachment was measured using inventory of teacher attachment developed by (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987) which researcher used to assess children’s views of the relationships with their teachers.

1.9.5 Attitude to aggressive behaviour

**Conceptual definition:** Attitude to aggressive behaviour is the degree to which children has a positive or negative assessment of intention of aggressive behaviour. Attitude to aggressive behaviour is the intents to think, feel, or act positively or negatively in the environment (Ajzen, 2001). Attitude to aggressive behaviour is when a person is known with negative and positive attitudes throughout his or her life (Ajzen & Cote, 2008). Attitude was defined as an evaluation of many beliefs concerning intention to involve in aggressive behaviour (Miller (2005).

**Operational definition:** In this study, attitude to aggressive behavior is measured using self-report items developed by Bosworth & Espelage (1995). This instrument was used to measures attitudes to aggressive behaviour. The scale is composed of 6
items which measured fight that influence children’ intention to involve in aggressive behaviour. The higher the score i, the more often the actual attitude like fighting is committed.

1.9.6 Subjective norms to aggressive behaviour

**Conceptual definition:** Subjective norms to aggressive behaviour are defined as an individual’s perception of social pressures in the school to have intention to involve in aggressive behaviour (Ajzen, 1998). Subjective norm to aggressive behaviour is a function of individual’s belief and motivation to obey with the people to have intention to involve in aggressive behaviour (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975).

**Operational definition:** In this study, subjective norms to aggressive behaviour are used to measure the guidelines provided by Jackson, (1966). This measures school children’s’ observations of what other children in their school would think if children engaged in intention of aggressive behaviour or alternatives to aggressive behaviour (school norms) and children’s’ own evaluations of the aggressive behaviour (individual norms). The higher the score, the more often the exact aggressive behaviour like rumor is committed.

1.9.7 Perceived Behavioural Control

**Conceptual definition:** Perceived behavioral control is defined as a person’s belief as to know how easy or hard to involve in aggressive behaviour (Azjen & Madden, 1986; Ajzen, 1998). It is define as the extent to which a person trust that he or she is able to perform or carry out aggressive behaviour (Baron & Byrne, 1991).

**Operational definition:** In the current study, perceived behavioral control was developed by the researcher. This perception is to know if children will like or will not like to engage in aggressive behaviour in their daily life. The scale is composed of 5 items which measured their intention to involve or not involve in aggressive behaviour. The higher the score in each category, the more often the real aggressive act is committed.

1.10 Organization of the Study

This research is organized into five chapters. Chapter one comprises of background of study, statement of the problem, research questions and objective of study, significance of study, scope and limitations of study, conceptual and operational definitions of terms and organization of study. Chapter two is the literature review which explains various literatures relevant to the study. Chapter three contains the research methodology which is the research design, population and the sampling of
study, location of study, data collection and data analysis. Chapter four consists of
data analysis, results and findings. Chapter five consists of summary, conclusion and
recommendation for further study, bibliography and appendix of the research.
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