

**Factors Influencing Aggressiveness Among Adolescent School Children****Sneha Thapa**

Freelance Researcher

Registered Nurse, Kathmandu Medical College and Teaching Hospital, Nepal

Email: snehathapa883@gmail.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3126/jdl.v4i1.88046>**Abstract**

Adolescents are those who goes through behavior problems and aggressive behavior is one of the major behavioral problems. Aggression is a behaviour that is intended to hurt or injure another either physically (hitting, slapping, kicking, bullying, etc.) or verbally (insulting, rude, sarcasms, arguments, etc.) or through their strong emotions to harm another (anger) or having negative behaviour to threat another (hostility). Kind of family, currently living status, parent-child relationship, safety at school, truancy, number of close friends and peer relationship are found to be the factors of aggression among adolescents. A cross-sectional descriptive study will be conducted to assess factors affecting aggressiveness among adolescents. The study was conducted in Nava Arunima Secondary School among the adolescents studying in grade 8 to 10. Non probability total enumerative sampling technique was adopted to select the sample. Sample size was 126. Self-administered questionnaire technique was used to collect the data using standard tool of Buss-Perry aggression scale, 1992 and self-developed structured questionnaire. Descriptive analysis like frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation, and inferential statistics like chi-square test was done. SPSS version 20 was used to analyze the data. The finding of the study reveals that majority of respondents 74.6% had aggression and 25.4% had no aggression and there is significant association between peer relationship and aggression ( $p=0.017$ ). The majority of respondents had aggression and there is significant association between peer relationship and aggression. With respect to finding, it is necessary to conduct counseling programme for aggression management by school management.

**Keywords:** adolescents, aggression, aggressive behavior, factors

**Introduction**

Adolescents are those from ages 10 to 19 who are in the phase of life between childhood and adulthood. It is a unique stage of human development and an important

©2025 Author(s)



*This open-access article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0).*

time for laying the foundations of good health (World Health Organization, 2019). It is the time to develop knowledge and skills and to learn to manage emotions and also to acquire information and capability that will be essential for having good the adolescent life and better adult life. Finding out the factors affecting aggressiveness among adolescents is necessary as adolescence is the period of life that might be followed by various behavioral problems such as aggressive behaviour (Ye et al., 2021). Aggression is a behaviour that is intended to hurt or injure another either physically (hitting, slapping, kicking, bullying, etc.) or verbally (insulting, rude, sarcasms, arguments, etc.) or through their strong emotions to harm another (anger) or having negative behaviour to threat another (hostility) (Sidhu et al., 2021). It can be indicated as directly (physical aggression) or indirectly (verbal or anger or hostility) (Lagerspetz, 1988). Aggressive behaviour is a psycho-social dysfunction that sums up as state of emotional and behavior disorders which is synonymous with internalizing such as depression, anxiety and externalizing conditions such as aggression, delinquency (Ahmad, 2007).

The students with aggressiveness behavior are at risk of having poor academic performance, poor social adjustment, and negative and wrong behaviors throughout life (Estévez López et al, 2018). Aggressive behaviors are linked to several negative consequences in adult life, including low employment, social withdrawal, many social problems, and weaken physical health (Buchmann, 2014). However, school environment, the teacher–student relationship, peers at school may be critical factors to children’s health outcomes (Sette, 2013). Moreover, family environment and parental support could play a protective role in developing aggressive behavior (Henneberger et al., 2016).

A cross-sectional study was conducted by Omer et.al. (2020) to assess physical fighting among school attending adolescents of age 13-10 studying in grade 7 to 9 in El Salvador, United State in 2020. Total 1915 students participated in the study. The result showed that 70.9% of male were involved in physical fighting, males were 2.82 times more involved in physical fights than female in past 12 months. Those students who were involved in physical fights had non-understanding parents (63.4%), truancy (16.6%), unhelpful peers (58.6%) and no close friends (mean= 2.4, SD=1.03).

Similarly, Verma et al. (2021) conducted a cross-sectional study to assess association of psycho-social factors with aggression among 480 school going adolescents of age group 12-19 years of 18 government school in Haryana in October 2021. The result shows that verbal aggression was 48.3%, physical aggression 62.9%, anger 52.1% and

hostility 52.1%. Aggression was found nearly 0.3 times more in girls as compared to boys. The subjects belonging to class 10 were 53% less aggressive as compared to class 8 students. The factors like good family and peer relationships were the protective factors against aggression in adolescents. Also, long and stable friendships and good relationships with others were found less likely in aggressive adolescents.

A cross-sectional study was conducted by Sharma (2019) among 330 adolescent students of grade 7-11 of two school of Pokhara, Nepal in 2018 to assess the emotional and behavioral problems. The result showed aggressive behavior was present in 77.9% in normal case, 11.8% of borderline case and clinical case of 10.3% among the adolescents. It shows that male adolescents are 2.1 times more likely to have problem than female. Likewise, adolescents having nuclear families were more likely to have behavioral problems than adolescents having joint family. Adolescents having only one friend are 1.8 times more likely to have problem than having two or more friends. This shows gender, family, peer and school are the factors associated with such behaviour.

A research report by UNESCO (2018) among 1494 adolescents of age group 12-18 years in Mexico, in 2017 to assess the role of individual, family and school variables in aggression. The result shows that there is association between family variables such as family environment, relationship with parents and aggression and there is association between school variables such as school's environment, school authority and aggression.

Another study was conducted by Hawkins, et al. (2016) among 210 adolescents of age group 13-19 years in Chandigarh, India, in 2014 to assess the adolescents' aggression in relation to peer and family relationship. The result showed that there is significant association between family affection, value and family behaviour and aggression ( $p=0.003$ ) and there is significant association between peer relationship and aggression ( $p=0.20$ ).

Although, it has been found that aggressiveness as an alarming behavior among adolescents with consequences in life, there has been limited numbers of researches to find-out the factors affecting aggressiveness among adolescents in Nepal. Hence, the study is intended with the objective to find out the prevalence of aggressiveness and factors affecting it among adolescents of selected school of Kathmandu, Nepal.

Globally, according to UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization), 2018, the 30% of adolescents experience aggression (Shaikh et al., 2014). A youth-based surveillance survey was conducted among 12-19 years old

students to assess health behaviors in Maryland, United States of America from 2014-2015. The result showed that youths have health risk behaviors such as physical aggression, bullying verbally and through electronics. Such behavior is leading cause of mortality and morbidity in adolescents. As much as 5.5% of mortality is due to aggressive behavior has been found (Pandey et al., 2021). Adolescents are too young to open up about such experiences, which heighten the problem and its consequences such as poor academic performance, poor social adjustment, and negative and wrong behaviors throughout life as well (Pandey et al., 2021).

A cross-sectional study conducted among 347 school children of grade 7 to 10 of North Karnataka to assess physical and verbal aggressive behaviour pattern in 2014. The result showed 69.5% of students have physical aggression, 71.5% had verbal aggression in previous month. Children having nuclear family, 26.2% students experienced aggressive behavior in the family. Role models for aggressive behavior were parents (42.3%) physical aggression was significantly more common among boys than among girls. Physical aggression increased substantially from 7 standard (56.9%) to 10 standard (84.6%) (Sehgal & Nayak, 2021).

A descriptive study was conducted by Buss and Perry (1992) among 6531 school going adolescents from grade 7 to 11 of Nepal from 7<sup>th</sup> August 2015 to 14 March 2016 to identify factors associated with physical and sexual violence. The study found out that 50.29% of males were involved in physical attacks and 42.68% were involved in physical fights whereas, 40.12% female were involved in physical attacks and 34.85% were involved in physical fights. Similarly, students who had more prevalence of physical attack (59.75%) and physical fights (52.73%) than higher grade students. Likewise, students who had one close friend (46.24%) and no close (48.40%) were involved more in physical attacks and physical fights, parents who understood problems of their child, had done proper supervision, those children were less involved in physical aggression, and those students who had history of truancy more than 3 times a week, who felt unsafe in school (41.72%) and who got corporal punishment (40.81%) had higher prevalence of physical aggression.

This study conducted on Nava Arunima Secondary School, Kathmandu to attempts to find out the prevalence and factors affecting aggressiveness among adolescents. Although, aggression has been found in adolescents as great issue of concern and gender, family, school and peer factors has been found as major factors associated with

aggression, there is insufficient studies to explore the factors affecting aggression in adolescent in Nepal (Bista, 2016). Therefore, the researcher is interested to find out prevalence of aggression, and factors influencing it among adolescents which will help to form a system which will help create, effects in reducing, preventing and managing it. The study aims to assess the factors affecting aggressiveness among adolescents. To achieve the objective, the study deals with research questions as what are the association between factors such as family, school and peer and aggression among adolescents. The study will sensitize the school and teachers about aggressiveness among adolescents and provide counseling to them. The study will have marked importance in the field of school health nursing as it will provide evidence to plan health promotional activities for adolescents and provide anticipatory guideline. Furthermore, this research will help the upcoming researcher as they can take references and conduct similar research in the future.

### **Research Method**

This descriptive cross-sectional study aimed to examine the factors influencing aggression among adolescents. The research was carried out at Nava Arunima Secondary School, a private institution located in Arubari, Kathmandu, Province No. 3, Nepal, established in 2042 B.S. and offering education from nursery to grade 10. The study population consisted of students from grades 8, 9, and 10, with a total of 126 participants selected using a non-probability total enumeration sampling method—56 from grade 8, 34 from grade 9, and 36 from grade 10. The inclusion criteria were adolescents studying in the specified grades who were willing to participate in the study. The permission was obtained from the administration of Nobel College and also from selected authorities were taken. After a formal written letter from principal of Nava Arunima Secondary School, data collection was done. Students from particular class 8, 9, and 10 were divided into two groups in a separate class. Each day particular classes was taken for data collection by dividing them into two groups. The objective of the study was made clear to the respondents and informal verbal consent and written consent was taken before administering questionnaire. Respondents were assured that their confidentiality of information they provided was maintained. They were also informed about the voluntary participation and their right to quit anytime during the research. 20-30 minutes was taken

from each group of respondent for data collection. Data was collected during 2week of data collection period except during public holidays and Saturday. Absent students were followed up, next day. Data collection employed a structured, standardized tool—the Buss-Perry Aggression Scale—to assess the prevalence of aggression, alongside a self-administered questionnaire developed in English to explore contributing factors. The questionnaire was divided into five parts: socio-demographic characteristics, prevalence of aggression, and family, school, and peer-related factors.

To ensure validity, the tools were developed based on an extensive literature review and refined through consultation with research advisors and subject experts. Reliability was established by pretesting the instruments on 10% of a similar population at Mokshada School, Kathmandu. The pretest confirmed the clarity and simplicity of the tools, requiring no further modifications. The Buss-Perry Aggression Scale demonstrated a Cronbach's alpha of 0.89, while the questionnaire yielded a reliability coefficient of 0.767. Data were reviewed, edited, coded, and analyzed using SPSS Version 20, applying descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage, mean) and inferential statistics (chi-square tests) to determine associations between variables. The 29-item aggression scale used a five-point Likert scale, with items 7 and 18 reverse-coded. Scores were classified as aggressive ( $\geq 50$ ) or non-aggressive ( $< 50$ ), based on the mean cutoff. Ethical approval was obtained from the Institutional Review Committee (IRC) of Nobel College. Informed consent was acquired from participants and school authorities. Anonymity, confidentiality, and participant rights were safeguarded throughout the research process.

### **Findings of the Study**

This chapter is concerned with the findings of the study obtained from the analysis and interpretation of raw data has been collected from the students of Grade 8, 9, and 10 of Nava Arunima Secondary School. The response from 126 adolescents have been analyzed according to the objectives. Analyzed data was organized and presented in table to facilitate the interpretation.

**Socio-demographic Data****Table 1***Respondents' Age, Gender and Education Level (n=126)*

Variables (Age in complete years)	Frequency(f)	Percent (%)
12	8	6.34
13	38	30.15
14	40	31.74
15	29	23.04
16	10	7.93
17	1	0.80
Mean (13.75) ±Standard deviation (1.24)		
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	77	61.1
Female	49	38.9
<b>Education Level</b>		
Grade 8	56	44.4
Grade 9	34	27
Grade 10	36	28.6

Table 1 reveals that out of 126 adolescents, 31.74% of them were 14years old, 61.1% were male and 44.4% were studying in grade 8.

**Table 2.1***Respondents' Responses to Physical Aggression (n=126)*

Variables (Physical aggression)	EUM	UM	NCNUM	CM	ECM
Once in a while, I can't control the urge to hit another person.	12(9.5%)	25(19.8)	36(28.6)	34(27.6)	16(14.5)
Given enough provocation, I might hit another person.	19(15.1)	24(19%)	26(20.6)	31(24.6)	26(20.6)
If someone hits me, I hit back.	5(4%)	9(7.1%)	18(14.3)	60(47.6)	34(27%)

I get into fights a little more than the average person.	34(27%)	43(34.1)	22(17.5)	17(13.5)	10(7.9%)
If I have to resort to violence to protect my rights I will.	4(3.2%)	4(3.2%)	14(11.7)	62(49.2)	42(33.3)
There are people who pushed me so far that we came to blow.	14(11.1)	18(14.3)	33(26.2)	34(27%)	27(21.4)

(\*EUM=Extremely uncharacteristic of me, UM= Uncharacteristic of me, NCNUM= Neither characteristic nor uncharacteristic of me, CM= Characteristic of me, ECM= Extremely characteristic of me)

Table 2.1 shows that out of 126 respondents, in statements 28.6% responded that it was neither characteristics nor uncharacteristic of them to control the urge to hit another person, once in a while, 24.6% responded that it was characteristics of them to hit another person on provocation, 47.6% responded that it was characteristics of them to hit back if someone hits, 34.1% responded that it was uncharacteristic of them to get into fights a little more than the average person, 49.2% responded that it was characteristics of them to resort to violence to protect their rights and 27% responded that it was characteristics of them that there were people who pushed them so far that they came to blows.

**Table 2.2**

*Respondents' Responses to Physical and Verbal Aggression (n=126)*

Variables	EUM	UM	NCNUM	CM	ECM
I can think of no-good reason for ever hitting a person.	11(8.7%)	26(20.6%)	50(39.7%)	4(3.1%)	35(27.9%)
I have threatened people I know.	32(25. %)	43(34.1%)	19(15.1%)	25(19.8%)	7(5.6%)
I have become so mad that I have broken things.	23(18. %)	30(23.8%)	21(16.7%)	29(23%)	23(18.3%)
Verbal aggression I tell my friends openly, when I disagree with them.	9(7.1%)	14(11.1%)	20(15.9%)	48(38.1%)	35(27.8%)

(\*EUM=Extremely uncharacteristic of me, UM= Uncharacteristic of me, NCNUM= Neither characteristic nor uncharacteristic of me, CM= Characteristic of me, ECM= Extremely characteristic of me)



Table 2.2, shows that out of 126 respondents, in these statements 39.7% responded that it was neither characteristics nor uncharacteristic of them to think of no-good reason for ever hitting a person, 34.1% responded that it was uncharacteristic of them to threatened people they know and 23.8% responded that it was uncharacteristic of them to become so mad that they have broken things.

**Table 2.3**

*Respondents' Responses to Verbal Aggression and Anger (n=126)*

Variables	EUM	UM	NCNUM	CM	ECM
I often find myself disagreeing with people.	9(7.4%)	23(18%)	41(32.5%)	40(31.7%)	13(10.3%)
When people annoy me, I may tell them what I think of them.	13(10.3%)	24(19%)	25(19.8%)	48(38.1%)	16(12.7%)
I can't help getting into arguments when people disagree with me.	18(14.3%)	34(27%)	37(29.4%)	32(25.4%)	5(4%)
My friends say that I'm somewhat argumentative.	28(22.6%)	32(25%)	33(26.2%)	25(19.8%)	8(6.3%)
Anger	15(11.9%)	21(16%)	19(15.3%)	32(25.4%)	39(31.5%)
When people annoy me, I may tell them what I think of them.					

(\*EUM=Extremely uncharacteristic of me, UM= Uncharacteristic of me, NCNUM= Neither characteristic nor uncharacteristic of me, CM= Characteristic of me, ECM= Extremely characteristic of me)

Table 2.3, shows that out of 126 respondents, in these statements 32.5% responded that it was neither characteristics nor uncharacteristic of them to find themselves disagreeing with people, 38.1% responded that it was characteristics of them to tell people what they think about them when people annoy, 29.4% responded that it was neither characteristics nor uncharacteristic of them to get into arguments when people disagree with them, 26.2% responded that it was neither characteristics nor uncharacteristic for their friends to think that they are argumentative and 31.5% responded that it was extremely characteristic of them to flare up quickly but get over it quickly.

**Table 2.4***Respondent's Responses to Anger (n=126)*

Variables	EUM	UM	NCNUM	CM	ECM
When frustrated I let my irritation show.	18(14.3%)	33(26.2%)	26(20.6%)	23(18.3%)	26(20.6%)
I sometimes feel like a powder keg ready to explode.	12(9.5%)	18(14.3%)	41(32.5%)	35(27.8%)	20(15.9%)
I am an even-tempered person.	12(9.5%)	38(30.2%)	32(25.4%)	26(20.6%)	18(14.3%)
Some of my friends think I'm hothead.	25(17.5%)	32(25.8%)	29(22.8%)	27(21.4%)	14(10.1%)
Sometimes I fly off the handle for no good reason.	22(17.5%)	24(19%)	33(26.2%)	37(29.4%)	10(7.9%)

(\*EUM=Extremely uncharacteristic of me, UM= Uncharacteristic of me, NCNUM= Neither characteristic nor uncharacteristic of me, CM= Characteristic of me, ECM= Extremely characteristic of me)

Table 2.4 shows that out of 126 respondents, in these statements 26.2% responded that it was uncharacteristic of them to let their irritation show when frustrated, 32.5% responded that it was neither characteristics nor uncharacteristic for them to feel like a powder keg ready to explode, 30.2% responded that it was uncharacteristic of them to be an even-tempered person, 25,8% responded that it was uncharacteristic for their friends to think that they are hothead, 29.4% responded that it was characteristic of them to fly off the handle for no good reason.

**Table 2.5***Respondents' Responses to Anger and Hostility (n=126)*

Variables	EUM	UM	NCNUM	CM	ECM
I have trouble controlling my temper.	17(13.8%)	29(23.2%)	25(19.8%)	28(22%)	27(21.2%)
I am sometimes eaten up with jealousy.	16(12.7%)	25(19.8%)	23(18.3%)	36(29%)	26(19.2%)
At times I feel I have gotten raw deal out of my life.	22(17.7%)	25(19.8%)	40(31.7%)	21(16%)	18(14.7%)

Other people always seem to get the breaks.	21(16.7%)	26(20.6%)	45(35.7%)	25(20%)	9(6.2%)
I wonder why sometimes I feel so bitter.	11(8.8%)	15(11.9%)	30(23.8%)	53(42%)	17(13.5%)

(\*EUM = *Extremely uncharacteristic of me*, UM= *Uncharacteristic of me*, NCNUM= *Neither characteristic nor uncharacteristic of me*, CM= *Characteristic of me*, ECM= *Extremely characteristic of me*)

Table 2.5, shows that out of 126 respondents, in these statements 23.2% responded that it was uncharacteristic of them to have trouble in controlling their temper, 29% responded that it was characteristics of them to get eaten up with jealousy sometimes, 31.7% responded that it was neither characteristics nor uncharacteristic of them to feel that they have gotten raw deal out of their life, at times, 35.7% responded that it was neither characteristics nor uncharacteristic of them to feel other people always seem to get the breaks and 42.1% responded that it was characteristic of them to wonder why sometimes they feel so bitter about things.

**Table 2.6**

*Respondents' Responses to Hostility (n=126)*

Variables	EUM	UM	NCNUM	CM	ECM
I know that "friends" talk about me behind my back.	9(6.2%)	13(10.3%)	25(20%)	38(30.2%)	41(32.5%)
I'm suspicious of overly friendly strangers.	12(9.5%)	19(4.2%)	23(35%)	44(34.9%)	28(22.2%)
I sometimes feel that people are laughing behind my back.	5(4.5%)	11(8.7%)	22(17%)	48(38.1%)	40(31.7%)
When people are especially nice, I wonder what they want.	9(7.1%)	12(9.5%)	15(12%)	45(35.7%)	46(37.7%)

(\*EUM= *Extremely uncharacteristic of me*, UM= *Uncharacteristic of me*, NCNUM= *Neither characteristic nor uncharacteristic of me*, CM= *Characteristic of me*, ECM= *Extremely characteristic of me*)

Table 2.6, shows that out of 126 respondents, in these statements 32.5% responded that it was extremely characteristic of them to know that their friends talk behind their back, 34.9% responded that it was characteristics of them to be suspicious of overly

friendly strangers, 38.1% responded that it was characteristics of them to sometimes feel that people are laughing at them behind their back, and 37.7% responded that it was extremely characteristics of them to wonder what people want, when they are especially nice.

**Table 3.1**

*Domains of Aggression (n=126)*

Variables	Frequency(f)	Percent (%)
<b>Physical aggression</b>		
Non-aggression	40	31.7
Aggression	86	68.3
<b>Verbal aggression</b>		
Non-aggression	44	34.9
Aggression	82	65.1
<b>Anger</b>		
Non-aggression	52	41.3
Aggression	74	58.7
<b>Hostility</b>		
Non-aggression	32	25.4
Aggression	94	74.6

Table 3.1, shows that out of four domains of aggression, hostility was 74.6%, physical aggression (68.3%), verbal aggression (65.1%) and anger was 58.7%.

**Table 3.2**

*Prevalence of Aggression (n=126)*

Variables	Frequency(f)	Percent (%)
<b>Aggression Level</b>		
Non-aggression	32	25.4
Aggression	94	74.6

Table 3.2 reveals that out of 126 adolescents, 74.6% had aggression whereas 25.4% had no aggression.

**Table 4**

*Respondents' Family Factors (n=126)*

Variables	Frequency(f)	Percent (%)
<b>Kind of family</b>		
Nuclear Family	77	61.1
<b>Currently living with</b>		
Both mother and father	58	46.0
<b>Education status of father</b>		
Secondary level (9-12)	56	44.4
<b>Education status of mother</b>		
Secondary level (9-12)	61	48.4
<b>Occupation of father</b>		
Business	63	50.0
<b>Occupation of mother</b>		
Housemaker	68	54.0
<b>Parent-child relationship</b>		
Good	115	91.3

Table 4, shows that out of 126 respondents 61.1% of respondents had nuclear family, 46% were currently living with both mother and father and 44.4% of respondents' fathers studied up to secondary level, 48.4% of respondents' mothers studied up to secondary level, 50% of respondents' fathers' occupation was business, 54% of respondents' mothers were housemaker, and 91.3% had good parent-child relationship.

**Table 5***Respondents' School Factors and Peer Factors (n=126)*

Variables	Frequency(f)	Percent (%)
<b>Truancy</b>		
Zero	81	64.3
<b>Safety from physical attacks in school</b>		
No	92	73.0
<b>Safety to express fears, experiences, ideas at school</b>		
No	67	53.2
<b>Number of close friends:</b>		
5 or less	67	53.2
<b>Peer relationship</b>		
Good	105	83.3

Table 5, shows that among 126 adolescents, 64.3% weren't absent, 73% didn't feel safe from physical attacks in school and 53.2% of adolescents didn't feel safe to express fears, experiences, ideas at school and 53.2% had 5 or less close friends and 83.3% had good peer relationship.

**Table 6***Association between Family Factors and Aggression (n=126)*

Variables	Aggression Level		Chi-square(X <sup>2</sup> )	p-value
	Non-aggression	Aggression		
<b>Kind of families</b>				
Nuclear Family	17	60	1.853	0.520**
Joint Family	14	29		
Extended Family	1	5		
<b>Currently living with</b>				
Living with both parents	26	27	0.299	0.584

Not living with both parents/grandparents only/alone in rent or hostel/relatives	6	22		
<b>Educational status of father</b>				
Up-to basic	23	74	0.632	0.427
Secondary and above	9	20		
<b>Educational status of mother</b>				
Up-to basic	27	82	0.167	0.683
Secondary and above	5	12		
<b>Occupation of father</b>				
Not working	1	6	0.483	0.678**
Working	31	88		
<b>Occupation of mother</b>				
House-maker	15	53	0.869	0.351
Others	17	41		
<b>Parent-child relationship</b>				
Poor	2	9	0.331	0.565
Good	30	85		
<i>Fisher exact test**</i>			<i>p-value &lt;0.05</i>	

Table 6 shows that there is no significant association between family factors and aggression.

### Table 7

*Association between School Factors, Peer Factors and Aggression Level (n=126)*

Variables	Aggression Level		Chi-square(X <sup>2</sup> )	p-value
	Non-aggression	Aggression		
Truancy				
Zero	23	58	1.076	0.300

1 or more	9	36		
<b>Safety from physical attacks in school</b>				
No	21	71	1.189	0.275
Yes	11	23		
<b>Safety to express fears, experiences, ideas at school</b>				
No	15	52	0.684	0.408
Yes	17	42		
<b>Number of close friends</b>				
5 or less	17	50	0.788	0.995
6 and above	15	44		
<b>Peer relationship</b>				
Poor	1	20	5.663	0.017
Good	31	74		

*p-value < 0.05*

Table 7 shows that there is significant association between peer relationship and aggression level but there is no significant association between school factors, number of close friends and aggression level.

## Discussion of Findings

### Socio-demographic Information

Out of 126 adolescents, majority of them 31.74% were 14 years old followed by 13 years old 30.15%, 15 years old 23.04%, 16 years old 7.93%, 12 years old 6.34%, 17 years old 0.80%. The mean age of respondents was 13.75. Regarding gender most of the adolescents were male 61.1% and female 38.9%. Likewise, most of them were study at grade 8 44.4% followed by grade 10 28.6% and grade 9 27%.

In regards to family factors, most of them had nuclear family 61.1%, joint family 34.1% and extended family 4.8%. Most of them were living with both parents 46%, both mother, father and grandparents 31.7%, only mother 10%, only grandparents 5.6%,



relatives 3.2%, only father 2.4% and alone in rent/hostel 0.8%. Similarly, most of their fathers 44.4% and mother 48.4% studied up to secondary level, father 23.8% and mother 21.4% studied up to basic level, fathers 23% and mother 3.5% studied up to higher level, fathers 7.1% and mothers 10.3% had informal education and fathers 1.6% and mother 6.3% couldn't read and write. Likewise, most of their father 50% were businessman and mother 54% were housemaker, father 1.6% and mother 0.8% were farmers, fathers 1.6% and mother 19% were labour, father 23% and mother 2.4% were service provider, father 18.3% and mother 20.6% were foreign worker, 5.6% fathers were not working and 3.2% mothers were business woman. Similarly, 91.3% of respondents had good parent-child relationship whereas 8.7% had bad parent-child relationship.

In regards to school factors, most of them 64.3% weren't absent whereas 35.7% were absent for 1 or more days. 73% of them didn't feel safe from physical attacks in school whereas 27% felt safe from physical attacks in school. Likewise, 53.2% didn't feel safe to express fears, ideas, and experiences at school whereas 46.8% felt safe to express fears, ideas, and experiences at school.

In regards to peer factors, 53.2% had 5 or a smaller number of close friends whereas 46.8% had 6 or more number of friends. Similarly, 83.3% had good peer-relationship whereas 16.7% had poor peer-relationship.

### **Prevalence of Aggression**

Out of 126 adolescents, majority of adolescents 74.6% had aggression and 25.4% had no aggression. The present study shows most prevalent form of aggression was hostile aggression 74.6%, followed by physical aggression 68.3%, verbal aggression 65.1% and anger 58.7%. The finding of the study is supported by a study conducted in United states<sup>[32]</sup>(n=330) where majority 80% had hostility and in contradiction the study which was conducted in Chitwan (Nepal)<sup>[33]</sup> (n=417) shows that majority had verbal aggression 66.33%, followed by hostility 61.41% and anger 56.80%. This could be because of different and more sample size who may be prone of different kind of aggression such as physical, verbal, anger, hostility as the studies were conducted in two different districts of Nepal i.e. Chitwan and Kathmandu, the stressors that can lead to aggression can be different for the adolescents living in respective district.

### **Association of Factors With Aggression**

The present study showed that there is significant association between peer-relationship and aggression ( $p=0.017$ ). Similarly, the finding of the study was supported

by a study conducted in India<sup>[34]</sup>( $n=5476$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) and Nigeria ( $n=5700$ ,  $p=0.00$ )<sup>[35]</sup> which showed that there is significant association between peer relationship and aggression and in contradiction a study which was conducted in Iran ( $n=805$ ,  $p=0.10$ )<sup>[20]</sup> showed that there is no significant association between peer relationship and aggression. This might be because of difference in sample size, different cultural norms surrounding peer relationship as in Iran there may be more emphasis on individualism and self-sufficiency which may lead to less reliance on peer-relationship for social support whereas in Nepal there may be more emphasis on collectivism and interdependence which may lead to greater reliance on peer relationship for social support and it included only adolescent girls as sample for the study which might have caused difference in finding.

The findings of the present study showed that there is no significant association between association between number of close friends and aggression ( $p=0.995$ ). Similarly, the finding of the study is supported by a study conducted in Iran ( $n=805$ ,  $p<0.05$ )<sup>[20]</sup> showed that there is no association between number of close friends and aggression and in contradiction a study conducted in United States ( $n= 1088$ )<sup>[36]</sup> showed that there is significant association between number of peers and aggression. This might be cause of difference in sample size and difference in friendship pattern of adolescents as friendships in Nepal rely more on face-to-face interactions, collectivism whereas in United States it depends on shared interests, hobbies, individualism.

The findings of the present study showed that there is no significant difference between physical safety at school ( $p=0.275$ ) and emotional safety at school ( $p=0.684$ ) and truancy ( $p=0.300$ ) and aggression. Similarly, the finding of the study is supported by a study conducted in Turkey ( $n=914$ ,  $p>0.05$ )<sup>[37]</sup> showed that there is no significant difference between safety at school, truancy and aggression and in contradiction a study conducted in Egypt ( $n=380$ ,  $p=0.01$ )<sup>[38]</sup> found that there significant association between physical and emotional safety at school with aggression. This might be because of differences in cultural norms and values that influences how aggression is viewed and addressed in school environment.

The present study showed there is no association between kind of family and aggression ( $p= 0.520$ ). The finding of the study is supported by a study conducted in India, which showed there is no significant association with type of family ( $p>0.05$ )<sup>[3]</sup>. In contrast, a study conducted in Pakistan showed that there is significant association between kind of family and aggression ( $p<0.001$ )<sup>[39]</sup>. This might be because of cultural

differences in terms of family values which may play a role in shaping the relationship between family structure and aggression as most of the Pakistani people value the concept of staying together, maintaining strong family ties and it is common for them to live in an extended family.

The present study showed that adolescents living with both parents were most aggressive and there is no significant association between currently living status and aggression. In contradiction, a study conducted in Lebanon showed that there higher level of aggression in those who are not living with both parents and there is significant association between them ( $p < 0.001$ )<sup>[40]</sup>. This might be because in Lebanon living with parents may be considered more normative and desirable for adolescents which might be the reason that adolescents of Lebanon who aren't living with parents are more likely to experience aggression causing stressors whereas adolescents of Nepal might be getting enough social support and are free of aggression stressors irrespective of who they are living with.

The present study showed that there is no significant association between education status of father ( $p = 0.427$ ) and mother ( $p = 0.683$ ). Similarly, the findings of present study is supported by a study conducted in Turkey ( $n = 914$ ,  $p > 0.05$ )<sup>[37]</sup> which showed there is no significant association between education status of parents and in contradiction, a study conducted in Iran ( $n = 500$ ,  $p = 0.007$ )<sup>[41]</sup>, there is significant association between parents education status and aggression. This might be because of in Iran there may be more emphasis on importance of education and adolescents with parents who have lower education level of education may experiences more stress which could increase the likelihood of aggression whereas in Nepal education status of parents and aggression might be less relevant due to more relevancy of other factors such as poverty or social conflicts or peer relationship that contribute to increased aggression level.

The present study showed that there is no significant association between occupation of father ( $p = 0.678$ ) and mother ( $p = 0.351$ ). Similarly, the findings of present study is supported by a study conducted in Turkey ( $n = 914$ )<sup>[37]</sup> which showed there is no significant association between education status of parents ( $p > 0.05$ ) and in contradiction, a study conducted in India ( $n = 550$ ,  $p = 0.022$ )<sup>[42]</sup>, there is significant association between parents occupation and aggression. This might be because in India there may be more emphasis on social status and occupational prestige, and adolescents with parents in lower status occupations may experience more stress which increase likelihood of

aggression whereas in Nepal occupation status of parents and aggression might be less relevant due to more relevancy of other factors such as political instability or social conflicts or peer relationship that contribute to increased aggression level.

The present study showed that there is no significant association between parent-child relationship and aggression ( $p=0.565$ ). In contradiction, a study conducted in China ( $n=3213$ ,  $p<0.05$ )<sup>[27]</sup>, there is significant association between parent-child relationship and aggression. This might be because parent-child relationship among adolescents is a complex and dynamic area for research and there might be various other reason that might contribute the aggression other than parent-child relationship.

### Conclusion

The findings of the present study indicated that more than half of the adolescent participants exhibited some level of aggressive behaviour. Among the variables examined, peer relationship emerged as the only factor that showed a statistically significant association with aggression. This suggests that the dynamics within peer groups may be a key influence on students' aggressive tendencies, possibly due to social pressure, modelling of behaviours, or interpersonal conflicts among peers. Conversely, no significant association was found between aggression and family factors, school-related influences, or the number of close friends, which may imply that these dimensions either require deeper qualitative exploration or may not be as directly linked to overt aggression in this specific population. It is important to note, however, that the study was limited to a single school and involved a relatively small sample size. Thus, the results should be interpreted with caution and cannot be generalized to other schools or wider adolescent populations without further empirical validation.

### Implications and Recommendations

Despite its limitations, the study holds important implications for researchers, educators, and health professionals. For future researchers, the study can serve as a preliminary reference or baseline for designing more extensive and rigorous investigations on adolescent aggression in various contexts. It underscores the need for larger, multi-site studies that incorporate broader socio-cultural variables and perhaps mixed-method approaches to better understand the root causes of aggressive behaviour. For educational institutions and concerned authorities, the findings point to the necessity

of school-based preventive and promotive measures focused on peer dynamics. Schools could implement structured interventions such as peer counselling programmes, individual counselling services, anticipatory guidance sessions, and aggression management classes. Furthermore, school health professionals, such as school nurses or counsellors, may use these insights to develop targeted awareness campaigns and psychosocial support services that address aggression among students. Such interventions may contribute not only to reducing aggressive behaviours but also to promoting a healthier and more supportive school environment. Similarly, policy makers should enhance peer-mentorship programs to ensure positive peer interactions. Schools should implement strict anti-bullying policies and establish procedures for safe reporting. Teachers should be trained regarding the identification of early signs of peer-related aggression and appropriate interventions. Parent-school collaboration should be enhanced to monitor the peer groups and behavior of students. Life-skills and mental health education should be integrated to help adolescents manage their emotions and peer pressure.

### References

- Ahmad, A., Khalique, N., Khan, Z., & Amir, A. (2007). Prevalence of psychosocial problems among school going male adolescents. *Indian Journal of Community Medicine*, 32(3), 219–221. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0970-0218.36836>
- Assaf, A. E.-R., Abd El-Hay, M., Eissa, M., & Abohammar, S. (2018). Assessment of aggressive behavior among preparatory school children in Tanta City. *Tanta Medical Journal*, 46(1), 29–37. [https://doi.org/10.4103/tmj.tmj\\_1\\_18](https://doi.org/10.4103/tmj.tmj_1_18)
- Bista, B., Thapa, P., Sapkota, D., Singh, S. B., & Pokharel, P. K. (2016). Psychosocial problems among adolescent students: An exploratory study in the central region of Nepal. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 4, 158. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2016.00158>
- Buchmann, A., Hohmann, S., Brandeis, D., Banaschewski, T., & Poustka, L. (2014). Aggression in children and adolescents. In *Neuroscience of aggression* (pp. 421–442).
- Buss, A. H., & Perry, M. (1992). The aggression questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63(3), 452–459. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.63.3.452>

- Estévez López, E., Jiménez Gutiérrez, T. I., & Moreno Ruiz, D. (2018). Aggressive behavior in adolescence as a predictor of personal, family, and school adjustment problems. *Psicothema*, 30(1), 66–73.
- Garg, I., Sethi, S., & Kishore, J. (2018). The prevalence and patterns of aggression in school adolescents in a rural area of Moga District of Punjab, India. *Indian Journal of Youth and Adolescent Health*, 5(1), 43–46.
- Heizomi, H., Jafarabadi, M. A., Kouzekanani, K., Matlabi, H., Bayrami, M., & Chattu, V. K., et al. (2021). Factors affecting aggressiveness among young teenage girls: A structural equation modeling approach. *European Journal of Investigation in Health, Psychology and Education*, 11(4), 1350–1356.  
<https://doi.org/10.3390/ejihpe11040098>
- Henneberger, A. K., Varga, S. M., Moudy, A., & Tolan, P. H. (2016). Family functioning and high-risk adolescents' aggressive behavior: Examining effects by ethnicity. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 45(1), 145–155.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-015-0366-4>
- Kann, L., McManus, T., Harris, W. A., Shanklin, S. L., Flint, K. H., Hawkins, J., et al. (2016). Youth risk behavior surveillance—United States, 2015. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report: Surveillance Summaries*, 65(6), 1–174.  
<https://doi.org/10.1097/NNR.0000000000000310>
- Lagerspetz, K. M., Björkqvist, K., & Peltonen, T. (1988). Is indirect aggression typical of females? Gender differences in aggressiveness in 11- to 12-year-old children. *Aggressive Behavior*, 14(6), 403–414. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-2337\(1988\)14:6<403::AID-AB2480140602>3.0.CO;2-D](https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-2337(1988)14:6<403::AID-AB2480140602>3.0.CO;2-D)
- Omer, M., Shaikh, M. A., Stiller, M., & Lowery Wilson, M. (2020). Physical fighting among school-attending adolescents in El Salvador: An examination of the 2013 Global School-Based Health Survey. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(4), 1248. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17041248>
- Pandey, A. R., Neupane, T., Chalise, B., Shrestha, N., Chaudhary, S., Dhungana, R. R., et al. (2021). Factors associated with physical and sexual violence among school-going adolescents in Nepal: Findings from Global School-based Student Health Survey. *PLoS ONE*, 16(3), 24–56. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0248566>
- Sehgal, M., & Nayak, A. (2021). Aggression in school children: Role of gender, family factors and exposure to violence. *Med Rxiv*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.25.21254374>

- Sette, S., Spinrad, T. L., & Baumgartner, E. (2013). Links among Italian preschoolers' socioemotional competence, teacher–child relationship quality, and peer acceptance. *Early Education & Development, 24*(6), 851–866. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10409289.2013.744684>
- Shaikh, F., Viveki, R., & Halappanavar, A. (2014). Physical and verbal aggressive behaviour pattern among school children in urban area of North Karnataka: A cross-sectional study. *Journal of Krishna Institute of Medical Sciences, 3*(2), 126–132.
- Sharma, B., Rai, M. K., Sharma, A., & Karki, S. (2019). Emotional and behavioral problems among adolescents in Pokhara City in Nepal. *Journal of Nepal Health Research Council, 16*(41), 419–424. [https://doi.org/10.4103/jfmprc.jfmprc\\_447\\_21](https://doi.org/10.4103/jfmprc.jfmprc_447_21)
- Sharma, R., Grover, V. L., & Chaturvedi, S. (2008). Risk behaviors related to inter-personal violence among school and college-going adolescents in South Delhi. *Indian Journal of Community Medicine, 33*(2), 85–88. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0970-0218.40874>
- Sidhu, T. K., Kaur, P., Sangha, N. K., & Bansal, A. S. (2019). Aggression among adolescents: A cross-sectional study. *Adesh University Journal of Medical Sciences & Research, 1*(1), 21–26. [https://doi.org/10.25259/AUJMSR\\_3\\_2019](https://doi.org/10.25259/AUJMSR_3_2019)
- UNESCO. (2018). *School violence and bullying: Global status and trends, drivers and consequences*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
- Verma, R., Kumar, G., Yadav, R. K., Chayal, V., Kalhan, M., & Bhalla, K. (2021). Association of psychosocial factors with aggression among school-going rural adolescents in Haryana. *Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care, 10*(10), 3720–3724.
- World Health Organization. (2019). *Adolescent health*. Retrieved from: [https://www.who.int/health-topics/adolescent-health#tab=tab\\_1](https://www.who.int/health-topics/adolescent-health#tab=tab_1)
- Ye, P., Huang, Z., Zhou, H., & Tang, Q. (2021). Music-based intervention to reduce aggressive behavior in children and adolescents: A meta-analysis. *Medicine, 100*(4), e23894. <https://doi.org/10.1097/MD.00000000000023894>

**To Cite this Article [APA Style, 7<sup>th</sup> Edition]:**

Thapa, S. (2025). Factors influencing aggressiveness among adolescent school children. *Journal of Durgalexmi, 4*(1), 328-350. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jdl.v4i1.88046>