Aggressive Students' Academic Performance: Teachers' Insight

Najam ul Kashif ^a, Furrukh Bashir ^b, Rashid Ahmad ^c, Ismat Nasim ^d

- ^a Assistant Professor, Department of Education, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Pakistan Email: drnajam.ulkashif@iub.edu.pk
- ^b Assistant Professor, School of Economics, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Pakistan Email: furrukh@bzu.edu.pk
- ^c Assistant Professor, School of Economics, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Pakistan Email: rashidahmad@bzu.edu.pk
- ^d Lecturer, Department of Economics, The Government Sadiq College Women University, Bahawalpur, Pakistan

Email: ismat.nasim@gscwu.edu.pk

ARTICLE DETAILS	ABSTRACT
History: Accepted 15 May 2022 Available Online June 2022	Presented study was aimed to highlight the different causes of aggressive behavior of students and its effects on their academic performance, according to the observations of secondary school students. To accomplish this goal, the conducted research was
Keywords: Aggressive Behaviors, Academic Performance, Teachers	descriptive in nature. Data were collected from elementary school students' teachers through a questionnaire. The population of the study was considered as all public elementary school male and female teachers in four Tehsils of District Multan region. Total eighty schools and from each school 3 teachers were randomly selected as a result total 240
JEL Classification: P36,	teachers were selected. A questionnaire consisting of 49 items was designed for teachers. Furthermore, data were analyzed by adopting as per need descriptive and inferential statistics. It is concluded that aggressive behaviors in students do not significantly reduce a students'
DOI: 10.47067/reads.v8i2.447	academic performance, however, there is a sign that academic scores are declining as aggression increases. Aggressive behaviors in students do not directly lead to low academic performance. Although there is an insignificant link between aggressive behavior and academic performance, aggressive students face difficulties in their education. It is recommended that teachers need additional training on how to deal with children with aggressive behavior. In this regard, parents-teachers meeting on regular basis and on required desires of teachers is necessary.
	© 2022 The authors. Published by SPCRD Global Publishing. This is an open access article under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0

Corresponding author's email address: rashidahmad@bzu.edu.pk

1. Introduction

Aggressive behavior seeks to physically harm others, such as fighting or spreading harmful rumors (Gasa, 2007). Different signs of warnings can be noticed for presenting a strong depiction for future possible aggressive behavior (Moeller, 2001). Inter and intra personal extraction; weak concentration on academia; unfortunate academic performance results; expression of violence in writings and drawings; abandoned annoyance; examples of impulsive and chronic beating, intimidation and harassment; intolerance of differences and prejudices; drug and alcohol abuse; join gangs; serious physical struggle with peers or family members; serious destruction of property; detailed threats of deadly violence; unauthorized possession and / or use of firearms and other weapons and self-injury or suicide threat are few examples of aggressive behaviors. Mwendia (2018) focuses on other aggressive symptoms among growing youth, such as object biting, grabbing and kicking others, responding to grownups, execration, abusive remarks, and naming.

Aggression among students occurs globally. No one can be as debilitating as aggressive behavior because it affects violence and victims. In his definitions of social psychology, he says that aggression is a psychological violence; a persistent aggression that undermines a person's control and dignity (Tambawal & Rukayya, 2017). On the other hand, physical aggression is at an extremely high point in the continuation of aggression, such as violence, murder, and assault. Although all acts of violence are defined as acts of aggression, not all acts of violence are acts of violence. Many aggressive actions are relatively common and result in only minimal physical damage, such as verbal attacks (e.g., insults) or minor physical attacks (e.g., hits). A child who gives another child an obscene name or pushes another child off a tricycle is aggressive but does not show violence. A school fire is both aggressive and violent. Some definitions of violence require not only that the victim be seriously injured, but also that the act be illegal. Such a narrow definition is unsatisfactory because it excludes excessive physical harm (usually in the form of organizational and structural violence) applied primarily under the laws of a nation. However, this study focuses on different types of aggression against others rather than violence (Byrnes, 2000).

The cognitive neo-associative form claimed that frustration was a bit angrier than aggression. Certain cues will be needed for anger to lead to aggression. This can be an aggressive behavior, a nervous object, or a human-related environmental stimulus (Harmon, 2007). By imparting social learning theories, people receive aggressive responses in the way that they acquire direct knowledge or other multifaceted forms of social behavior through observation of others. Aggressive behaviors' acquisition by observing others while giving a resourceful pattern sympathetically explaining different attitudes in the perspectives of leading social behavior in the context of social learning theories (Rosenstock, Strecher, & Becker, 1988). Academia's different stake holders are looking for such issues of aggressive behaviors to create more lasting places of silence sympathy and reflection on the causes of hostility and aggression are, as a result, important topics on the agenda of social science research (Barratt, Stanford, Kent, & Alan, 1997).

Aggressive behavior is an individual or collective social interaction in which the enemy behaves with the intention of harming or harming. Aggressive behavior includes physical violence such as beating, biting, hitting, and kicking. Aggressive behavior causes physical and moral harm to children. Aggressive behavior made students anxious. There are many factors; these factors are features and social networks. A student's overall school experience is shaped by many factors. They learned a lot about the social and cultural context in which they lived. All these factors operate interdependently in the context of the school community (Buck et al., 2019). All influences help students (and others) perceive quality of life in school (social/emotional and academic) (Zins, Elias, & Greenberg, 2007).

2. Study's Aim

Aggressive behavior is rampant in Pakistani schools also and especially at Elementary School level. Aggressive behaviors by Shekarey, Ladani, Rostami and Jamshidi (2013) are common in Elementary schools. Similarly, Aluede (2011) reported that school violence was a growing concern in the last few years because of the increase in news articles about school violence. Aggression among elementary school students is a matter of concern among stakeholders in education, as the school is an institution designed for teaching and learning. Undoubtedly, teaching and learning can only be successful in an environment that is free from fear, aggression, insecurity, and fear. Aggressive behavior of students is a factor and a major obstacle to the proper learning of students at the elementary school level. The researcher here in this study intends to investigate the aggressive students' academic performance at elementary school level. The study also looked at how aggression affects children's attendance, homework, academic performance, and dropout rates. In addition, the study sought to identify problems faced by teachers working with aggressive students. The study was delimited to public elementary schools of Multan region.

2. Research Design

This study was conducted to investigate the aggressive students' academic performance at the elementary school level in the Multan Region. The research was descriptive by nature and quantitative approach was applied to address the research problem. Study covers all the four tehsils (Multan City, Multan Saddar, Shujabad and Jalal PurPirwala) of Multan District. There are 187 total elementary schools in the region and 2836 teachers who are working in these schools as Elementary School Teachers and primary School Teachers. According to sample size calculator 126 schools were selected. From each school 2 teachers were selected randomly. So, total sample size becomes 252 teachers. Research tool was distributed among 252 teachers and 240 teachers' data was received which was analyzed as per the need of the study.

A self-developed questionnaire was used as a research tool or as a means of data collection. The questionnaire consisted of two sections; first as demographical variables and second as main part of the questionnaire which was comprised of 49statements. All statements are based on 5 Point Likert Scale. The division of 49 statements are categorized in 6 sections as 09 items focused on students 'personal behavior, 05 items on aggressive behavior, 13 items focused on the causes of aggressive behavior, again 05 items focused on verbal aggression, 07 items focused on physical aggression, and 10 items focused on students' academic activities. Collected data was analyzed through SPSS. Different descriptive and inferential statistics were applied to find out the impact of demographic variables on students' aggressive behavior on their academic performance. For comparing responses on demographic variables such as gender, locality, academic qualification, professional qualification, and teaching experience t- test and ANOVA were used. Regression analysis was made to predict the impact of students' aggressive behavior on their academic performance.

3. Results & Discussion

Table 1: Aggressive behavior on their Academic Performance

Sr.	Variables	Maan	Std.	Mean	Sig. Value
No.	Variables	Mean	dev.	Difference	
1	Personal Behaviors	3.77	0.771	3.78590	.000
2	Aggressive Behaviour	4.38	0.381	3.61807	.000
3	Causes of Aggressive Behaviours	4.14	0.348	3.67221	.000
4	Verbal Aggression	3.99	0.742	3.73410	.000
5	Physical Aggression	4.26	0.472	3.70792	.000
6	Students' Academic Performance	4.24	0.258	3.68606	.000

In Table 1states that descriptive statistics table of the determinants of students' aggressive behavior on their academic performance with respect to teachers states that the number of teachers included in the sample are 227 whereas as the mean of (M = 4.38, SD = 0.381) shows that teachers are agreed that aggressive behavior of students. The second level of (M = 4.26, SD = 0.472) shows that give positive opinions about physical aggression among students. The third level of (M = 4.24, SD = 0.258) teachers agreed that students' academic performance. The fourth level of (M = 4.14, SD = 0.348) teachers give positive opinions about causes of aggressive behavior of students. The fifth level of (M = 3.99, SD = 0.742) teachers are favorable opinions about verbal aggression and the sixth level of (M = 3.77, SD = 0.771) teachers are satisfied with personal behavior of students. The value of standard deviation and mean difference is also calculated, and t-test results are significant at p < .05.

Table 2: Correlation of students' aggressive behavior on their academic performance

	AB	CAB	VB	PA	SAP
Personal Behaviors (PB)	.175**	.670**	.541**	.367**	.360**
Aggressive Behaviour (AB)		.197**	.269**	.518**	.047
Causes of Aggressive Behaviours (CAB)			·477**	.450**	.643**
Verbal Aggression (VB)				.708**	.408**
Physical Aggression (PA)					.352**
Students' Academic Performance (SAP)					

^{** 0.01} is considered statistically significant while finding the correlation.

A person product-moment correlation was conducted to examine the relationship with personal behaviors, aggressive behavior, causes of aggressive behaviors, verbal aggression, physical aggression, and students' academic performance. Aggressive behavior was stronger positive related to aggressive behavior, r(227) = 0.175, p < 0.000, causes of aggressive behavior, r(227) = 0.197, p < 0.000, verbal aggression, r(227) = 0.708, p < 0.000, physical aggression, r(227) = 0.352, p < 0.000, than to students' academic performance, r(227) = 0.360, p < 0.000. A complete list of correlations is presented in table 20f aggressive behavior of students' academic performance. These findings indicated that aggressive behavior explains much more of the variability in students' academic performance. The impact size for aggressive behavior indicated that the level of aggressive behavior that the counselor experience accounted for a large portion (19%) of the variability in students' academic performance.

Table 3: Determinants Students Aggressive Behavior Regression Analysis (Teachers)

Model	r	r ²	r² adjusted	Estimate of SE	f	Sig.
1	.215 ^a	.046	.043	.44640	14.489	.000 ^b

a. DV: Students Academic Performance

In Table 3 states the results have found that R is moderately positive with 0.215 while coefficient of determination i.e., R^2 is 0.046. Coefficient of determination is the increase of DV due to IV, as this is the value of whole model therefore it shows the impact of model. Adjusted R^2 is the value of R^2 after removing standard error of estimate, in this model adjusted R^2 is 0.043 while standard error of estimate is 0.446. The results of F statistics results are significant at p < 0.05. Hence the results are significant and reliable.

Table 4: Beta Coefficients students' aggressive behavior on their academic performance

Mo	Model Unstand		l Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		В	SE	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.998	.149		20.170	.000
	PB	.304	.121	.345	2.511	.012
	AB	.326	·337	.366	.967	.002
	CAB	.103	.071	.103	049	.001
	VB	.466	.324	.531	-1.440	.015
	PA	.133	.108	.132	.306	.005

a. DV: SAP

In Table 4 states the beta coefficients of all determinants of students' aggressive behavior on their academic performance in teachers are calculated and the results have found that all the results are significant as p value <0.05. The relationship between VB and SAP is strongest and the beta value is 0.531, the results are significant at p <0.05. The variable's idealized influence has moderately strong positive beta values whereas CAB and PA have weak positive beta values i.e.,0.103 and 0.132 respectively.

Table 5: Gender of teachers about students' aggressive behavior on their academic performance

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	MD	р
CDD	M	165	34.52	5.602	46.566	2.021	.000
SPB	F	62	32.50	9.540			
A D	M	165	21.79	1.536	1.407	448	.237
AB	F	62	22.24	2.641			
CAD	M	165	53.65	4.314	3.196	900	.075
CAB	F	62	54.55	5.059			
T 7 A	M	165	19.70	3.442	4.354	-1.055	.038
VA	F	62	20.76	4.284			
DΛ	M	165	29.72	3.018	.735	543	.392
PA	F	62	30.26	3.979			
CAD	M	165	42.38	2.480	3.672	318	.057
SAP	F	62	42.69	2.855			
Overall	M	165	201.76	15.614	9.970	-1.242	.002
	F	62	203.00	21.178			

Above In Table 51 shows that the t value (9.970) was significant at p <0.05 for the overall students' aggressive behavior on their academic performance subscale, hence the female teachers' (M = 203.00, SD = 21.178) were better in students' aggressive behavior on their academic performance rights as compared to male teachers' (M = 201.76, SD = 15.614). The analysis regarding the student's aggressive behavior on their academic performance factors reveal that t value of 'students' personal

behavior' (46.566), aggression behavior (1.407), causes of aggressive behavior (3.196), verbal aggression (4.354), physical aggression (.735) and 'students' academic performance' (3.672) were significant at p <0.05. Therefore, it is concluded that female teachers were more sensitive in student's personal behavior, aggressive behavior, causes of aggressive behavior, verbal aggression, physical aggression and students' academic performance and overall students' aggressive behavior on their academic performance as compared to male teachers'.

Table 6: Locality wise distribution of teachers about students' aggressive behavior on their academic performance

	Locality	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	MD	p
ann	Rural	98	37.35	5.631	6.773	5.944	.010
SPB	Urban	129	31.40	6.754			
A.D.	Rural	98	21.85	2.501	12.706	122	.000
AB	Urban	129	21.97	1.293			
CAD	Rural	98	56.29	4.064	.006	4.208	.937
CAB	Urban	129	52.08	4.013			
T 7 A	Rural	98	21.14	3.555	.042	2.027	.838
VA	Urban	129	19.12	3.598			
D A	Rural	98	30.43	3.758	5.602	.994	.019
PA	Urban	129	29.43	2.861			
CAD	Rural	98	43.21	2.629	3.145	1.323	.078
SAP	Urban	129	41.89	2.408			
Overall	Rural	98	210.27	16.928	C 00-		
	Urban	129	195.89	14.819	6.805	14.374	.000

In Table 6 shows that the t value (6.805) was significant at p <0.05 for the overall students' aggressive behavior on their academic performance subscale, hence the rural area schoolteachers (M = 210.27, SD = 16.928) were better in students' aggressive behavior on their academic performance as compared to urban area schoolteachers (M = 195.89, SD = 14.819). The analysis regarding the students' aggressive behavior on their academic performance factors reveal that t value of 'students' personal behavior' (6.773), aggression behavior (12.706) and physical aggression (5.602) were significant at p <0.05. The students' aggressive behavior on their academic performance factors reveals that t value of causes of aggressive behavior (.006), verbal aggression (.042) and students' academic performance (3.145) were insignificant at p > 0.05. Therefore, it is concluded that rural area schoolteachers were more sensitive in student's personal behavior, aggressive behavior, causes of aggressive behavior, verbal aggression, physical aggression and students' academic performance and overall students' aggressive behavior on their academic performance as compared to urban area schoolteachers.

Table 7: Impact of academic qualification of teachers about students' aggressive behavior on their

academic performance

1	CHOTHIANCE	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.
	BS (Hons.)	69	36.48	6.072	7.087	.001
SPB	MA/MSc	103	33.16	7.336		
	M.Phil.	55	32.35	6.438		
	BS (Hons.)	69	21.93	1.458	.766	.466
AB	MA/MSc	103	22.05	2.366		
	M.Phil.	55	21.65	1.364		
	BS (Hons.)	69	54.30	3.727	1.688	.187
CAB	MA/MSc	103	54.14	5.275		
	M.Phil.	55	52.93	3.843		
	BS (Hons.)	69	20.35	3.147	3.038	.050
VA	MA/MSc	103	20.32	4.018		
	M.Phil.	55	18.93	3.625		
	BS (Hons.)	69	29.88	2.392	.216	.806
PA	MA/MSc	103	29.98	4.259		
	M.Phil.	55	29.62	2.059		
	BS (Hons.)	69	42.61	2.433	.166	.847
SAP	MA/MSc	103	42.38	2.981		
	M.Phil.	55	42.44	1.922		
Overall	BS (Hons.)	69	205.55	13.618	3.052	.049
	MA/MSc	103	202.02	19.857		
	M.Phil.	55	197.91	15.392		

In Table 7 shows ANOVA results about opinion of teachers based on academic qualification regarding students' aggressive behavior on their academic performance. According to results (F = 3.052, P = 0.049) a significant mean difference has found between groups. Mean comparison indicates that BS (Hons) academic education of teachers (Mean = 205.55, SD 13.618) had better opinion than MA/MSc academic qualification of teachers (Mean = 202.02, SD 19.857) and M.Phil. academic qualification of teachers (Mean = 197.91, SD 15.392).

Table 8: Impact of professional qualification of teachers about students' aggressive behavior on their

academic performance

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.
	B.Ed	131	34.07	7.346	.077	.926
SPB	MEd	75	33.72	6.536		
	MA	21	34.24	5.915		
	B.Ed	131	22.01	1.517	.449	.639
AB	M.Ed	75	21.75	2.483		
	MA	21	21.95	1.774		
	B.Ed	131	54.05	4.821	.175	.840
CAB	MEd	75	53.71	3.952		
	MA	21	53.62	4.822		
	B.Ed	131	20.17	3.627	.373	.689
VA	MEd	75	19.71	3.910		
	MA	21	19.90	3.604		
	B.Ed	131	29.91	3.168	.056	.946
PA	MEd	75	29.76	3.719		
	MA	21	29.95	2.674		
	B.Ed	131	42.47	2.609	.420	.657
SAP	M.Ed	75	42.59	2.526		
	MA	21	42.00	2.720		
Overall	B.Ed	131	202.66	17.208	.171	.843
	MEd	75	201.23	17.373		
	M.A	21	201.67	18.001		

Above In Table 7 shows ANOVA results about opinion of teachers based on professional qualification regarding students' aggressive behavior on their academic performance. According to results (F = .171, P = 0.843) a insignificant mean difference has found between groups.

Table 8: Impact of teaching experience of teachers about students' aggressive behavior on their academic performance

	Years	N	X	SD	f	Sig
	> 5	4	38.75	3.202	8.484	.000
SPB	6 to 10	22	40.23	2.927		
	11 to 15	161	33.41	6.939		
	< 15	40	32.30	6.896		
	> 5	4	21.75	.957	1.345	.261
A.D.	6 to 10	22	22.41	1.501		
AB	11 to 15	161	21.97	2.014		
	< 15	40	21.45	1.663		
	> 5	4	57.25	2.872	5.576	.001
CAD	6 to 10	22	56.82	3.924		
CAB	11 to 15	161	53.78	4.407		
	< 15	40	52.40	4.722		
	> 5	4	22.75	2.062	8.474	.000
T 7 A	6 to 10	22	23.27	2.394		
VA	11 to 15	161	19.72	3.795		
	< 15	40	19.00	3.021		
	> 5	4	30.75	2.062	3.835	.010
D.A	6 to 10	22	31.95	2.420		
PA	11 to 15	161	29.73	3.565		
	< 15	40	29.18	2.159		
	> 5	4	43.25	1.893	4.511	.004
CAD	6 to 10	22	43.82	2.938		
SAP	11 to 15	161	42.52	2.478		
	< 15	40	41.43	2.531		
Overall	> 5	4	214.50	12.152	10.435	.000
	6 to 10	22	218.50	11.681		
	11 to 15	161	201.12	17.103		
	< 15	40	195.75	15.192		

Above In Table 8 shows ANOVA results about opinion of teachers based on teaching experience regarding students' aggressive behavior on their academic performance. According to results (F = 10.435, P = 0.000) a significant mean difference has found between groups. Mean comparison indicates that 6-10 years' experience of teachers (Mean = 218.50, SD 11.681) had better opinion than 0-5 years teaching experiences of teachers (Mean = 214.50, SD 12.152), there was 11-15 years teaching experience of teachers (Mean = 201.12, SD = 17.103) and more than 15 teaching experiences of teachers (Mean = 195.75, SD 15.192).

In most cases, domestic violence is associated with aggressive behavior in children in the present study. A similar study conducted by Gasa in 2005 which shows the similar results that family environment becomes the main source of children's aggressive behavior. An unforgiving family environment is the cause of unexpected behaviors of children. Different other studies indicated the results that abusive children also come from decrepit families, with a majority of them belong to those hard circumstances families (Wakanyua, 1995; Ndirangu, 2001; Gitau, 2002;). This is in line with Ndoga

(1987), which refers to children from more families, families with less parental education, people with lower socioeconomic status, families where parents or caretakers hardly visit siblings. Low levels of religious affiliation indicate higher levels of crime.

The results showed that R was moderately positive with 0.215, and the determination factor, R², was 0.046. The detection factor is the increase in DV due to IV, because this is the value of the whole model, so it shows the effect of the model. The corrected R² is the value of R2 after the standard estimation error is eliminated, the corrected R2 in this model is 0.043, and the standard estimate error is 0.446. The results of the F statistic are at p < 0.05. Thus, the results are significant and reliable. This finding suggests that aggressive behaviors in children do not significantly reduce a child's academic performance. However, there is a sign that academic scores are declining as aggression increases. Hudley (2013) and McEvoy and Welker (2012) also figured out that pointed out extremely aggressive students are hardly successful in their academic activities as well as troublemaking and not good motivated in the classroom. Trainers' schoolwork is badly exaggerated due to violence. Violence experiences reveals that students preoccupied due to bad feelings and illnesses. Some of them do not have trust on their mentors and even they feel that their teachers don't have ability to help. Another study conducted in 2012 by Nijuguna which indicated that violence behavior developed among students due to uncoordinated behaviors of the society and family. The said nonconformity may be due to teachers' non coordinated pedagogies, inappropriate assessment, and evaluation. Still, such students' academic performance lies above C Grade or 65%. Above-average academic performance of aggressive children indicates that their behavior does not result in retardation. In fact, talent can manifest itself with extreme level of energy which is adopted by the students at both ends i.e., violence behavior and good academic performance. In addition, only in USA about 20 to 25% students have different social or emotional problems. The reason for this may be curriculum and school activities boredom (Steven & Media, 2014). Very talented students perform the minute there is no competition. Therefore, they become more violence as they get upset and saddened. This behavior becomes more violent among those students who yet not learnt how to lead their talent and energies. Thus, they become sensitive in weak inter and intrapersonal challenges. Violent students set unattainable objectives for own selves, which leads them for mistakenly perceive themselves as failures.

5. Conclusion and Suggestions

After presenting the findings and doing discussion, it can be concluded that aggressive behavior among students is not caused by one factor, but by different factors that affect the behavior of students. Aggressive behaviors of students directly lead to their academic performance. Average academic performance indicated that these students have good potential to perform better in their academic performance. There is no significant difference between academic performance with violent behaviors. Class attendance and class activities participation is also not good. It prevents such students from reaching at the potential climax. Mentors who work with abusive students are not fully trained to deal with them. In addition, there is no curricula or training modules for the training teachers to deal with violent students. A few purposed strategies may be; providing students with basic needs such as guidance and counseling, love and care, food, shelter, and clothing; teacher-parent cooperation and collaboration.

Following suggestion can be helpful for the different stakeholders of the study. Teachers need additional training on how to deal with children with aggressive behavior. Teachers need to be more sensitive for the aggressive students. School discipline officers or psychologists should counsel sessions with such students as well as have sessions with their parents. Educational administrators organize proper platforms where parents can be sensitive to violent students. Parents must be fully involved in

the school education process so that children can be guided in the right places. It includes the identities of violent students and designed and desired programs for such students. An offered programs may be guidance and counseling for youth.

References

- Aluede, O. (2011). Managing bullying problems in Nigerian secondary schools: Some counselling interventions for implementation. Paper presented at the The African Symposium.
- Byrnes, J. D. (2000). The aggression continuum: A paradigm shift. Occupational Health & Safety, 69(2), 70-70.
- Gasa, V. G. (2007). Learners' aggressive behaviour in secondary school: a psycho-social perspective.
- Gasa, V.G. (2005). Learners' aggressive behaviour in secondary school: A psycho-social perspective. Doctor of Education Thesis, University of South Africa, South Africa.
- Gitau, J. K. (2002). A baseline survey report on situation of children in conflict with the law in Nairobi, Nakuru and Kisumu in Support of the Diversion Programme. Save the children UK.
- Harmon, J. E. (2007). Trait anger predicts relative left frontal cortical activation to anger-inducing stimuli. International Journal of Psychophysiology, 66(2), 154-160.
- Hudley, C. (2013). Aggression in children, www.education/reference/article/aggression, 22nd April 2013
- Kibera, C. W. (1998). An investigation of the disciplinary styles and problems of Nairobi parents with children in standard eight. Med, Kenyatta University, Kenya
- McEvoy, A., & Welker, R. (2012). Antisocial behaviours academic failure and school performance. A Journal of Emotional and Behavioural Disorders, http://ebx.sagepub.com/content, 8th February 2013
- Moeller, T.G. (2001). Youth Aggression and violence: A Psychological Approach. Mahwah, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
- Mwendia, M. (2018). Influence of preschool pupils'aggressive behaviour on learning outcomes in kajiado county, kenya.
- Ndirangu, L.N. (2001). Rehabilitation of Disadvantaged Children in Nairobi. A comparative Study of selected Rehabilitation Homes in Nairobi. MA Thesis, University of Nairobi, Kenya
- Njuguna, N. W. (2012). The provision of psycho-social support to children traumatized by the 2007-2008 post-election violence in Kibera, Kenya. Thesis (MA) University of Nairobi, Kenya
- Rosenstock, I. M., Strecher, V. J., & Becker, M. H. (1988). Social learning theory and the health belief model. Health Education & Behavior, 15(2), 175-183.
- Shekarey, A., Ladani, H. J., Rostami, M. S., & Jamshidi, M. (2013). On the Relationship between the social intelligence and aggression: A case study of High School boy students. International Journal of Education, 5(1), 94.
- Steven, M. &Media, D. (2014). Early Childhood Giftedness and Aggressive Behaviour.fromwww.everydaylife.globalpost.com/earlychildhood –giftedaggressive behaviours-2170.html. retrieved on 5th December 2014.
- Tambawal, M. U., & Rukayya, M. (2017). Bullying and its impact on academic performance of secondary school students in Nigeria: Implications for counselling.
- Wakanyua, S.N. (1995). Rehabilitation of Juvenile Delinquents: A survey of Approved Schools in Kenya. M.A. Thesis in Sociology, University of Nairobi, Kenya
- Zins, J. E., Elias, M. J., & Greenberg, M. T. (2007). School practices to build social-emotional competence as the foundation of academic and life success. Educating people to be emotionally intelligent, 79-94