



Discourteous Behaviour among Students in High School of Duhok City

Alaa Noori Sarkees^{1*}, Faris Jalaludeen Ibrahim²

¹Assiss Prof. Community Health Nursing, Department of Nursing, College of Health and Medical Technology, Duhok Polytechnic University, Duhok, Iraq.

²Student of master degree. Public health, College of Health and Medical Technology, Duhok Polytechnic University

***Corresponding author:** Alaa Noori Sarkees, Assiss. Prof. Community Health Nursing, Department of Nursing, College of Health and Medical Technology, Duhok Polytechnic University, Duhok, Iraq, Email: alaa.noori@dpu.edu.krd

Submitted: 24 February 2023; Accepted: 10 March 2023; Published: 07 April 2023

ABSTRACT

Background and objectives: According to this definition, disrespect can have a variety of conceptually conceivable meanings when used in diverse circumstances and situations; so, the Latin term rudus, which means "broken stone," and the ancient French word rude and discourteous, both come from the same sources. The current study aims to identify discourteous behavior among high school students in Duhok City in order to ascertain its prevalence.

Subject and methods: Cross-sectional research was carried out at 31 of 57 preparatory schools of both public and private sectors. A multistage of the random selection method was used to select 504 High school students who attended classes 10, 11, and 12, aged 15 to 22 years in both vocational and non-vocational studies. The assessment of students' discourteous behavior was through using a three-response scale form questionnaire as never, sometimes, and always and they scored one to three respectively. The data were analyzed after being interred to SPSS IBM version 23 using frequency, percentage, fisher exact test, and chi-square analysis, and the significance was determined at P. Value ≤ 0.05 .

Results: The present study indicates that about one-third of high school students show discourteous behavior ranging between mild (32.3%) and absolute (1.4%) disrespectful, and nearly one-half present physically discourteous ranging between mercurial (39.5%) and hostile (7.3%) discourteous, also, verbal discourteous stand for about 15% distributed as abusive and very abusive (14.1%), (0.6%) respectively.

Conclusions: The study concluded that the prevalence of the students' behavioral discourteous which presented from mild to highly disrespectful behavior had the first level among the aspects of discourteous behaviors, followed by verbal discourteous ranging between abusive to very abusive as the second level, and physical discourteous stand for the third one.

Keywords: *Discourteous Behaviour, High School Students, Duhok City*

INTRODUCTION

The word discourteous as an adjective is defined as an individual showing a lack of politeness towards others, showing bad manners, impolite, and rudeness [1],[2]. Similarly, discourteous is defined by the Cambridge dictionary, as “rude and not considering other people's feelings”, also, rude is characterized by coarsely, offensively exhibiting, and a lack of respect [3]. Although any explanation should be sufficient to provide the causes, process, and consequences resulting in the discourteous behaviors, it is originally derived from two words (dis) as opposite and (courteous), and both mean “lacking courtesy” [1]. Discourteous behaviors are defined by many sociologists and psychologists from different perspectives; for example, Clark dealt with the concept of discourteous as incivility, which can see as any speech or action violating the norms of mutual respect in educator–student interaction which is behaved by the student toward the academic members are hurting the process of education and studying, he called it incivility within the education system in the context of an educational sphere between the students and the faculty and staff [4]. On the other hand, incivility behavior involves disrespect for others, a refusal to consider other people's perspectives or look for areas of agreement, and a failure to recognize the value of social dialogue [5]. Like disruptive behaviors encompass using obscene language, intimidating others, making sexual remarks, using racial insults, and making ethnic jokes, other disruptive actions include humiliating or criticizing team members in front of other people, threatening them with retaliation, litigation, violence, or losing their jobs, throwing objects, such as charts or other items, and tossing instruments [6]. Moreover, bullying is another term used in the same context as discourteous, which can be intentional disrespect and rudeness; likewise, the American Nurse Association defines repetitive, annoying, and destructive activities intended to bother, insult, and distress the recipient, including many forms of injury, undermining and demeaning others, verbal attacks, threats, insults, intimidation, and withdrawal of assistance [7]. Additionally,

bullying is a widespread behavior that affects kids generally and students specifically, and it is more prevalent in schools that are perceived as unpleasant, unfair, and unwelcoming behaviors [8]. Geleta defines school climate as the learning environment produced by the combination of interpersonal connections, physical surroundings, and psychological atmosphere. So, the ecology, social structure, milieu, and culture make up the school's overall environment [9]. Also, the collective personality of a school or school system is referred to as its "school atmosphere. In addition, Academic success and improved student learning both correlate with a pleasant, positive school environment, thus, higher rates of high school graduation, lower levels of absenteeism, and fewer instances of high school suspension. According to the National Academies of Science, Engineering, and Medicine (NASEM), inevitable consequences can be observed and noticed as a reason for bullying among children who are rude and have bullying behaviours are more likely to be depressed, engage in high-risk activities such as theft and vandalism, and have adverse outcomes later in their life for both Bully and Bullying individual [10]. From all of the above, one can understand that Student discourteous behavior has defined as bullying, incivility, or inappropriate activities either one time or more done directly by them or indirectly by stimulating others, whether oral speech etiquette changes from polite, excellent manners to violent tone or physical actions from respectful to aggressive or socially to impolite subsequently harm others at the school or anywhere.

Importance of the study

An article has been done by Martens and Andreen mentioned that Behavior problems have an effect on the entire learning community in addition to the immediate effects they have on the particular child who is demonstrating them [11]. As an illustration, "student misconduct negatively impacts education, the learning environment, and the general school atmosphere for all learners inside the school.

Objectives of the study

This study objects to determine the prevalence of discourteous behaviors and their association among high school students of Duhok city.

Subject and methods

Cross-sectional research was carried out at 31 of 57 preparatory schools of both public and private sectors which are distributed in the eastern and western directorates of education to study the students' discourteous behavior and its magnitude in three forms of behavioral, physical, and verbal, among students in high school in Duhok city.

A multistage of the random selection method was used to select 504 High school students out of 24611 students registered for the academic school year 2021-2022, who attended classes 10, 11, and 12, aged 15 to 22 years in both vocational and non-vocational study and were distributed in both public and private sectors. The researcher selected the High Schools based on their geographical distribution in two educational directorates in Duhok city (12 of 23 schools from the Eastern Directorate of Education and 19 of 37 schools from the Western Directorate of Education), where 50% of the Public and Privet High schools were taken from each directorate by using the lottery process to be the cluster sample for each geographical area. Consequently, the schools were divided into three study stages, 10, 11, and 12, to form the sample strata; then, drew 4% of the students from each stratum used the lottery process so that the number of the study sample reached 568 participants after that 64 ones were excluded because of incomplete the study questionnaires filling. All students around of age 15 to 22 years included who attended class 10, 11, and 12 of all preparatory schools within the Duhok city borderline, in the vocational, scientific, or literary schools. While, the students above the age of 22 years or those who had incomplete responses to questionnaire sheets; even one question, or the questions had unclear answers had excluded from the present study. In the current study, the assessment of students' discourteous behavior was through using a three-response scale form questionnaire as never, sometimes, and always and they scored

one to three respectively. This questionnaire encompassed four parts of study-related information. The first part included the social status of the participant and number of their friends. The second part of the questionnaire assesses a student's behavior in the class and school setting which contains 22 questions to assess students' opinions on their actions and behavior at school, including misbehavior towards friends, teachers, or unknown persons, and how they will respond if the teacher or friend shouts at them, or the students destroy teaching aids if they fail, get rude when being punished by the teacher...etc. The third part measured the physical discourteous of the students, by assessing the violent responses of the student during the daily school interaction with their teachers, school workers, and colleagues in the school setting. Thus, this part involves questions about aggressive behavior which contains 15 questions, including provoking, responding to aggression, taking revenge, quarreling with students, threatening....etc. The Fourth Part deal with Verbal discourteous (verbal violence) which contains seven questions for students: obscene words, violent tone during talking, spreading rumors, and using bad words or derogating a person's ethnicity or religion. The students' scores were calculated and divided into three levels using cutoff points for behavioral discourteous from 22-36 is respectful, 37-51 is mild disrespectful and 52-66 scores is a disrespectful student. Likewise, for the physically discourteous aspect as pacifist (15-24), mercurial (25-34), and hostile (35-45). In the same way, determining the verbal discourteous was from (7-11) which stands for polite, (12-16) for abusive, and (17-21) very offensive verbal behavior. The questionnaire reliability was determined by using the Alpha-Cronbach coefficient test to find out the internal consistency of the questionnaire which resulted in $r = 0.87$. The data of the current study were analyzed after being interred to SPSS IBM version 23 to achieve the study objectives by applying the descriptive statistics method using (frequency, percentage) and inferential method by using Fisher Exact Test and Chi-square statistical analysis, and the significance was determined at $P. Value \leq 0.05$.

Administrative arrangements and ethical considerations

Firstly, The approvals were obtained from the Scientific Committee of the College of Health and Medical Technology-Shekhan, the ethics committee of the Duhok General Directorate of Health, permission from the administration of

both the west and east general directorate of Duhok education, and before data collection, informed written consent was obtained from each student's parent that was sent to them and got their agreement to participate in the present research.

RESULTS OF THE STUDY**TABLE 1:** distribution of the discourteous aspects of the high school students.

		Freq	%
Behavioral Discourteous	Respectful	334	66.3
	Mild disrespectful	163	32.3
	Disrespectful	7	1.4
Physical Discourteous	Pacifist	268	53.2
	Mercurial	199	39.5
	Hostile	37	7.3
Verbal Discourteous	Polite	430	85.3
	Abusive	71	14.1
	very abusive	3	0.6

Table 1 indicates that about one-third of high school students show discourteous behavior ranging between mild (32.3%) and absolute (1.4%) disrespectful, and nearly one-half present physical discourteous ranging between mercurial

(39.5%) and hostile (7.3%) discourteous, also, verbal discourteous stand for about 15% distributed as abusive and very abusive (14.1%), (0.6%) respectively.

TABLE 2: Association between the high school students' behavioral discourteous with their sociodemographic characteristics

		Behavioral Discourteous			P. Value
		Respectful	Mild Disrespectful	Disrespectful	
Age	15-16	135	51	3	0.083**
	17-18	147	69	4	
	19-20	42	33	0	
	21-22	10	10	0	
Sex	Male	157	104	6	< 0.001**
	Female	177	59	1	
Class	class 10	138	66	3	0.229**
	class 11	111	46	4	
	class 12	85	51	0	
Student work	yes	42	33	1	0.081*
	no	292	130	6	
Student lives with	Both parents	311	151	7	0.703**
	Mother	17	11	0	
	Father	6	1	0	

Number of friends	zero friends	19	10	0	0.133**
	1-3 friends	188	72	3	
	4-6 friends	87	51	4	
	7-9 friends	21	11	0	
	10 and more friends	19	19	0	
Friendship preferences	Male	167	97	2	0.057**
	female	167	66	5	
Daily pocket money	Zero	9	5	0	0.016**
	Less than 5 thousand	200	92	6	
		93	33	0	
	5- less than 10000 thousand	32	33	1	
		More than 10000 thousand			
Smoke	Never	271	95	3	< 0.001**
	Sometimes	34	24	0	
	Always	29	44	4	
Consume alcohol	Never	327	157	6	0.052**
	Sometimes	6	5	0	
	Always	1	1	1	
Student like study	Yes	225	64	0	< 0.001**
	Little	96	71	5	
	Never	13	28	2	
Failed in the study	Never	182	66	4	0.002**
	one year	96	45	2	
	Two and more	56	52	1	

* Chi-square, ** Fisher exact test

Table 2 reveals a highly significant association between students' behavioral discourteous with students' Sex, cigarette smoking, and students like the study and a significant association with daily pocket money, while no association with the other characteristics.

TABLE 3: Association between the high school students' physical discourteous with their socio-demographic characteristics.

		Physical Discourteous			P. Value
		Pacifist	Mercurial	Hostile	
Age	15-16	114	64	11	0.162*
	17-18	113	90	17	
	19-20	33	34	8	
	21-22	8	11	1	
Sex	Male	96	141	30	< 0.001*
	Female	172	58	7	
Class	class 10	110	78	19	0.683*
	class 11	88	63	10	
	class 12	70	58	8	
Student work	yes	22	46	8	< 0.001*
	no	246	153	29	

Student lives with	Both parents Mother Father	249 15 4	185 11 3	35 2 0	1.000**
Number of friends	zero friends 1-3 friends 4-6 friends 7-9 friends 10 and more friends	12 157 73 13 13	14 93 56 16 20	3 13 13 3 5	0.047*
Friendship preferences	Male female	115 153	127 72	24 13	< 0.001*
Daily pocket money	Zero Less than 5 thousand 5- less than 10000 thousand More than 10000 thousand	6 164 74 24	8 114 44 33	0 20 8 9	0.038*
Smoke	Never Sometimes Always	235 18 15	121 34 44	13 6 18	< 0.001*
Consume alcohol	Never Sometimes Always	265 3 0	191 7 1	34 1 2	0.008**
Student like study	Yes Little Never	179 77 12	97 82 20	13 13 11	< 0.001*
Failed in the study	Never one year Two and more	153 67 48	83 63 53	16 13 8	0.016*

* Chi-square, ** Fisher exact test

Table 3 presents a highly significant association between students' physical discourteous with their Sex, working, friendship preferences, cigarette smoking, consume alcohol, and liking the study, and a significant association with students' number of friends, daily pocket money, and Failed in the study while no association with the other characteristics.

TABLE 4: Association between the high school students' verbal discourteous with their sociodemographic characteristics.

		Verbal Discourteous			P. Value
		Polite	Abusive	very abusive	
Age	15-16	161	26	2	0.048**
	17-18	186	33	1	
	19-20	70	5	0	
	21-22	13	7	0	
Sex	Male	227	38	2	1.000**
	Female	203	33	1	
Class	class 10	179	26	2	0.767**
	class 11	134	26	1	
	class 12	117	19	0	

Student work	yes	61	14	1	0.218**
	no	369	57	2	
Student lives with	Both parents	400	66	3	1.000**
	Mother	24	4	0	
	Father	6	1	0	
Number of friends	zero friends	19	9	1	0.038**
	1-3 friends	234	28	1	
	4-6 friends	118	23	1	
	7-9 friends	26	6	0	
	10 and more friends	33	5	0	
Friendship preferences	Male	224	40	2	0.673**
	female	206	31	1	
Daily pocket money	Zero	11	3	0	0.728*
	Less than 5 thousand	253	43	2	
	5- less than 10000 thousand	109	17	0	
	More than 10000 thousand	57	8	1	
Smoke	Never	328	39	2	< 0.001**
	Sometimes	47	10	1	
	Always	55	22	0	
Consume alcohol	Never	420	67	3	0.123**
	Sometimes	9	2	0	
	Always	1	2	0	
Student like study	Yes	252	36	1	0.024**
	Little	148	22	2	
	Never	30	13	0	
Failed in the study	Never	214	36	2	1.000**
	one year	122	20	1	
	Two and more	94	15	0	

* Chi-square, ** Fisher exact test

Table 4 indicates a highly significant association between students' verbal discourteous with cigarette smoking and a significant association with students' age, number of friends, and students like the study, while there is no association with the other characteristics.

DISCUSSION

The results of the current study indicate that about one-third of high school students show discourteous behavior ranging between mild and absolutely disrespectful, and nearly one-half present physical discourteous ranging between mercurial and hostile discourteous, while verbal discourteous stand for about 15% distributed as abusive and very abusive. Researchers found that females were more likely to engage in social

bullying and property damage than males, and verbal discourteous was the most prevalent kind of aggressive behavior among both males and females (36%), while of the many forms of discourteous, physical bullying was the least prevalent for both males and females (18.6) [12]. There was a 60% frequency of bullying behavior overall; when looking at the different types of bullying, it was revealed that the most considerable prevalence was for verbal violence across the entire sample (51.7%), followed by physical violence among men and relational violence among females [13]. Furthermore, researchers found that among high school students, physical fighting was the most prevalent health risk activity [14]. More than one-fifth of victims experienced verbal bullying (21.3%), while another 17.5% experienced

physical bullying, 15.6% experienced relational bullying, and 15.3% experienced verbal bullying [15]. There were nine studies; eight were carried out in India and one internationally said adolescents were found to have a high rate of aggressiveness, overall, it was 17.7% and as high as 66.5% when physical aggression [16]. Analysis of a cluster sample of young people found that 41% of those we labeled pacifists had highly unfavorable interpretations of the antagonist's behavior in the vignettes but backed vengeance aims at low levels; conversely, we found that 25% of young people, whom we labeled Vengeance-Seekers, had very unfavorable assessments of the antagonist's actions and strongly favored revenge intentions [17]. Out of 1070 students, 60.0% were engaged in a general form of bullying behavior; 330 (30.8%) of the students were bullied, 280 (26.2%) were bully-victims, and 32 (3.0%) were bullies [18].

Regarding high school students' behavioral discourteous with their sociodemographic characteristics, data analysis of the present study indicated that male students, who smoke cigarettes, dislike school studies, and get less than 5 thousand daily pocket money had a significant association with students' behavioral discourteous. In respect to high school students' verbal discourteous with their sociodemographic characteristics. The present study indicated that students aged 17-18 years who have 1-3 friends did not smoke cigarettes and, like the school study, had associated with verbal discourteous through showing polite behavior. Concerning high school students' physical discourteous with their sociodemographic characteristics; results of the current study provoke that the male sex, did not work after school, had male preferences for friendship with either 1-3 or 4-6 friends, got less than 5 thousand, smoke cigarettes, consume alcohol present physical discourteous, while those liked the school studies, and had never failed in the study were more pacifist in their behavior. In a similar context among high school students in Mush province in Turkey, the proportion of bullying among boys is more than among girls [19]. The incidence of bullying, in general, among students, was 60.0%; there was a significant difference between males and females

in the prevalence of bullying behavior, which was 67.9% and 51.6%, respectively (P 0.001) [13]. It seems that boys are globally more discourteous than girls, A study conducted by Alsaleem with his colleagues in Saudia Arabia in 2021 among 300 students of secondary school aged 15-18 years, they found that the overall bullying prevalence rate was 64.7% and males had two times more than female [20]. A study was conducted among 2724 students of classes 10th and 11th, this study found a highly significant smoking role in antisocial deviation in the different ethnic groups, for example, smoking vs cursing, lying, exhibiting one's boldness sex gender identity, or smoking, dangerously driving a motor vehicle; their study found that current smoking connected to antisocial behavior differed considerably between males and females [21]. In a study of 320 high school students in Antalys, a statistically significant difference was found between how much they liked school and how likely they were to bully, students who disliked school were more likely to bully than those who did (p 0.001) [15]. Pocket money may be a factor in discourteous behavior among late adolescents and cause emotional disorders and aggression, so adolescents with limited pocket money may lack positive role models in their lives who can teach them healthy ways to manage their emotions, this can result in the development of maladaptive coping mechanisms, such as physical aggression, likewise, researchers discovered that research participants were more likely to smoke on average as they reported having a larger quantity of pocket money; it appears evident that those having access to pocket money might make it easier for teenagers to get cigarettes [22]. Furthermore, Researchers found that males fought much more frequently than females; this result is in line with prior research on youth battling, which has consistently found that boys are more likely to participate in physical fighting than girls, regardless of the context [14]. Moreover, investigators stated that teenage students were found to have a high degree of aggression; overall, it was 17.7%, but when it came to physical aggression, it was 66.5%, in addition, boys were shown to be more violent physically than girls [16]. It is important to note, however,

not all boys and girls exhibit the same level or type of aggression, in the study conducted in Romania in 2020, to compare data from two national representatives to identify factors relevant to physical fighting behaviors among Romanian high school students aged 15 - 16 years old, they found that physical fighting was to be more common in boys than in girls, with boys engaging in undisguised violence to gain influence, money, or power, while girls resort to relational aggression in emotional situations [23]. Also, according to research by Mani and Savarimuthu mentioned male secondary school students were found to have a significantly higher mean hostility score (58.29) than female students (52.75) [24]. Again in a study conducted by Monahan and his colleagues to find out the relation between hours worked, school attendance, and antisocial behavior among students aged 14–17, the study interpreted that high-intensity employed youth reported significantly less income-related antisocial behavior than low-intensity employed or unemployed youth [25]. Similar to the current study findings, Rambaran and his colleagues found that over 75% of nominations for bullying were between individuals of the same sex suggesting that same-sex friendships and bullying are common among adolescents [26]. In other aspects, late adolescents like adults whose needs with age might increase and avoid social connections with their colleagues, therefore enough pocket money is one of the factors associated with aggressiveness, adolescents did not have access to enough pocket money may develop aggressive and psychological dysfunction [27]. Furthermore, the findings of the survey indicated that problems with classmates and the influence of peers accounted for 53.2% and 63.5% of the primary causes of physical fighting and smoking, respectively; at the same time, they show that in comparison to students in other classes, students in grade 10 had much greater prevalence rates of physical fighting and smoking cigarettes [14]. In addition, Lewis and his colleague concluded that the chances of self-directed violence and being a victim did not differ much between former daily smokers and never-daily smokers; however,

former daily smokers were much less likely than never-smokers to report violence from other people [28]. Likewise, the study conducted by Baiee and Al-Murshedi, (2018) shows significant associations between tobacco smoking and bullying school colleagues verbally ($P < 0.001$) [29]. The study's results on adolescents show that early aggressive behavior increases with alcohol use and aggression related to alcohol but that alcohol use levels are not significantly related to later aggressive behavior, as a result, the data suggest that aggressive people who drink alcohol also engage in alcohol-related aggression [30]. The lowest percentage of bullies (1.7% of the total) were in the "outstanding" category in terms of their final grades, indicating a strong association between bullying and academic performance; however, no such association was observed between bullying and the number of friends [31]. Besides, it is noted in the research paper that students who did not engage in bullying at school were more likely to have at least one friend compared to students who regularly engaged in bullying, who were less likely to have any friends [32].

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The study concluded that the prevalence of the students' behavioral discourteous which presented from mild to highly disrespectful behavior had the first level among the aspects of discourteous behaviors, followed by verbal discourteous ranging between abusive to very abusive as a second level, and physical discourteous stand for the third one. Besides, these discourteous aspects affected the main students' demographic characteristics such as sex, cigarette smoking, preferring school studying, daily pocket money, and the student's number of friends. Therefore, studying the family variables and their effect on the student's school and social behavior is crucial in solving such behaviors.

Financial support and sponsorship

The authors did not receive any financial support

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

There are no conflicts of interest The authors state that with each other.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors acknowledge all students who participate in the current study.

REFERENCES

1. Merriam-Webster. Discourteous. In Merriam-webster.com. (2022). Retrieved July 25, 2022. Available from: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/discourteousness>.
2. Collins. Discourteous. In Collins dictionary.com. (2022). Retrieved July 25, 2022. Available from: <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/discourteous>.
3. Cambridge University Press. Discourteous. Cambridge dictionary.org.(2022). Retrieved July 25, 2022. Available from: <https://www.dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/discourteous>
4. Clark, C. Creating & sustaining civility in nursing education. 2nd ed. Indianapolis: Renee Wilmeth. (2013). P.P. 10-11.
5. Natarajan J, Muliira JK, van der Colff J. Incidence and perception of nursing students' academic incivility in Oman. BMC Nurs, (2017), 16:19. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-017-0213-7>.
6. Felblinger D M . Incivility and bullying in the workplace and nurses' shame responses. JOGNN, (2008), 37, 234-42. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1552-6909.2008.00227.x>
7. American Nurses Association, (ANA). 'Incivility, bullying and workplace violence: A position statement', in Professional Issues Panel on Incivility, Bullying, and Workplace Violence. (2015). Available from: <http://www.nursingworld.org/Workplace-Violence-and-Incivility-Panel>.
8. Marsh V L. Bullying in School: Prevalence, Contributing Factors, and interventions. Center for Urban Education Success, the warner school of education at the University of Rochester. Rochester, New York. (2018). Available from: www.rochester.edu/warner/cues/.
9. Geleta A. Schools Climate and Student Achievement in Secondary Schools of Ethiopia, European Scientific Journal June. (2017), 13(17), 239-261. DOI: 10.19044/esj.2017.v13n17p239
10. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, Medicine (NASEM), Preventing Bullying Through Science, Policy, And Practice. (2016). 2nd ed. Edited by F. Rivara and S. Le Menestrel. Washington: The National Academies Press. DOI: 10.17226/23482.
11. Martens K, & Andreen K. School counselors' involvement with a school-wide positive behavior support system: Addressing student behavior issues in a proactive and positive manner. Professional School Counseling, (2013), 16(5), 313-22. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5330/PSC.n.2013-16.313>.
12. Aldughayyim A, Almarshoud Y, Alanazi M, Almutairi M, Aldahman R. Prevalence, perception, and associated factors with bullying among high school students in Buraidah, Qassim: a cross-sectional study. IJMDC, (2021), 5(7),1394-9. <https://doi.org/10.24911/ijmdc.51-1621565985>
13. Ahmed B, Al-Hadithi T. Bullying among school adolescents in Erbil City of Iraq. Zanco J Med Sci, (2019), 23(2),194-205. <https://doi.org/10.15218/zjms.2019.025>
14. Qasem A O, Nasir K A, Al-Tawil N G. Prevalence and Perceived Contributing Factors of Physical Fighting, Cigarette Smoking, and Alcohol Use among Adolescents in Erbil City. Kufa Journal for Nursing Sciences, (2022).12(2),1-9. <https://doi.org/10.36321/kjns.vi20222.9741>
15. Bozan K, EvginD, Gördeles Beşer N. Relationship bullying in adolescent period with family functionalities and child behaviors. Psychology in the Schools, (2021), 1(23). <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22501>
16. Kumar M, Kapoor R, Sharma P, Bhilwar M. Prevalence of Aggression among School-Going Adolescents in India: A Review Study. Ind.J.Youth Adol.Health, (2016), 3(4), 39-47. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327605409_Prevalence_of_Aggression_among_School-Going_Adolescents_in_India_A_Review_Study
17. McDonald K L, Asher S R. Pacifists and Revenge-Seekers in Response to Unambiguous Peer Provocation. J Youth Adolescence, (2018), 47(9), 1907-25. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-017-0767-4>
18. Shawki B, Al-Hadithi T, Shabila N, (2021). Association of bullying behaviour with smoking, alcohol use and drug use among school students in Erbil City, Iraq. EMHJ;27(5):483-90. <https://doi.org/10.26719/2021.27.5.483>

19. Hesapcioglu S, Tural M K. Prevalence of peer bullying in secondary education and its relation with high school entrance scores. *Dusunen Adam: The Journal of Psychiatry and Neurological Sciences*, (2018), 31(4), 347-55. <https://doi.org/10.5350/dajpn2018310403>
20. Alsaleem M A, Alhashem H A, Alsaleem S A, Mahfouz A A. Bullying Prevalence among Secondary School Children in Khamis Mushait City, Southwestern Saudi Arabia. *Behavioral Sciences*, (2021), 11(10), 134. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs11100134>
21. Weiss B, Nguyen T, Trung L, Ngo V, Lau A. Tobacco smoking and antisocial deviance among Vietnamese, Vietnamese-American, and European-American adolescents. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, (2019), 47(1), 59-69. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-018-0416-8>
22. Siziya S, Muula A S, Rudatsikira E. Correlates of current cigarette smoking among in-school adolescents in the Kurdistan region of Iraq. *Confl Health*, (2007), 1(13). <https://doi.org/10.1186/1752-1505-1-13>
23. Bucur A, Ursoniu S, Caraion-Buzdea C, Ciobanu V, Florescu S, Vladescu C. Aggressive Behaviors among 15–16-Year-Old Romanian High School Students: Results from Two Consecutive Surveys Related to Alcohol and Other Drug Use at the European Level. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, (2020), 17(10), 3670. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17103670>
24. Mani P, Savarimuthu A. Analysis of Factors Affecting Hostility among Secondary School Students. *Strad Research*, (2020), 7(8), 470-8. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.37896/sr7.8/044>
25. Monahan KC, Steinberg L, Cauffman E. Age Differences in the Impact of Employment on Antisocial Behavior. *Child Development*, (2012), 84(3), 791-801. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12031>
26. Rambaran J A, Dijkstra J K, Veenstra R. Bullying as a Group Process in Childhood: A Longitudinal Social Network Analysis. *Child Development*, (2019), 91(4), 1336-52. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13298>
27. Chhabra G, Sodhi M. Impact of Family Conflict on the Psychosocial Behaviour in Male Adolescents. *Journal of Nepal Paediatric Society*, (2012), 32(2), 124-31. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jnps.v32i2.6147>
28. Lewis A, Oberleitner L, Morgan P, Picciotto M, McKee S. Association of Cigarette Smoking With Interpersonal and SelfDirected Violence in a Large CommunityBased Sample. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research*, (2015), 18(6), 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ntr/ntv287>
29. Baiee H, Al-Murshedi R. Smoking and its correlates among secondary school students in Al-Hilla City 2018. *Medical Journal of Babylon*, (2018), 15(4), 326-333 https://doi.org/10.4103/mjbl.mjbl_66_18
30. White H R, Brick J, Hansell S, A longitudinal investigation of alcohol use and aggression in adolescence. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, Supplement*, (1993), 11(11), 62-77. <https://doi.org/10.15288/jsas.1993.s11.62>
31. Abdulsalam A J, Al Daihani A E, & Francis K. Prevalence and Associated Factors of Peer Victimization (Bullying) among Grades 7 and 8 Middle School Students in Kuwait. *International Journal of Pediatrics*, 2019, (2019), (3):1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2017/2862360>
32. Tomé G, Gaspar de Matos M, Camacho I, Simões C. The lack of friends amongst adolescents and well-being. *IJSciences*, (2013), 2(11), 43-51. Available at: <https://www.ijsciences.com/pub/pdf/V220131107.pdf>