

## The Relation Between Cruelty and Individual Family, Libratory Factors in Students: A Case Study

<sup>1</sup>Mokhtar Arefi, <sup>2</sup>Hojat Alah Tahmasebian, <sup>3</sup>Mehdi Hariri and <sup>4</sup>Masoud Nosrati

<sup>1</sup>Department of Psychology, Kermanshah Branch, Islamic Azad University, Kermanshah, Iran.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Psychology, Kermanshah Branch, Islamic Azad University, Kermanshah, Iran.

<sup>3</sup>The scientific member of Law group in Payam Noor University, Iran.

<sup>4</sup>Eslamabad-E-Gharb branch, Islamic Azad University, Eslamabad-E-Gharb, Iran.

---

**Abstract:** The goal is to examine the degree of cruelty among students, and their relations with factors of family, tension, depression, beliefs, and school. The example includes 334 students in the guidance school. Sample population are selected from Kermanshah city (in Iran) students (205 female and 139 male). They were chosen in the branches in the different levels. The tools of measurement includes authentic questionnaire of Ulysses cruelty, Depression in five items in Texas university, Bolorous' tension, Dalberg's tension beliefs, Gondof's sense of belonging and Holman's set a family quality. Data was analyzed by descriptive, statistical methods, regression. The results show that the different kinds of cruel behaviors happen in 17.7 to 52.1 of male students and 10.2 to 46.6 female students, both of them show it by: calling others by ugly names and the least cruel behaviors have been reported by robbing money and means or hurting others. Findings show that there is meaningful difference between predicted factors of cruelty, but there are only three factors in male students including: depression, tension. The regression analysis shows that female students show it in the family condition, the sense of belonging to school, but it is predicted, meaningful only among male students. Finally, it has suggested meddling in the family region, student's psychological health, in order to prevent cruelty.

**Key words:** cruel behaviors, family condition, depression, tension-based, the beliefs to support cruelty.

---

### INTRODUCTION

It was Olweus who introduced the cruel behavior in Norway in 1970's. After Lee (2009) in the south Korea, Chan (2006) in Canada, Salmivalli (2010) in Finland, Wong (2004) in Hong Kong and some of American researchers understood the cruel behaviors. They used the different definitions for cruel behavior. Olweus (1987) defined it as a systematic application of physical or psychological anger of one boy or some boy against others. Then, he edited his definition concluding that cruelty is a continuous psychological physical annoyance. After studying Britanlian children's behavior, Arora (1988) reported that cruelty is a social domination by aggression, because victims are not able to join the people in their age. Another Britanlian researcher reported that cruelty happens while a person or a group of people deprives others intentionally (Galloway, 1994). In the other study, Hoover *et al* (1994) defines "cruelty as physical or psychological abuse by a person or a group of students". All of the definitions are common one point that cruelty is bilateral: physical and psychological. In spite of different definitions of cruelty, the researchers have approved the definitions relatively. The present definitions happen in the following cases: 1) cruelty is an aggressive behaviour, 2) There is unfair between cruel and victim 3) cruelty has two aspects including physical and psychological (vocabulary) and 4) Cruelty is an intentional, repetitive behaviour (Rigby, 2004). The cruel behaviour is applied in the different ways including hurt such as calling other by ugly names, to repel a group, cruelty and physical attack like kicking. The behavior has been called either direct or indirect cruelty by Olweus (1991). The direct cruelty is an obvious attack on victim, but indirect cruelty includes the social solitude, to repel group, not to choose the groups. Nansel *et al* (2001) mentioned that 9 to 15 percentages of USA students have experienced the continuous cruelty by their class mates in the school. The different researches of different countries have examined the broadcast of cruel behavior in the schools, in none of them, it wasn't necessary to meddle in; it shows that cruelty is common among the students. On the other hand, the studies show that those who exposed by cruelty have psychological problems. The images of suicide (Cary, 2000; Kim *et al* (2005)), depression and anxiety (Bond *et al*, 2001) inter-relations problems (Kumpulainen *et al*, 1988), psyche complaints (Janson and Hazler, 2004) are predicted by victims. Furthermore, the decrease of student's security makes them not to be motivated to attend in the schools, and it leads to decrease of learning, the educational failure. (Esbensen, Carson, 2009).

---

**Corresponding Author:** Mokhtar Arefi, Department of Psychology, Kermanshah Branch, Islamic Azad University, Kermanshah, Iran.

E-mail: arefimokhtar@yahoo.com

The findings of previous studies have approved three factors in appearing cruelty including individual, family, laboratory, social-psychological factors. Some of individual factors of previous studies include: the beliefs supporting cruelty, depression and tension-based behavior. Klicpera (1996) studied Australian students in the eighth, he approved that those who tended to cruelty, they solve their problems by their physical power Bentley (1995) studied the students in fourth, fifth and sixth in Canada. The beliefs of aggressive behavior are greater in the cruel students than others who do not. Slee's study shows that Australian students who are cruel may suffer depression and grief in the schools. Finally, Olweus' study (1994) shows that there is negative relation between tension-based behaviour and cruelty.

Some studies show that the cruel and victims perceive their families in the different ways. The cruel people believe their families are not cohesive (Bowers *et al*, 1994), they have experienced more aggression in their families (Oliver *et al*, 1994). Smith *et al* (1993) show that there are some relations between aggression and solitude-derived. Furthermore, there are a serious unbalance between patriatic and matriatic power (usually father is more powerful) beside sibling (Bowers *et al*, 1992). The family of those who are cruel does not leave the children to be independent; the family usually provides their children's aggression. On the contrary, the victims (those are exposed by cruels) perceive their families in most cohesively (Bowers *et al*, 1994) and the least discussion (Oliver *et al* 1994). The beloved one of such people is bilateral, and they have lived in the patriatic family, besides they believe their siblings weaker than them. Some of unsuitable family factors are common between cruels and victims, for example Schwartz *et al* (1997) mentioned that disorganized orders, to avoid children, and more emotions were common in both groups.

Most of researchers have emphasized a suitable, laboratory spot to avoid aggression (Stephens, 1994, Dwyer, Osher, Hoffman, 2000). The schools that provide the students with constant, fair, and clear approaches about aggression may be able to decrease such behaviour in the students (Adams, 2000). The supportive, positive relations between teachers and managers can help students to solve their emotional, behavioural problems (Dwyer *et al*, 2000).

It is necessary to say that the cultural context provides the different, aggressive behavior, for example, Vaillancourt *et al* (2008) mentioned that separation of a group, social domination, and indirect cruelty are common in Japan, while both cruel behaviors are common in America.

On the other hand, the degree of aggressive behaviours is more in the guidance school students. Regarding the psychological effect, the exposition of aggressive behavior, the different cultures play an important role in the different cultures of countries, it is a deep gap in the literature of psychology and laboratory consult, and hence the present study is to fill the gap of aggressive behavior, the causes and to find the replies for following questions:

- How much is the degree of aggressive behavior in the male and female students?
- Is there any relation between family conditions and student's aggression?
- Is there any relation between students' psychological factors (depression, tension, the supportive beliefs of cruelty) and cruelty?
- Is there any relation between the sense of belonging to school and student's cruelty?

#### **Methodology:**

The research plant and participants, regarding this fact that the present study has considered the cruelty among the students, family, individual, laboratory factors, there has been used a cohesive background. The study society contains male and female, guidance school students in the first reigon of instruction organ in Kermanshah in 1390-91. They were 344 persons (205 female, 139 male) who have been chosen in the multiple levels in the branches.

Means. Data was gathered by the following questionnaires Olweus' cruelty questionnaire. It contains 40 items including the different aspects of aggressive behaviour in the five aspects including: the degree of facing the different aggressive behavior, the application of cruelty, how to know about social reactions, teachers, parents, classmates.

The questionnaire was based on accessing the descriptive information and spread of aggressive behavior of students. The questionnaire includes 8 items which examine the degree of cruelty. The cohesive, internal correlation comparisons are reported 0.85 to 0.90 (Olweus *et al*, 2005).

Depression feeling. Depression is measured by five items of Texas University (Dahberg, Toal and Behrens, 1998). This comparison is measured by Lickert in 5 degree from 1 to 5. This comparison asks some questions about people's conditions in 30 days before for example "Have felt depression about future?" The correlation of Alfa Cronbakh is reported 0.74.

Tension-based. Bosworth's *et al* (1999) questionnaires include four items which were internally cohesive (0.62). The comparison had items such as "waiting is very difficult for me" It asks the participants to justify how much items have been visible in them by 5 degree comparison.

The supporting beliefs of aggressive behavior. Dahlberg's *et al* (1998) questionnaire has been used in the 6 items out of 20 by Lickert 5 degrees. The comparison includes the phrases such as "if I avoid fighting, my friends will believe me coward". The degree of acceptance is based on 1 to 5. Alfa Cronbakh correlation is 0.71.

The sense of belonging to school. It was measured by Goodnow's four psychological items to be member of school. These items were marked by Lickert's five degree. The correlation of Alfa Cronbakh was reported 0.63.

The quality of family condition. It is measured by items of preparation for marriage (PREP-EM). The questionnaire includes 205 items to measure the main factors of family, personality factors in the couples. The questionnaire was successful to examine the couple's satisfaction, the internal correlation was reported 0.83 (Holman *et al*, 1994). The measurement of mother-child relationship (including 5 items) and that of father-child relationship (includes 5 items), and the general quality of family (including 4 items) which were marked by Lickert in 5 degrees in order to measure the individual's satisfaction. It is necessary say that total marks of these three measurements were considered as the mark of family condition.

**Table 1:** Frequency of committing cruelty according to different sexes.

In the previous months		As whole once or twice		Twice or three times in the month		Once a week		Several in a week			
male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female		
48.9	53.4	15.1	13.6	12.9	5.3	3.6	9.2	19.4	18.4	Calling with ugly names	1
64.7	69.4	21.6	14.1	3.6	5.8	2.2	5.8	7.9	4.9	To depart you from a group	2
59.0	69.9	12.9	10.2	7.2	4.9	10.1	6.8	10.8	8.3	Kicking pushing	3
75.5	82.0	12.2	7.8	3.6	4.4	4.3	3.9	4.3	1.9	Lying slander	4
86.3	89.8	8.6	6.8	1.4	1.0	1.4	5.0	2.2	1.9	Snobbing robbing hurting	5
82.0	77.2	10.1	9.7	2.9	4.4	2.2	4.9	2.9	3.9	Threatening forcing	6
76.3	82.5	7.9	7.8	2.9	2.4	4.3	2.4	8.6	4.9	Using names phrase	7
76.3	76.7	11.5	12.1	5.0	3.9	3.6	1.9	3.6	5.3	Cruelty	8

Table (1) shows the differ cruel behavior in female and male. It has been approved that cruelty has happen in 13.7 to 52.1 of male in the two previous months. The least cruel behaviors belonged to snob means, money, and to hurt others, and the most belong to call by ugly, humorous names. There are also different cruel behaviors in female about 10.2 to 46.6 in the two previous months. The least cruel behaviors belong to snob money and means to hurt others, and the most belong to call others by ugly, humorous names.

**Table 2:** Cohesive correlation of committing cruelty and predicted factors.

View of school	Tension-based bahaivour	depression	View of cruel behaviour	Family condition		Committing cruelty
-0.19*	0.43*	0.37*	0.23*	-0.38*	female	
-0.15	0.27*	0.43*	0.04	-0.24*	male	

p<0.05

Table (2) shows the cohesive correlation of factors. There is a meaningful relation among all of cruel factors in the female group (p<0.05), but there is meaningful relation between depression, tension-base behavior, family condition with committing cruelty (p<0.05).

**Table 3:** Prediction of cruel behaviour on factors.

meaningful	SE	β	B	ΔR <sup>2</sup>	R <sup>2</sup>	R	Predicted factors	model	Sex
0.001	0.068	0.381	0.398		0.145	0.381	family condition	1	Female
0.001	0.064	-0.387	0.404	0.090	0.235	0.485	Family condition and view of shcool	2	
0.001	0.101	-0.300	-0.492						
0.001	0.073	-0.314	0.328	0.016	0.251	0.501	Family condition	3	male
0.001	0.107	-0.253	-0.414				View of school		
0.001	0.83	-0.153	0.172				View of cruel behaviour		
0.001	0.127	0.372	0.594	--	0.138	0.372	Tension-based behaviour	1	

Table (3) shows the predicted, cruel factors of male and female on depression, tension-based behavior, their view of school, their view of cruelty, family condition by using regression. It has been considered that the first factor is the family condition by 14.5 variance, then there is their view of school, thirdly, there is factor of cruel behaviour among female students. But in the male group, the tension-based factor is the first in the cruel behaviour, other factors can not be added by regression model.

**Discussion and Conclusions:**

The goal of study is to examine the degree of cruel behavior in the high school students, it is also considered the relation between cruelty with individual and family factors. The individual factors include: depression, tension-based behavior, view of cruelty, view of school, and in the family, the family condition has been considered. There were 344 high school students including 205 female and 139 male.

The studies of male cruel behavior show the different behavior in 14 to 53 percentage, it is better to say that at least %53 male have committed cruelty in two previous months, these behavior were to snob and to rob money and meaning and the most cruel behavior was to call others by ugly, humourous names and titles.

On the other hand, it has been reported between 20 to 53 percentage of male who have experienced cruelty. The cruelest behavior was to call others by ugly, humouros names, and the least of them have been to threat others. There were 35 percentage that has been reported to threat others to rob and snob their means, it has been the least.

There were about 11 to 47 percentages who committed cruelty among females including: mostly to call by ugly, humorous name and at the least, it belongs to snob others' means and money and to hurt others, but the most percentage belonged to call others with ugly, humorous names, and the least names belonged to sexual issues.

The previous studies belong to social-cultural contexts were different, for example that of Oluweius (1993) which has reported the committing cruelty about 12.8 percentage, but Besorth, Spelag and Simon (1999) reported 81 percentage in the previous month. It is necessary to say that the indirect questions have been reported most affective. As whole, the different cruel behavior in the different cultures, for example, Olweus (1993) mentioned that solitude, the social separation, unsuitable behavior are common in Japan, but in USA, the vocabulary and non-vocabulary cruelty are common. The present study shows that the vocabular cruelty has been mostly in the cultural contexts. The finding show that there is meaningful relation between cruelty and family conditions, depression, tension-based behavior, and the view of school among male.

It means the positive emotional family condition decreases depression, tension and cruelty in the males. There have been 5 items to commit cruelty among female including emotional condition of family, depression, tension, the view of school which all have meaningful relations with cruelty.

As whole, findings were aligned with predicted factors of cruelty. The effects of family conditions show that cruel people feel less cohesion in their family (Bowers *et al*, 1992), they have also experienced more hostility in their families (Oliver *et al*, 1994). It should be considered that family is the most affective organ in individual behairours, there are many hypotheses approved this fact including: social learning, heritage transfer, affection theory. There are also other findings that have been aligned with the study. For example Spelg and Simon (1999) show that more aggressive students are crueler, depressed. Bentley and Lea (1995) show that the cruel people have stronger aggressive behavior than others. Stanely (1995) also approved that the depressed uncontent students have experienced cruel behavior.

Findings show that cruel behavior is common among high school students, but the previous studies have approved them in the guidance school students. It is a warning in the guidance school, because it has the psychological, incurable effects. There are instructions to resist the cruel behavior such as the instruction of resistance skills, the connective skills, to support both supervisors and cruel people, to instruct parent's students. The relation between cultural factors and cruel behaviors has been avoided in our country.

The finding paves the way for experts, counslators in the schools. Regarding the relation between family and cruelty, the first, most causes of cruel behavior is family which should be examined in the social-cultural field.

Other findings approve the positive view of school and the least, aggressive behavior. Therefore, It is necessary to design some plans in order to improve students' behavior and to prevent them from cruel behavior. In order to provide a positive view, it is necessary to accompany the different instructional organs. It can be applicable in limited condition of school, the instruction of staff, to attract students.

Other findings approved the female cruel behaviors, because they have no way to mend their problems. They have social, cultural problems to overcome others. They believe the cruel behaviors are most affective to solve their individual problems.

Hence, the instruction of methods to solve the individual problems helps them to decrease their cruel behavior.

Finally, depression, and tension-based behavior are signs of lack of psychological health among cruel people, hence such signs should be considered by hygiene organs, schools, counslators in order to prevent student's cruel behavior. It hopes the future studies examine the effects of psychological meddling in the cruel people and victim, their profiles will approve the same fact too.

## REFERENCES

- Adams, T.A., 2000. The status of school discipline and violence. *Annals of The American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 567: 140-156.
- Arora, C.M., 1987. Defining bullying for a secondary school. *Educational and Child Psychology*, 3-4, 110-120.
- Bentley, K.M., A.K.F. Li, 1995. Bully and victim problems in elementary schools and students' beliefs about aggression. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology*, 11: 153-165.
- Berger, D., 2012. Multiple Regression: A Comprehensive Introduction. *International Journal of Engineering Sciences, TI Journals*, 1(1): 1-9.
- Bond, L., J. Carlin and L. Thomas, 2001. 'Does Bullying Cause Emotional Problems? A Prospective Study of Young Teenagers', *British Medical Journal*, 323: 480-84.
- Bosworth, K., D.L. Espelage and T.R. Simon, 1999. Factors associated with bullying behavior in middle school students. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 19(3): 341-362.
- Bowers, L., P.K. Smith, V. Binney, 1994. Cohesion and power in the families of children involved in bully/victim problems at school. *J. Fam. Ther.*, 14: 371-387.
- Carney, J.V., 2000. 'Bullied to Death: Perceptions of Peer Abuse and Suicidal Behaviour During Adolescence. *School Psychology International*, 21: 213-23.
- Chan, J.H., 2006. Systemic Patterns in Bullying and Victimization. *School Psychology International*, 27(3): 352-369.
- Dahlberg, L.L., S.B. Toal, C.B. Behrens, 1998. Measuring violence-related attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors among youths: A compendium of assessment tools. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control.
- Dwyer, K.P., D. Osher, C.C. Hoffman, 2000. Creating responsive schools: Contextualizing early warning, timely response. *Exceptional Children*, 66(3): 347-365.
- Esbensen, F., D.C. Carson, 2009. Consequences of Being Bullied: Results From a Longitudinal Assessment of Bullying Victimization in a Multisite Sample of American Students. *Youth & Society*, 41(2): 209-233.
- Galloway, D., 1994. Bullying: The importance of a whole school approach. *Therapeutic Care and Education*, 3: 315-329.
- Goodenow, C., 1993. The psychological sense of school membership among adolescents: Scale development and educational correlates. *Psychology in the Schools*, 30, 79-90.
- Greenbaum, S., B. Turner, R.D. Stephens, 1988. Set straight on bullies. Los Angeles: Pepperdine University Press.
- Holman, T.B., J.H. Larson, S.L. Harmer, 1994. The development and predictive validity of a new premarital assessment instrument: The Preparation for Marriage Questionnaire. *Family Relations*, 43: 46-52.
- Hoover, J.H., R. Oliver, K. Thomson, 1993. Perceived victimization by school bullies: New research and future directions. *Journal of Humanistic Education and Development*, 32: 76-84.
- Janson, G.R. and R.J. Hazler, 2004. 'Trauma Reactions of Bystanders and Victims to Repetitive Abuse Experiences', *Violence and Victims*, 19: 239-55.
- Kim, Y.S., Y. Koh and B. Leventhal, 2005. 'School Bullying and Suicidal Risk in Korean Middle School Students', *Pediatrics*, 115: 357-63.
- Klicpera, C., B.G. Klicpera, 1996. The situation of bullies and victims of aggressive acts in school. *Praxis der Kinderpsychologie und Kinderpsychiatrie*, 45: 2-9.
- Kumpulainen, K., E. Räsänen and I. Henttonen, 1998. 'Bullying and Psychiatric Symptoms among Elementary School-Age Children', *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 22: 705-17.
- Lee, E., 2009. The relationship of aggression and bullying to social preference: Differences in gender and types of aggression. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 33(4): 323-330.
- Nansel, T.R., M. Overpeck, R.S. Pilla, W.J. Ruan, B. Simons-Morton, P. Scheidt, 2001. Bullying behaviors among U.S. youth: Prevalence and association with psychosocial adjustment. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 285(16): 2094-2100.
- Oliver, R., J.H. Hoover, R. Hazler, 1994. The perceived roles of bullying in small-town Midwestern schools. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 72: 416-420.
- Olweus, D., 1978. *Aggression in the schools: Bullies and whipping boys*. New York: John Wiley.
- Olweus, D., 1991. Bully/victim problems among schoolchildren: basic facts and effects of a school based intervention program. In D. J. Pepler & K. H. Rubin (Eds.), *The development and treatment of childhood aggression* (pp. 411-448). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Olweus, D., 1994. Bullying at school: Long-term outcomes for the victims and an effective school-based intervention program. In L. R. Huesmann (Ed.), *Aggressive behavior: Current perspectives* (pp: 97-130). New York: Plenum.

Rigby, K., 2004. Addressing Bullying in Schools Theoretical Perspectives and Their Implications. *School Psychology International*, 25(3): 287-300.

Salmivalli, C., 2010. Bullying and the peer group: A review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 15: 112-120.

Schutt, R., 2012. A Tutorial on Correlation, Regression Analysis and Analysis of Variance. *World Applied Programming, TI Journals*, 2(11): 485-491.

Slee, P.T., 1995. Bullying in the playground: The impact of interpersonal violence on Australian children's perceptions of their play environment. *Children's Environments*, 12: 273-282.

Smith, P.K., L. Bowers, V. Binney, H. Cowie, 1993. Relationships of children involved in bully/victim problems at school. In S. Duck (Ed.), *Learning about relationships* (pp: 184-204). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Stephens, R.D., 1994. Planning for safer and better schools: School violence prevention and intervention strategies. *School Psychology Review*, 23(2): 204-215.

Vaillancourt, T., P. McDougall, S. Hymel, A. Krygsman, J. Miller, K. Stiver, C. Davis, 2008. Bullying: Are researchers and children/youth talking about the same thing? *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 32(6): 486-495.

Wong, D.S.W., 2004. School Bullying and Tackling Strategies in Hong Kong, 48(5): 537-553.