

# Determine of Distrutive Behaviors Problems among Child Schools in Iraq

<sup>1</sup>Shahznan Hassan Badr, <sup>2</sup>Ridha. M. Lefta, <sup>3</sup>Ghassan AL-Talkany

## **ABSTRACT-**

**Background:** *Disruptive behavior” refers to a wide range of harming acts that are seen at high rates among youth in the juvenile justice system. In fact, early psychoanalytically derived theories of delinquency posited that antisocial behavior itself was a form of destructiveness, driven by alienation, low self-regard, and perceived or actual rejection by others.*

**Goals:** *To Determine of disruptive behaviors among children at primary school in Al-Najafe city; to find out the relationship between their demographic data for child school and destructive behaviors.*

**Methodology:** *The study design a quantitative research by a descriptive study conducted to determine of destructive behaviors among child school in alnajafe city; to find out the relationship between their demographic data for child school and destructive behaviors. , the sampling it is non-Probability "purposive" sample was sample was conducted on 70 people with Thalassemia at the Women's and Children's Hospital in Al-Muthanna City for the period from September 7, 2016 to February 16, 2017. A questionnaire it has used as a tool of data collection to fulfill the study, which consist of three parts, include demographic characteristics, medical history, and the health Protective behaviors. A content validity, which is carried out through 13 panel of experts. A panel of experts determines validity, while reliability use split half. A descriptive and inferential statistics are been used to analyze the data.*

**Results:** *The study results indicate for demographic data that indicate the majority of the study sample for gender is male (61.3%) and age is more than 9 years within age groups (54.9%). The study results depict most of the study samples of sequences are 1-3 (68.5%) and their most have father and mother are life (93%and 93.8%) respectively. Concerned with father and mother occupation are businessman and free business respectively (46.6% and 55.1%) respectively. The study results that there is different between male and female for disruptive behaviors that indicate high significance different between male and female at p. value equal or less than 0.001.*

---

<sup>1</sup> University of Misan, College of Education

<sup>2</sup> University of Misan, College of Education

<sup>3</sup> University of Misan, College of Education

**Conclusion:** *the study sample by their demographic data the majority of the study sample of gender is male and their age is more than 9 years within age groups. The overall assessment for distributive behaviors are their most do not suffer from disruptive behaviors after this study results are gradually elevate (mild, moderate, and sever) the disruptive behaviors among children in primary school. The study conclude that there is high a significance relationship between most of variable for demographic data and disruptive behaviors at p. value equal or less than 0.01*

**Recommendations:** *Provide training session for teachers to identified disruptive behaviors, use standardized measures to help determine whether behaviours fall within the normative, borderline or at-risk, or clinically significant range. Further, scientific research that increase Screening through can complement clinical assessment when determining the need for further evaluation or intervention to prevent disruptive behaviors. Cooperation between ministry education and ministry of health to evidence-based parent-training programs as a first-line intervention for children with significant disruptive behaviors. Provide anticipatory guidance and psycho-education to parents, including directed reading, when a child's behaviors fall within the borderline/at-risk range that lead to disruptive behaviors.*

**Keywords-** *Disruptive behaviors, Types of Child Behaviors, Child Juvenile, Risk factors for destructive behaviors*

## I INTRODUCTION

Destructive behavior” refers to a wide range of harming acts that are seen at high rates among youth in the juvenile justice system. In fact, early psychoanalytically derived theories of delinquency posited that antisocial behavior itself was a form of destructiveness, driven by alienation, low self-regard, and perceived or actual rejection by others. More recently, in addition to overtly suicidal behavior, two other constructs related to destructiveness have received empirical attention in the literature on justice-involved youth: non-suicidal injury and reckless behavior (Abram, et al., 2015)

Child school is the period in which harming behaviors including running away from home, intention no harming one-self attempts are been initiated and may escalate. Many of the adversities and difficulties during adolescence are associated with significant changes in the psychological and social development of young girls and boys (Dougall, et al., 2016).

Any abnormal pattern of behavior is above the expected norm for age and level of development can be described as “challenging behavior”. It has been defined as: “Culturally abnormal behaviors of such an intensity, frequency or duration that the physical safety of the person or others is likely to be placed in serious jeopardy or behavior which is likely to seriously limit or deny access to use of ordinary community facilities (Emerson, 2017)

They can include self-injury, physical or verbal aggression, non-compliance, and disruption of the environment, inappropriate vocalizations, and various stereotypies. These behaviors can impede learning, restrict access to normal activities and social opportunities, and require a considerable amount of both manpower and financial resources to manage effectively (Esposito & Clum, 2016)

Approximately 20% of European child school have reported destructive thoughts and/ or behaviors (Cheng et al., 2009).

Notably, all of these forms of destructiveness are prevalent among the large proportion of youth in detention and correctional settings, who have been exposed to psychological trauma (Acoca, 2018).

Destructive patterns are ranged on a continuum that includes suicidal thoughts, destructive behaviors from which the intent to die is absent and suicide-related behaviors that can culminate in suicide (Cruz et al., 2013)

Several studies have confirmed that approximately 20% of child school report destructive thoughts and behaviors, which represents a challenge for those who work with child school, including teachers and mental health professionals (Kieling et al., 2016). Moreover, suicide is one of the leading causes of death among adolescents and child school worldwide (WHO, 2006).

The majority of studies investigating this issue have relied on clinical samples; only recent studies have employed community samples of child school (Azevedo et al., 2015). However, research that facilitates the accurate identification of the risk factors for destructive behaviors and the factors that prevent such behaviors is of utmost importance. Such knowledge is crucial for therapeutic interventions - namely, psychotherapy and family therapy- and for mitigating the risk of engaging in more severe behaviors that may compromise mental and physical integrity (Pringsheim, 2015).

**Study Material:** study design: A descriptive quantitative study was Carry out in order to achieve the stated objectives. The study is begin from September 7, 2019 to February 16, 2019 in AL-Njafe city. **Sample and sampling:** Study Sample non-probability Purposive sample of 728 students. Furthermore, the target population are children in primary school in age is school age. Several statements of this questionnaire was modify and develop to increase the validity of this instrument and to be more appropriate for achieving the aims of the present study. **Instruments:** The study instrument consisted of (2) parts as the following: Demographic data and the Basic Information for child and parents (11) items, and distructive behavior consist from four domains. **Data collection:** The collected data was self-report by researcher from teacher or caregivers and utilize the file of school for students to complete some information, each questionnaire need time (10-15) minutes.

**Statistically analyzed by two methods:**

1. A descriptive statistical method (frequencies and percentages)
2. Inferential statistical method (Correlation Coefficient and P. Value).

## II Results of the study

Table (1) distribution of the study sample by their demographic data

Demographic data	Rating	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Gender	Male	446	61.3	61.3
	Female	282	38.7	100.0
Age/ years	7-8	328	45.1	45.1
	More than 9	400	54.9	100.0
Child number	1-3	499	68.5	68.5
	4 - 6	181	24.9	93.4
	7+	48	6.6	100.0
Father life	Yes	677	93.0	93.0
	No	51	7.0	100.0
Mother life	Yes	683	93.8	93.8
	No	45	6.2	100.0
Father Occupation	Dead	51	7.0	7.0
	Employed	339	46.6	53.6
	Business mane	271	37.2	90.8
	Unemployed	67	9.2	100.0
Mother Occupation	Dead	45	6.2	6.2
	Employed	280	38.5	44.6
	Business mane	401	55.1	99.7
	Unemployed	2	.3	100.0
Father levels of Education	No write and reading	69	9.5	9.5
	Primary school	187	25.7	35.2
	High school	217	29.8	65.0
	Bachelor	255	35.0	100.0
	No write and reading	87	12.0	12.0
Mother levels of Education	Primary school	218	29.9	41.9
	High school	149	20.5	62.4
	Bachelor	274	37.6	100.0
	Total	728	100.0	

This table show that the study results for demographic data that indicate the majority of the study sample for gender is male (61.3%) and age is more than 9 years within age groups (54.9%). The study results depict most of the study samples of sequences are 1-3 (68.5%) and their most have father and mother are life (93%and 93.8%) respectively. Concerned with father and mother occupation are businessman and free business respectively (46.6% and 55.1%) respectively. Related to mother and father education for the study sample the study results have bachelor (35% and 37.6%) respectively.

Table (2) summery statistics for overall assessment among children with distructive behaviors

Overall Assessment For Distructive behaviors	Rating	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
	None distructive	266	36.5	92.7
	Mild distructive	409	56.2	56.2
	Moderate distructive	50	6.9	99.6
	Sever distructive	3	0.4	100.0
	Total	728	100.0	

This table depict that the study results for overall assessment are most of the study sample suffer from mild distructive behaviors distructive behaviors are (56.2%) among children in primary school.

Table (3) summery statistics for relationship between demographic data and overall assessment for distructive behaviors

Demographic data	Chi. Sq Value	d.f	Level of significant
Gender	8.470a	3	0.037
Age/years	2.679a	3	0.444
Child number	13.070a	6	0.042
Father life	.512a	3	0.916
Mother live	.769a	3	0.857
Father occupation	32.356a	9	0.0001
Mother occupation	42.296a	9	0.0001
Father education	14.724a	9	0.099
Mother education	33.376a	9	0.0001

This table indicate that there are high a significance relationship between most of variable for demographic data and distructive behaviors at p. value equal or less than 0.001. While, non-significance relationship between (age and father and mother life) and distructive behaviors at p. value more than 0.05.

Table ( 4 ) summery statistics for t. test to comparison between male and female

Compression for Gender	Gender	Mean	S.D	t. Test	df	sig
	Male	96.4843	53.27013	0.155	726	0.001
	Female	97.0709	43.81840			

This table show the study results that there is different between male and female for distructive behaviors that indicate high significance different between male and female at p. value equal or less than 0.001.

Table ( 5 ) summery statistics ANOVA test according to quality of variance and mean values parameters by different responding among child number

Variables of children number	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	F	sig
Less than 3	91.0800	46.63057	2.81193	5.859	0.003
4 - 6	92.0467	49.39409	4.03301		
7and more	92.049	51.92929	2.98326		
Total	96.7115	49.79150	1.84540		

This table show that the study results that there is mean different among children number that disruptive behaviors elevate gradually for that indicate high significance at p. value equal or less than 0.001.

### III Discussion

Our study results are by their demographic data that indicate the majority of the study sample of gender is male and age is more than 9 years within age groups. This finding of the study agree with researchers who found male more than female and age groups are within 12 years in study that include the reality of self-destruction levels of students at secondary schools in Vietnam by (Son Van Huynh, 2018). The study results depict most of the study samples of sequences are 1-3, their most have father, and mother are life. Concerned with father and mother occupation are businessperson and free business respectively. Related to mother and father education for the study sample have bachelor graduate. The Association Between Student Reports of Classmates' Disruptive Behavior and Student Achievement by (Carmel and Yossi Shavit)2016, these study is com with finding of the study related to level of education for parents and but disagree concerned with occupation for parents.

Also (Justin and Nicola) 2012, they found through study The Relation of Parent and Child Gender to Parental Tolerance of Child Disruptive Behaviors these study results indicate the sample consisted of 160 parents (79.3 % mothers, 20.7 % fathers) with a mean age of 34.68 years (SD = 7.8). Ten families had missing data on gender of the parent and were excluded from primary analyses. Forty-seven percent of the children were female and the mean age of children was 4.37 years old (SD = 0.97). The education level of parents included less than high school (5.4 %), high school (15.6 %), and high school plus vocational training or at least some college (79 %). Parent race included Caucasian (75 %). This finding of the study are agree with our study.

The finding of study for overall assessment destructive behaviors are their most suffer from disruptive behaviors and the majority of the study finding is mild disruptive behaviors among children in primary school.

McCoy and others (2013), the researcher they found destructive its high in child school and spcilst with divorces parents through study among Constructive and Destructive Marital Conflict, Parenting, and Children's School and Social Adjustment. These findings are inconsistent with our study.

Others study such as Nkoli and others (2016), they found in study the distructive behaviors in school pupil intervention imperative through determine overall assessment for distructive behavior among student in classroom is middle this study result is consistent with our study finding.

Other study is support with study finding that include Development of Disruptive Behaviors In Young Children: A Prospective Population-Based Cohort Study by (Raymond and others 2012), that indicate the distructive is low among primary school. (Sandra) 2016, there is a significant ( $p < .05$ ) and positive relationship between percent minority of the school and frequency of classroom disorder ( $r = .02$ ). There are several control variables in the analysis that could potentially be mediating racial composition effects, including the individual-level race, socioeconomic status, and prior misbehavior variables such number of children in family; this results are consistent with our finding of the study.

.The finding of study indicate that there is high a significance relationship between most of variable for demographic data and distructive behaviors at p. value equal or less than 0.01. this study related with Saija Alatupa and other (2011), their study about Childhood Disruptive Behaviour and School Performance across Comprehensive School: A Prospective Cohort Study that indicate gender differences within the associations between school perform-ance and disruptive behavior. Another study by (Erin and others 2012), that studied child disruptive behavior and parenting efficacy: a comparison of the effects of two models of insights, this atticle is investigate that relationship between family or parents demographic data and distructive behaviors among children school that mean is supportive with study.

While, non-significance relationship between (age and father and mother life) and distructive behaviors at p. value more than 0.05. this finding of the study is support with our study by that indicate disruptive behaviour at the age of three had no association with grad of distructive.

(Pieter and others) 2017, they found the correlation between distructive behavior problems, was high ( $r = .63-.77$ ). In the clinical sample, mothers rated the severity of externalizing behavior problems significantly higher than did fathers ( $p < .001$ ). So, discrepancy between fathers and mothers on externalizing behavior problems was not predicted by child factors or interparental differences in psychopathology, but it was predicted by interparental differences in parenting stress ( $R^2 = .25, p < .001$ ). This effect was significantly larger in the nonclinical sample ( $\Delta R^2 = .06, p < .001$ ) that include level education aon occupational. When parents disagree on the severity level of school students behavior problems, this results are inconsistence with our study.

## **IV Conclusions**

1. Our study conclusion of study sample by their demographic data that indicate the majority of the study sample of gender is male and age is more than 9 years within age groups.
2. The study conclude were most of the study samples of sequences are 1-3, and their most have father and mother are life.
3. The overall assessment for distributive behaviors are their most do not suffer from disruptive behaviors after this study results are gradually elevate (mild, moderate, and sever) the disruptive behaviors among children in primary school.
4. The study conclude that there is high a significance relationship between most of variable for demographic data and disruptive behaviors at p. value equal or less than 0.01

## **V Recommendations**

1. Provide training session for teachers to identified disruptive behaviors , use standardized measures to help determine whether behaviours fall within the normative, borderline or at-risk, or clinically significant range.
2. Further, scientific research that increase Screening through can complement clinical assessment when determining the need for further evaluation or intervention to prevent disruptive behaviors.
3. Cooperation between ministry education and ministry of health to evidence-based parent-training programs as a first-line intervention for children with significant disruptive behaviors.
4. Provide anticipatory guidance and psycho-education to parents, including directed reading, when a child's behaviors fall within the borderline/at-risk range that lead to disruptive behaviors.
5. Recommend is that schools use simple approaches as part of their regular routine, such as teachers taking the time to greet each pupil personally at the door of the classroom. Evidence suggests this can have a positive impact on pupils' behavior in the lesson.
6. Simple strategy with good evidence behind it is offering free, universal breakfast clubs before school starts, which has been found to prepare pupils well for learning an less the disruptive behaviors.

## **REFERENCES**

1. Abram, K. M., Choe, J. Y., Washburn, J. J., Teplin, L. A., King, D. C., Dulcan, M. K., and Bassett, E. D. (2015). Suicidal thoughts and behaviors among detained youth. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, US Department of Justice.
2. Acoca, L. (2018). Outside/inside: The violation of American girls at home, on the streets, and in the juvenile justice system. *Crime & Delinquency*, 44(4), 561-589.



3. Azevedo, A. S., & Faria, L. (2015). A auto-estima no ensino secundário: validação da Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale [The Self-Esteem in the Secondary School: validation of the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale]. In C. Machado, L. S. Almeida, M. Gonçalves, & V. Ramalho (Eds.), *Avaliação psicológica: formas e contextos* (vol. 10, pp. 415-421). Braga: Psiquilibrios.
4. Cheng, Y., Tao, M., Riley, L., Kann, L., Tian, X., Hu, J., & Chen, D. (2009). Protective factors relating to decreased risks of adolescent suicidal behaviour. *Child: Care, Health and Development*, 35(3), 313-322.
5. Cruz, D., Narciso, I., Muñoz, M., Pereira, C. R., & Sampaio, D. (2013). Adolescents and self-destructive behaviours: An exploratory analysis of family and individual correlates. *Behavioral psychology/Psicología conductual: Revista internacional de psicología clínica y de la salud*, 21, 271-288.
6. Emerson E. *Challenging Behaviour: Analysis and intervention in people with learning disabilities*. 2nd edition. Cambridge University Press, 2017: 2-4 [DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511543739]
7. Esposito, C. L., and Clum, G. A. (2016). Social support and problem-solving as moderators of the relationship between childhood abuse and suicidality: Applications to a delinquent population. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 15(2): 137-146.
8. Kieling, C., Baker-Henningham, H., Belfer, M., Conti, G., Ertem, I., Omigbodun, O., ... & Rahman, A. (2016). Child and adolescent mental health worldwide: evidence for action. *The Lancet*, 378(9801), 1515-1525.
9. McDougall, T., Armstrong, M., & Trainor, G. (2016). *Helping children and young people who self-harm: An introduction to self-harming and suicidal behaviours for health professionals*. Routledge.
10. *Ideal Journal of Education and Policy Studies* 2(2) 86-91, Gardner D, Gorman DA. The pharmacological management of oppositional behaviour, 2015; 60: 42-51.
11. World Health Organization (2006). *Suicide prevention and special programmers*. Geneva.
12. Son Van Huynh: The Reality of Self-Destruction Levels of Students at Secondary Schools in Vietnam, *International Journal of Learning and Development* ISSN 2164-4063 2018, Vol. 8, No. 3. P.155.
13. McCoy, M. R. W. George, E. M. Cummings, and P. T. Davies: *Constructive and Destructive Marital Conflict, Parenting, and Children's School and Social Adjustment*, *Journal List HHS Author Manuscripts*, 2013.
14. Saija Alatupa Laura, Pulkki-Råback, and Mirka Hintsanen: *Childhood Disruptive Behaviour and School Performance across Comprehensive School: A Prospective Cohort Study*, *Psychology* 2011. Vol.2, No.6, 542-551, p.544.
15. Carmel, M; and Yossi Shavit: *The Association Between Student Reports of Classmates' Disruptive Behavior and Student Achievement*, July-September 2016, Vol. 2, No. 3, pp. 1-17, P.2-3.
16. Ejesi Nkoli, S Phd, and Aleke Doris: *disruptive classroom behaviours among primary school pupils: intervention imperative*, *Ideal Journal of Education and Policy Studies*, 2016, 2(2) 86-91.

17. Erin O'Connor, Eileen Rodriguez, Elise Cappella, Jordan Morris, and Sandee McClowry: Child Disruptive Behavior And Parenting Efficacy: A Comparison Of The Effects Of Two Models Of Insights, *J Community Psychol.* 2012 Jul; 40(5): 555–572.
18. (Justin and Nicola) 2012, they found through study The Relation of Parent and Child Gender to Parental Tolerance of Child Disruptive Behaviors, *J Child Fam Stud* DOI 10.1007/s10826-012-9632,p.34.
19. Sandra M.: School Discipline and Disruptive Classroom Behavior: The Moderating Effects of Student Perceptions,2016, *Journal The Sociological Quarterly* Volume 52, - Issue 3,p.32
20. Maaïke H, Marieke E. ,2 Hoofdakker,1 and Pieter J.: Predictors of discrepancies between fathers and mothers in rating behaviors of preschool children with and without ADHD, *Eur Child Adolesc Psychiatry.* 2017; 26(3): 365–376,p. 24.