



RESEARCH ARTICLE

Aggression (Proactive - Reactive) for Preparatory School Students

Zainab Asaad Kadhim AL-Graishi¹, Ameerah Jaber Hashim Al-Jawfi^{2*}

^{1,2} Department of Educational and Psychological Sciences, College of Education for Girls, University of Kufa, Iraq

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
Received: May 25, 2024	<p>The research aims to define aggression (proactive - reactive) among middle school students, and to determine the differences in aggression (proactive - reactive) according to the gender variable (males - females) and the academic specialization variable (scientific - literary) among middle school students. The researcher adopted the descriptive approach. Correlational in the process of data collection and analysis The sample was selected from the community using a stratified random sample with a proportional distribution. It was stratified random because the population is divided into (males and females) and specializations (scientific and literary). The researcher selected a random exploratory sample with a proportional distribution. It consists of (30) male and female students, distributed between scientific and literary majors. The researcher reached the most important results:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Preparatory school students are not inclined to aggressive behavior of both types (proactive-responsive) . 2. There are no statistically significant differences according to the gender variable between (males and females) in aggressive behavior (proactive-responsive) among middle school students. 3. There are statistically significant differences according to the variable of academic specialization (scientific - Al-Adbi) in favor of Al-Alami in the behavior of aggression (proactive-responsive) among middle school students. 4. There are no statistically significant differences in the interaction between the variables of gender and academic specialization in aggressive behavior (proactive-responsive) among middle school students. .
Accepted: Jun 27, 2024	
<p>Keywords</p> <p>Aggression Adolescence Phenomenon Behaviorism Moral connection Bandura Aggressive behavior</p>	
<p>*Corresponding Author: ameeraj.hashim@uokufa.edu.iq</p>	

INTRODUCTION

Adolescence is considered one of the important developmental stages in an individual's life, as it is a transitional stage that mediates between childhood and adulthood, as it witnesses developmental changes from various aspects of growth and from stages that are not devoid of pressures from multiple sources and generated by the sum of biological and psychological changes on the one hand, and on the other hand due to... They resort to methods that increase the difficulty of life for them (Abdullah, 2013: 113). In addition, social and familial relationships in the family and school may constitute sources of threat to the adolescent. The adolescent may feel accepted or rejected by his family or peers, but the changes he is going through impose requirements on him. A number that makes him face many difficulties, situations and problems, where he finds himself required to respond and interact with them with the aim of controlling them, and if his ability exceeds his inability to adapt to them due to the lack of appropriate mechanisms, skills and methods to respond

to them, this may lead to his feeling of frustration and failure, which reflects negatively on his psychological and social compatibility (Al-Asar, 31: 2015), this may be expressed by the adolescent's various reactions that may be represented by hostile behaviors, if aggressive behavior is a behavioral phenomenon that is generally widespread at all age stages, but it is more widespread among individuals in adolescence, because of the consequences of this stage. Of evolutionary characteristics that in themselves constitute a context that facilitates the emergence of hostile responses (Connor et al.,2004; Jam et al., 2018).

The behaviors that a teenager may perform in adolescence and the hostile manifestations they carry constitute the formation of aspects of an individual's personality. These behaviors are those actions that a person performs on the basis of moral values and social standards. From a moral standpoint, the teenager may not reject moral standards, but on the contrary. He may be in a state of loss and need someone to guide him and show him the right path. The moral side of the teenager can develop within the correct framework if an atmosphere of understanding is provided and opportunities are given to discuss moral issues. The moral system is embodied in the individual's ability to prevent himself from committing unjust acts. Humanity and the proactive ability to act humanely, and the ethical system is rooted in a broader social cognitive theory to include various mechanisms such as Proactive and self-reflexive self-regulation mechanisms that are deeply rooted in personal moral standards associated with self-laws (Bandura,2002).

On the other hand, moral disengagement may contribute to an explanation of the aggressor's positions on the rules of social control in force in his society and his deviation from them, which reflects the extent of rejection and moral deprivation that he has fallen into, which prompts him to express his psychological and social problems through aggression and sabotage that he adopts as a plan to interact with his surroundings (Caroline et al.,2016:43-45).

(Al-Zoubi, 2004) points out in this regard, "Due to the disengagement from morality, aggressive behavior, especially proactive behavior among school students, has become a reality that exists in most countries of the world, and preoccupies the minds of all workers in the field of education in particular and society in general, because of the negative effects it leaves on people." The educational process (Al-Zoubi, 2004: 24), so it requires concerted joint efforts, whether at the level of governmental institutions or community institutions, because it is primarily a social phenomenon and has negative repercussions on society as a whole" (Al-Mayahi and Al-Rikabi, 2013; Kanval et al., 2024).

The study by Vitro et al (Vitare et al) "Students who have aggressive behavior show high levels of moral disengagement" (Vitare et al., 2006).

The research was divided into four chapters. The first chapter included an introduction to the research, the second presented the theoretical framework and some previous studies, the third chapter dealt with the research methodology and procedures, and the fourth chapter dealt with the presentation and interpretation of the results, mentioning recommendations and proposals.

Chapter One: Introduction to the research:

1. Research problem:

Through the researcher's visit to middle schools and her inquiries from male and female teachers and educational counselors, she found that there are behavioral phenomena, including the phenomenon of moral disengagement, where some adolescents resort to using moral disengagement mechanisms such as moral justification, euphemistic language, blaming others, and not taking responsibility to justify aggressive, inhumane behavior. And socially unacceptable.

In light of what has been proposed, the research problem can be formulated in the following main question:

Is there a statistically significant relationship between moral disengagement and aggression of both types (proactive - reactive) among middle school students?

2. research importance:

The importance of the research is determined:

First: The theoretical importance:

1. The research establishes a cognitive framework for the research variables that provides specialists in the field of educational and psychological sciences with a scientific base for their research, which contributes to bridging the knowledge gap about this in the Iraqi environment.
2. The current research dealt with an important and active sample in society, represented by middle school students, on whom the future and development of society depend.
3. The current research is one of the few studies that address the variables of moral disengagement and aggressive behavior, both proactive and responsive, among middle school students, as far as the researcher knows. Thus, it is considered a modest scientific addition by the researcher to provide the Iraqi library in particular with such psychological topics, and an incentive to conduct future studies on its relationship to other variables among adolescents.
4. The current research is concerned with an age group that may suffer from some problems, which is the adolescent group, and its attempt to reveal the relationship between the two research variables and their impact on them, contribute to their psychological structure, and expand interest in this type of research for a greater understanding of this group.

Practical importance:

1. Preparing guidance, preventive, and therapeutic programs for those concerned (parents and teachers) to understand how moral disengagement occurs in adolescents and how to address it to modify their aggressive behavior.
2. It provides those working in the educational and psychological fields with data and information that may help them follow up on individuals who exhibit aggressive behavior in order to shed light on it, determine its causes, and then treat it through mechanisms to restore moral disengagement.
3. In light of the results of the current research, it is possible to benefit from educational, counseling, preventive, and therapeutic programs that are appropriate for adolescents to develop emotional control skills, control behavior, modify aggressive behavioral patterns, and disengage from moral ties, thus reducing their influence and spread among adolescents.
4. The current research also contributes to providing tools specific to the Iraqi environment by assessing moral disengagement and aggression, both proactive and responsive, which contributes to enriching the field of clinical psychological evaluation.

Chapter Two: The theoretical framework and previous studies

1. Theoretical framework:

Theories that explained aggression (proactive - reactive):

First: Social Learning Theory:

This theory is no less important than other theories that dealt with aggressive behavior, which were formulated by the American psychologist (Bandura). This theory emphasizes the role of social learning. He was interested in studying humans in their interaction with others, and personality in his conception is only understood through the social context and his behavior. It is formed by

observing the behavior of others. This theory is summarized that aggressive behavior is a social behavior learned through modeling or imitation of role models. Individuals learn from teachers, parents, and friends and from following what the media presents and the methods and information that enable them to practice it. When he receives reinforcement as a result of his aggression, Others tend to imitate him in his behavior, which leads to generalizing that behavior to other people (Bandura,1973:18).

Bandura emphasized that teaching behavior is done by observing the behavior of others and observing the results of their actions, and learning is not only about comprehensive models of behavior, but also the rules that are based on the behavior (Bandura,2002:19).

Bandura provides some evidence for the validity of his previous assumptions that proactive aggression is learned and acquired like other forms of behavior as follows:

Human beings are not born with a large repertoire of aggressive responses at their disposal. These responses are acquired in a manner similar to the manner in which various forms of complex behavior are acquired, and the educational process plays an important role in this behavioral pattern.

Children, adolescents, and adults who receive material or moral rewards are equal when directed toward aggression towards others or things around them. Aggressive behavior is not always positively reinforced with rewards and gifts because some aggressive behavior has more negative results, such as going to prison, than positive results, and aggressive behavior needs repeated reinforcement. To become a strong and persistent behavioral tendency among people (Bandura,2002:18).

Walsh has endorsed (Walsh) Bandura's point of view is that children learn methods of aggressive behavior from adults where they obtain material, social, or achievement gains or reinforcements. Children also learn aggressive behavior by watching violent movies and stories they read or obtaining information that enables them to assault themselves and others. Others (Shaya Magali, 2013: 75).

The growth and development of aggressive behavior represents an important place in the learning theory of acquiring proactive aggression. It has been possible to confirm that children watching aggression, whether directly or indirectly, leads to an increase in their proactive aggressive behavior, and that the effect of watching aggression continues to affect behavior even after a long period of interruption. Observing, the acquisition of proactive aggressive behavior through previous experiences that the individual goes through, and rewards and punishment leads to an increase in aggression, and this is confirmed by (Rabie, 1997; Rashid et al., 2023), as the studies he conducted in this regard indicate that "adolescents who lived in families that inflicted severe punishment "Were more likely to engage in aggression, directing insults, threats, abusing individuals, or obstructing goal-directed behavior that might lead to aggression" (Bandura,2002:25).

Second: The theory of (frustration - aggression):

It is one of the most famous theories that attempted to explain aggressive behavior. Among the most famous theorists of this theory are John Dollard, Neil Miller, and later Leonard Dobb.Doob, Hubert Mowrer, and Robert Caesar Sears. Dollard and Miller presented their first book in 1939, entitled (Frustration and Aggression), in which they analyzed Freud's opinion that frustration leads to aggression. They defined frustration as the state Which occurs to an individual when the satisfaction of any goal he has is hindered or is the painful psychological impact resulting from not achieving the goal. They defined aggression as any behavior that results in harm or harm to oneself, others, or the surrounding environment (Abdul Rahman, 1998: 609-610).

Socially, aggression can be viewed as any behavior aimed at destroying another person's property or harming another person physically or psychologically. The best explanation for reactive aggression

(responsive aggression) may be the (aggression-frustration) model, which assumes that aggression is an angry and vindictive reaction to provocation. Or as a result of feeling frustrated (Acet et al., 2012).

The theoretical explanations for responsive aggression are derived from the frustration model. This model describes aggressive behaviors as a result of frustration by explaining that if the goals pursued by the adolescent are blocked as a result of internal or external factors, hostility and anger may arise, and these increased negative feelings can increase the readiness for the purpose of aggression to defend oneself or to cause harm to the source of loved ones. The more important the goal he seeks is, the greater the frustration and the greater the aggressive motivation. If aggression in the past led this individual to get rid of frustration, the probability of him resorting to aggression in the future will increase, and the same thing. True for any other response) Miller & Lynam 2006:1475).

Miller is one of the most important pioneers of this theory Miller, Sears, and Dollard

This theory is based on two hypotheses:

1. Aggressive behavior requires the presence of frustrating situations for the individual
2. Having these situations is frustrating It may lead to some form of aggressive behavior

Dollard and Miller provide an explanation for aggressive behavior through their theory, which is based on the assumption of (frustration-aggression). This theory believes that aggressive behavior is always the result of...a Frustration and that frustration always leads to a form of aggression, meaning that aggression is a natural and inevitable result of a Frustration, and whenever an aggressive act occurs, it is assumed that frustration is what instigated it. This theory also confirms that aggression is an internal instinctive motive, but it is not driven by instinct, as the theory of instincts has shown, but rather as a result of the influence of external factors. Dollard, the pioneer of this theory, confirms that aggressive behavior is a result of normal for a Frustration, frustration is prevention or obstruction, and the individual is frustrated when he is hindered from satisfying his needs, meaning that the individual feels a Frustration when his behavior produces results that do not satisfy his needs or satisfy his motives and the physical deficiency represented by his defect H Or a deformity that is considered one of the sources of frustration, and each individual has a certain capacity or range for how much frustration he can tolerate, and after this range the individual may explode into uncontrolled antisocial behavior, and the intensity of this behavior increases as the duration of frustration increases. Freud, 1933:98-102).

This theory influenced TaThera! Ambiguous in aggression continuously to a For many decades, the theory tends to justify aggressive behavior, such as feelings of distress a Frustration made me do that, and thus I assume that the occurrence of aggressive behavior always presupposes the presence of frustration, and on the contrary, the presence of frustration always leads to the emergence of responsive aggression, which depends on frustration, making frustration a necessary and sufficient condition for responsive aggression.

Thus, the frustration and aggression model views aggression in this case as responsive aggression, which represents a performative and angry act of perceived frustration according to this theory, where anger, a planned threat, or obstruction of goals are seen as factors that lead to an aggressive response (responsive aggression), and Dollard has concluded Miller and Miller based their study on some general foundations about the relationship between frustration and aggression and considered them as specific psychological foundations. H For this relationship:

- 1- The intensity of the desire for aggressive behavior varies depending on the amount of frustration, and the amount of frustration varies ba The different stages it goes through are:
 - أ- The intensity of the desire for a frustrating response.
 - ب- The extent of interference or obstruction of the frustrating response.
 - ت- The number of times the response was frustrated.

- 2- The intensity of the desire to act hostilely against what the individual perceives as a source of his frustration increases, and the individual's tendency to act non-hostilely toward what the individual perceives to be the source of his frustration decreases.
- 3- Aggressive responses may appear as a result of imitation.
- 4- Stopping aggressive behavior in frustrating situations amounts to another frustration that leads to an increase in responsive aggressive behavior on the part of the individual and against the main source of frustration. (Miller & Lynam, 2006).

The researcher adopted Bandura's (2002) theory of proactive aggression and Miller and Lynam's (2006) theory of responsive aggression.

PREVIOUS STUDIES

Studies related to aggression (proactive - reactive):

1 - Study (Mahmoud et al., 2015):

The study aimed to find the relationship between aggression (proactive-reactive) and empathy among the hearing-impaired and to find out the types of aggression that characterize the hearing-impaired. The study sample consisted of (132) hearing-impaired children, and the sample was divided into (83) male children. And (49) female children in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. The researchers applied the aggression scale (numbers: Dodge, Coie: 1987), and the researchers translated and Arabized the two scales and codified them in the Saudi environment. As a result, a statistically significant negative correlation was found between proactive aggression and reactive aggression and their relationship to emotional and cognitive empathy among the hearing impaired. (Mahmoud et al., 2015).

-The study of Fung et al (2018 Fung et al.,) :

The study aimed to measure reactive aggression and proactive aggression among adolescents in Spain. The study sample included (1203) male and female adolescents, whose ages ranged between (10-20) years. The Responsive Aggression Scale and the Proactive Aggression Scale were used. The results of the study concluded that proactive aggression appears among adolescents, as they grow older, it was also found that males have higher levels of general responsive aggression than females, while proactive aggression was found to be high in females only compared to males. (2018 Fung et al.,).

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

1- Research Methodology Methodology of the Research:

The researcher adopted the descriptive, correlational approach in the process of collecting and analyzing data.

2- research community Population of the Research:

The current research population is limited to middle school students and all middle school schools in Najaf Al-Ashraf, which amount to (50) schools/morning classes for the academic year 2023-2024, as the original research population reached (32,118) male and female students, with (15,552) males and (16,566) males. Of females, there were 21,707 male and female students in the scientific specialization, while in the literary specialization there were (10,411) male and female students.

3- The research sample:

The researcher selected a random exploratory sample with a proportional distribution, consisting of (30) male and female students, distributed between scientific and literary specializations, and Table (2) shows this.

Table 2: Distribution of members of the survey sample by school, academic major, and gender, according to percentages

the total	Total ratio	The ratio	Females	the school	The ratio	Male	the school	Academic specialization	T
20	66.66%	36.66%	11	A. Latakia	30%	9	A. Editing	Scientific	1
10	33.32%	16.66%	5	A. Al-Zahraa	16.66%	5	A. Imam Hussein	Literary	2
30	100%	53.32%	16		46.66%	14	the total		

4- Mr. DrAndSearchInstruments of the Research:

The researcher resorted to a series of procedures for constructing the scale, which requires psychometric properties of (validity and reliability).

The researcher adopted Bandura's theory Bandura (2002) as a theoretical framework for proactive aggression, It adopted Miller and Lynem's theory (Miller & Lynam, 2006) as a theoretical framework for reactive aggression.

Indicators sincerity the scale: Prepare Honesty from Most important Properties Psychometrics that Should Availability in Measurement psychological, so that it Pointing capacity the scale on measurement what He should Measure it actually (Harrison, 1983:11), So It was completed making sure from sincerity the scale Present on road three Species from Honesty The following: Which As follows:

- Honesty Virtual Face Validity:

this Type from Honesty He represents By examination The first For contents the scale, any look to Paragraphs And knowledge What It seems that You measure it, And it comes true this Type from Honesty when get up Specialists Checking the scale, then Concludes that His vertebrae on what It seems You measure Apparent what he claims the scale Measure it (Weiner & Stewart, 1984:79), and it has verification this Type from Honesty when She got up The researcher With a width the scale on (30) tight as Explained in paragraph Power the scale.

- Honesty Discriminatory:

extracted Transactions Discrimination For paragraphs in a manner The two groups The two terminals, And it was all Paragraphs Featured For scale.

- sincerity Building Construct Validity:

Means analysis grades the scale Based on to Building Psychological For the property What is meant? Measure it, any that it Show Bezel what Include it the scale from building theoretical specific or Trait Certain (Stanley & Hopkin, 1972:111),

And it has It was completed Verification from sincerity Building For scale on road Indicators that bitter He mentioned it previously in Analysis Statistician For paragraphs the scale Which:

relationship degree Paragraph By degree the college For the field: It was completed Extract Valuable Transactions Engagement degree Paragraph By degree the college for scale, It turns out that all Transactions Link Function Statistically when level indication(0.05).

Indicators stability the scale Reliability:

She got up The researcher Extracting stability the scale With three Methods And as Come:

أ. road the test-re the test:

To calculate Consistency With this method, Dish the scale on a sample I was chosen In style Random Self distribution Proportionate Its texture(50)student And a student from Both majors Scientific And the literary And it was done re application the scale on the group itself after He went on a period Stretch it out(14)One day on Application the first, And it was done account Factor Engagement(Pearson)between grades Individuals in The two applications for every area Aggression Proactive(0.77)And aggression Responsive(0.75), so be seen all from(Stanley&Hopkins)that Term the appropriate For laboratories Consistency To measure phenomenon Psychological Certain Ranging between(0.65–0.93).262) Stanley & Hopkins,1972:)And it is clear Its details in Schedule(9).

ب. road Retail Midterm:

Prepare Consistency With this method An indicator on Consistency Internal For paragraphs in measurement what Developed To measure it Furethor, 1978: 69)& Guilford), And just Consistency With this method By credit on grades a sample Application the first For stability re the test Referred to her previously, And the adult its size(50)student And a student,

It was completed Extract Factor Engagement(Pearson)between grades The two halves For scale Aggression(Proactive)And aggression(Responsive), And using equation(Spearman , Brown)Corrective So it was Factor Consistency For aggression Proactive(0.74), And for aggression Responsive(0.76), Which Indicator on stability the scale, so that Term the appropriate For laboratories Consistency(0.93-0.65)(Stanley & Hopkins,1972), as Shown in Schedule(9).

ج. Consistency in a way alpha Cronbach:

It was completed application the scale on a sample reach Its texture(400)student And a student It was completed Her choice In the way Random Class Self distribution proportionate, so reach Factor stability Scale Aggression Proactive(0.73)degree And also reach amount Factor stability Scale Aggression Responsive(0.72)degree, Which Indicator on stability the scale, As shown in Schedule(9).

Schedule(9)Transactions Consistency For scale Aggression(Proactive-Responsive)And its fields in a way re the test And in a way Retail Midterm And alpha Cronbach

Cronbach's alpha method	Half retail		Retest method	Aggression
	Stability coefficient after correction	Stability coefficient before correction		
0.73	0.74	0.61	0.77	Proactive
0.72	0.76	0.69	0.75	Responsive

Presentation and interpretation of results

– the first goal: Identifying aggression (proactive-responsive) For middle school students:

To achieve this the goal She got up The researcher By applying Scale Aggression(Proactive-Responsive)on Individuals a sample search Adult Their number(500)student And a student, And after practical to treat data Statistically, Lost I showed Results that middle grades the sample on Scale Aggression Proactive reach(29.13)degree And with a deviation normative Its amount(10.83)degree, As for Average Arithmetic For aggression Responsive reach(37.47)degree And with a deviation normative Its amount(12.99)degree, And from Okay Identify on indication Differences Statistics Between them It was completed use the test Al-Tai Damn one(T-Test)It turns out Existence difference D Statistically between them, where I reached the value T Calculated For behavior Aggression Proactive(-43.07)degree, As for behavior Aggression Responsive(-21.54)degree, Which Younger from the value Tabulation Adult(-1.96), when level indication(0.05)And a degree freedom(499), Than Means non Existence Differences Self indication Statistic between Average Arithmetic For aggression Proactive And the responsive one And the middle Hypothetical Adult(50)degree, And I found it Differences Favor Average Hypothetical, And a schedule(11)It is clear that.

Function at the 0.05 level	T value		Degree of freedom	Hypothetical mean	standard deviation	SMA	the sample	Variable
	Tabulation	Calculated						
0,05A function in favor of the hypothesized mean	1.96-	-43.07	499	50	10.83	29.13	500	Proactive aggression
0,05A function in favor of the hypothesized mean	1.96-	-21.54	499	50	12.99	37.47	500	Responsive aggression

Schedule(11)Value T Calculated And the tabular To signify the difference between Average Arithmetic And the average Hypothetical For scale Aggression(Proactive-Responsive)

Be consoled The researcher This is amazing The result to that drop level Aggression(Proactive-Responsive)I have Students stage Junior high a sample search may be Due to Laws that I put it down Education, Which Determine behavior requester inside the school from Okay success the operation

Educational So will Reflected application This is amazing Laws Positively on behavior requester And with this He is less aggression, And also See The researcher may be Due to Dealing Educational Available in Departments Schools As well as on Existence Guidance Educational in a lot from schools, And existence leader Educational if He was get up By his duty on Toward distinct In a way big in Solution Problems most Students Whose They have some Behaviors abnormal, and that Existence teenager in the environment school reflects impact This is amazing the environment on His behavior Sure will He is there interaction positive Between them Even if By limit The lowest and this is His reason between requester And his colleagues from Side And between Administration And teachers from Side other, gesticulate Availability the environment school from Forms Follow the example With it requester teenager And it was formed for him Importance Great in Interaction And deal with

others, and that that Confirms what She came with it theory Learning Social on The role that You play it Note And models And role model And reinforcers that Support the behavior Positive Built on Interaction And share inside Enterprise educational, maybe Explanation The result current That Personal Aggressiveness that Is characterized by With hostility Toward the people And try the control on them, she has also the desire in Empathy And the tendency to isolate, But it is Moving according to direction More powerful that He specifies Overall Her activity, where be seen Miller that palm the behavior Hostile in Attitudes Frustration As frustration last, and that To frustrate results Other As well as on Aggression like pulling out, And apathy feelings, And recidivism or Installation on Patterns behaviorism Certain

(Miller & Lynam,2006),This is amazing The result no She agrees with most results Studies Previous that I had Aggression(Proactive-Responsive)As a study(Hoda And Hammad,2016) And study(Esther, Lzaskun: 2010)And also study(Euler, 2017 & Stadler).

The goal the second:Identify on indication Differences in Aggression(Proactive-Responsive)Depending For my variable Sex And specialization Academic And interaction Between them I have Students stage Junior high:

Firstly-Differences in level Aggression(Proactive)Depending For my variable Sex And specialization:

To achieve this the goal used The researcher analysis variance the couple Two Way Anova))To get to know on indication Differences in behavior Aggression Proactive According to Sex(Males-Females)And specialization Academic(scientific-literary)And interaction between them, as Explained in Schedule(12).

Schedule (12)results a test analysis variance the couple For the differences in grades Individuals the sample on Scale Aggression(Proactive)According to My variable Sex And specialization Academic And interaction Between them I have Students stage Junior high.

A function at a level 0,05	F valueF		Mean squares	Degree of freedom	Sum of squares	Source of variance
	Tabulation	Calculated				
DHStatistically in favor of scientific	3.84	5.924	689.070	1	689.070	Specialization
Not statistically significant		0.700	81.430	1	81.430	Sex
Not a signHStatistically		0.473	55.022	1	55.022	Gender* for specialty
			116.324	496	57696.806	The error
				500	482,898,000	total summation

Firstly: Value Function on Scale Aggression(Proactive)I have Individuals the sample:

While Regard With what Produce it analysis variance the couple Found The researcher that Value I posed in:

1. Value Function Differences in Specialization Academic(scientific-literary)on Scale Aggression(Proactive):

notice that the value F Calculated For specialization Academic Adult(5.924)degree she Larger from the value F Tabulation Adult(3.84)degree Favor Specialization Scientific when level(0,05)And to a degree freedom(1,496), Than indicates that it Function Statistically Favor Specialization scientific, And I mean that Specialization Scientific They have behavior Aggression Proactive more from Specialization literary, And it was Average Arithmetic For specialization Scientific reach(29.937)degree And with a deviation normative(11.581)degree Which Larger from Average Arithmetic For specialization Literary that reach(27.497)And with a deviation normative(8.938)degree, In comparison between The averages We find that it There are Differences Self indication Statistic Clear between The averages Favor Specialization Scientific For scale Aggression(Proactive), And a schedule(13)It is clear that.

Schedule(13)It is clear Averages between Both majors(Scientific-Literary) on Scale Aggression(Proactive)

standard deviation	SMA	the sample	Specialization	T
11.581	29.937	335	scientific	1
8.938	27.497	165	literary	2

Explain The researcher This is amazing The result in a light Concept Aggression Proactive That Students With Specialization Scientific a result For their feelings By deprivation And not Existence the time Enough For entertainment So to understand more Focused on Their goals And their needs Hate look on Goals others And respect it, And therefore may be They rise in way Get on this With many from Behaviors Proactiveness Anti To their peers Without Specialties And even Their peers in the society that maybe that You make them feel While after guilty, So They rise By throwing Blame And attribute it to sources External Like studying And nature Specialization Scientific that He forbids them from practice what get up with it Students from With Specialties The other And we touch that from during questions that Include it a test Aggression proactive, In addition to the age And the stage Scholarship And class Academic And the curriculum Academic,And nature Specialization.

Secondly:Value not Function Differences on Scale Aggression(Proactive)I have Individuals the sample:

1. Differences Statistics in Sex(Males-Females):

indicate Results to that the value F Calculated For sex Adult(0.700)degree Which Younger from the value F Tabulation Adult(3.84)degree when level(0,05)And to a degree freedom(1,496), Than indicates that it not Function Statistically no There is differences, And he notices from schedule(27)that Average Arithmetic For males reach(29.600)degree And with a deviation normative(11.676)degree and he Larger from Average Arithmetic For females(28.682)degree And with a deviation normative(9.958)degree, as Explained in Schedule(14).

Schedule (14) It is clear Averages between(Male And females)For scale Aggression(Proactive)

standard deviation	SMA	the sample	Sex	T
11.676	29.600	245	Males	1
9.958	28.682	255	Females	2

Indicates schedule(14)that it not there Differences in Aggression Proactive Depending For a variable Sex(Males-Females), And that because the value F Calculated(0.700)less from the value F Tabulation Adult(3.84)when level(0.05)And a degree freedom(1,496).

maybe Explanation This is amazing The result to that drop behavior Aggression I have Male And females I have Students stage Junior high Due to Laws that I put it down Education, where Reflected application This is amazing Laws Positively on behavior requester And with this He is less aggression, no We ignore when Role Cohesion Histological For the community The Iraqi And a role Upbringing Social in Refinement behavior Individuals And publish love And tolerance While between them As more Desirability from Hatred And hate And desire in Abuse And revenge, And also The atmosphere Family Tolerant And love Contribute in formation Dignitaries Together And compatible And capable on Adaptation with life And its pressures different, as that the level Cultural For parents impact With a picture Positive in bringing up Individuals Family bringing up correct And she refuses The performance With behaviors aggressiveness, And also The role the important For means Educate And guidance in the society The Iraqi.

2. Differences Statistics in Interaction between(Sex And specialization Academic):

As for in what Regards level Interaction between My variable search Lost Found The researcher that Interactions between Variables not Function Statistically so I reached value(F)Calculated To interact between My variable(Sex And specialization) (0.473)degree Which Younger from the value F Tabulation Adult(3.84)degree when level(0,05)And to a degree freedom(1,496), Than indicates that it no There are Differences in Interaction between a variable Sex And specialization Academic on Scale Aggression(Proactive), Meaning that Aggression Proactive no Affected in Type Specialization Academic And sex together, And the explained in schedule(12), And it can Explanation that that what between the students Male And female students Females no There is between them difference in level Aggression proactive, and that Aggression Proactive may be no Affected in Type Specialization Academic.

Secondly-Differences in level Aggression(Responsive)Depending For my variable Sex And specialization Academic:

To achieve this the goal used The researcher analysis variance the couple Two Way Anova))To get to know on indication Differences in behavior Aggression Responsive According to Sex(Males-Females)And specialization Academic(scientific-literary)And interaction between them, as Explained in Schedule(15).

Schedule(15)results a test analysis variance the couple For the differences in grades Individuals the sample on Scale Aggression(Responsive)According to My variable Sex And specialization Academic And interaction Between them I have Students stage Junior high

A function at a level 0,05	F valueF		Mean squares	Degree of freedom	Sum of squares	Source of variance	
	Tabulation	Calculated					
Statistically significant in favor of scientific	3.84	12.071	1995.559	1	1995.559	Specialization	
Not statistically significant		0.898	148.513	1	148.513	Sex	
Not statistically significant		0.035	5.806	1	5.806	Gender* for specialty	
				165.325	496	82001.033	The error
					500	786599.000	total summation

Firstly:Value Function on Scale Aggression(Responsive)I have Individuals the sample:

While Regard With what Produce it analysis variance the couple Found The researcher that Value I posed in:

1. Value Function Differences in Specialization Academic(scientific-literary)on Scale Aggression(Responsive):

notice that the value F Calculated For specialization Academic Adult(12.071)degree Which Larger from the value F Tabulation Adult(3.84)degree Favor Specialization Scientific when level(0.05)And to a degree freedom(1), Than indicates that it Function Statistically Favor Specialization scientific, And I mean that Specialization Scientific They have behavior Aggression Responsive more from Specialization literary, And it was Average Arithmetic For specialization Scientific reach(38.916)degree And with a deviation normative(13.299)degree Which Larger from Average Arithmetic For specialization The humanitarian that reach(34.557)And with a deviation normative(11.872)degree, In comparison between The averages We find that it There are Differences Self indication Statistic Clear between The averages Favor Specialization Scientific For scale Aggression(Responsive), And a schedule(16)It is clear that.

Schedule(16)It is clear Averages between Both majors(Scientific-Literary) on Scale Aggression(Responsive)

standard deviation	SMA	the sample	Specialization	T
13.299	38.916	335	scientific	1
11.872	34.557	165	literary	2

It turns out from schedule above Existence difference Favor Specialization scientific, And attributed that to culture the society that He lives in it Individuals In addition to sentence from Conflicts Mental And social that It is difficult Adaptation with her especially if did not Find The floor Occasion that Help him on to understand This is amazing the changes And it becomes more Hostility with The surroundings with it, And given when involves on him the behavior aggressive Responsive from antiquities Psychological And social Bad So it is This is amazing Aggressiveness directed Toward Self or to the outside And it shows In a way clear in Specialties scientific, I explained Results to that Specialization Academic Prepare from Things The predictor With behavior aggressive because of difficulty Materials And he pressed the society And the family on them, that Interpretations the theory For aggression Responsive derived from model Frustration where that this Sample Described Behaviors Aggressiveness on that it a result To frustrate And that from during Explanation that it if It was completed ban Objectives that Seek to her teenager As a result For factors Internal or Factors External.

secondly:Value not Function Differences on Scale Aggression(Responsive)I have Individuals the sample:

1. Differences Statistics in Sex(Males-Females):

indicate Results to that the value F Calculated For sex Adult(0.898)degree Which Younger from the value F Tabulation Adult(3.84)degree when level(0.05)And to a degree freedom(1,496), Than indicates that it not Function Statistically no There is differences, And he notices from Schedule(30)that Average Arithmetic For males reach(36.685)degree And with a deviation normative(13.584)degree and he Younger from Average Arithmetic For females(38.239)degree And with a deviation normative(12.386)degree, as Explained in Schedule(17).

Schedule(17)It is clear Averages between(Male And females) For scale Aggression(Responsive)

standard deviation	SMA	the sample	Sex	T
13.584	36.685	245	Males	1
12.386	38.239	255	Females	2

maybe Explanation that to that The majority Great from Students She refuses an idea Aggression But it is Accept With violence in condition Defense on Self or the offer or the money or on Right, See The researcher that This is amazing The result Return to that Male And females They are equal in Aggression responsive, and on Although from that The researcher did not You find from Studies what supports This is amazing The result or opposes it, unless that it She agrees with what came in Production Theoretical That Aggression Responsive did not Associated With pressure, But Associated By not Ability on Adjust Emotions And control In which(Miller & Lynam,2006) (Debowska etal.,2015)

2. Differences Statistics in Interaction between(Sex And specialization Academic):

As for in what Regards level Interaction between My variable search Lost Found The researcher that Interactions between Variables not Function Statistically so I reached value(F)Calculated To interact between My variable(Sex And specialization) (0.035)degree Which Younger from the value F Tabulation Adult(3.84)degree when level(0.05)And to a degree freedom(1,496), Than indicates that it no There are Differences in Interaction between a variable Sex And specialization Academic on

Scale Aggression(Responsive), And the explained in Schedule(15), And it can Explanation that that what between the students Male And female students Females no There is between them difference in level Aggression responsive, and that Aggression Responsive may be no Affected in Type Specialization academic, did not bog down The researcher on studies She agrees or Disagree a result this the goal.

CONCLUSIONS

building on Results that Reach out to her search Present maybe that Determine The researcher following:

from where Aggression(Proactive-Responsive):

1. that Students stage Junior high no They tend to the behavior aggressive In kind(Proactive-Responsive).
2. no There are Differences Function Statistically according to a variable Sex between(Male And females)in behavior Aggression(Proactive-Responsive)I have Students stage Junior high.
3. There are Differences Function Statistically according to a variable Specialization Academic(Scientific-Literary)Favor Scientific in behavior Aggression(Proactive-Responsive)I have Students stage Junior high.
4. no There are Differences Function Statistically in Interaction between My variable Sex And specialization Academic in behavior Aggression(Proactive-Responsive)I have Students stage Junior high.

SOURCES

Arabic sources

- Al-Zoubi, Sameh (2007). Social, economic, and academic factors affecting the tendency towards aggressive behavior among Hashemite University students, *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 34 (1): 73-82.
- Shaya Magali (2013). Self-esteem and its relationship to aggressive behavior among eighth-grade students in basic education in the city of Saada, *Damascus University Journal*, 29 (1). 59-104.
- Abdel Rahman, Mohamed El-Sayed (1998). *Personality theories in the light of psychoanalysis*, ed1, daRNews for printingPublishing, Cairo.
- AbdullahH, Muhammad Mahmoud (2013). *Adolescence and caring for adolescents*, 1st edition, Ghaida Publishing House.
- Al-Assar, Islam (2015). *Temporary distortions and their relationship to the meaning of life among adolescents in the Gaza Strip*, Master's thesis (unpublished), Gaza, Islamic University.
- Al-Mayahi, Jaafar AbdAl-Kadhim and Al-Rikabi, Abdullah Kadhim (2013). Aggressive behavior among middle school students, *Arak Journal of Philosophy, Linguistics and Social Sciences*, Issue Twelve, Fifth Year: 57-58.

Foreign sources:

- Acet, M., Tazegul, U., Kocapinar, O., & Bas, Z. (2012). A comparison of the levels of aggression and assertiveness between amputee and hearing-impaired football players. *International Journal of Academic Research*, 4(3):5-10.
- Bandura, A. (1973). *Aggression: A social learning analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Bandura, A. (2002). Social Cognitive Theory in Cultural Context. *Journal of Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 51(2): 269-290.
- Caroline, M., Pattard, A. & Patrick, P. (2016). **Cognitive distortions**, University of Louisville.
- Connor, D. F., Steingard, R. J., Cunningham, J. A., Anderson, J. J., & Melloni, R. H. (2004). Proactive and reactive aggression in referred children and adolescents. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 74(2): 129-136.
- Esther, calvete, lzaskun, Orue, (2010) Cognitive schemes and Aggressive Behavior in Adolescents: the mediating role of social information processing, the Spanish Journal of Psychology, Vol: 13.
- Euler, F., Steinlin, C., & Stadler, C. (2017). Distinct profiles of reactive and proactive aggression in adolescents: Associations with cognitive and affective empathy. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Mental Health*, 11(1): 1-14.
- Freud, S. (1933). New Introductory lecture on Psycho-Analysis. In J. Strachy, Standard Edition. 22, London: Hogarth Press Ltd.
- Fung, A., Raine, A., & Gao, Y. (2009). Cross-Cultural Generalize Ability of the Reactive-Proactive Aggression Questionnaire (RPQ). *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 91(5): 473-479.
- Guilford, J. P., & Furethor, B. (1978). *Fundamental statistics in psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Jam, F. A., Singh, S. K. G., Ng, B., & Aziz, N. (2018). The interactive effect of uncertainty avoidance cultural values and leadership styles on open service innovation: A look at malaysian healthcare sector. *International Journal of Business and Administrative Studies*, 4(5), 208-223.
- Kanval, N., Ihsan, H., Irum, S., & Ambreen, I. (2024). Human Capital Formation, Foreign Direct Investment Inflows, and Economic Growth: A Way Forward to Achieve Sustainable Development. *Journal of Management Practices, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 8(3), 48-61.
- Rashid, A., Jehan, Z., & Kanval, N. (2023). External Shocks, Stock Market Volatility, and Macroeconomic Performance: An Empirical Evidence from Pakistan. *Journal of Economic Cooperation & Development*, 44(2), 1-26.
- Harrison, A. (1983). *Language Testing hand book*, London: Macmillan press.
- Miller, J. D., & Lynam, D. R. (2006). Reactive and proactive aggression: similarities and differences. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 41(8): 1469-1480.
- Stanley, J., & Hopkins, D. (1972). *Educational and psychological measurement and evaluation*. New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Weiner, E., & Stewart, B. (1984). *Assessing individuals: psychological and educational tests and measurements*. Boston: Little, Brown & Company.
- Vitaro, F, Brendgen M, & Barker ED (2006). Subtypes of aggressive behaviors: A developmental perspective. **International Journal of Behavioral Development**, 30(1):12-19.