

# أسباب السلوك الاستقوائي من وجهة نظر الطلبة المستقوين والضحايا



كلية التربية – جامعة البريموك

تاريخ القبول : 2010/02/18

تاريخ الاستلام : 2009/10/29

## الخلاصة:

هدفت الدراسة إلى الكشف عن أسباب السلوك الاستقوائي من وجهة نظر الطلبة المستقوين والطلبة الضحايا، وفيما إذا كانت هذه الأسباب تختلف باختلاف جنس الطالب ومكان سكنه. تألفت عينة الدراسة من (143) طالباً وطالبة من الصف السابع إلى الصف العاشر، تم تصنيفهم إلى (49) مستقوياً و(94) ضحية. طبق على أفراد عينة الدراسة مقاييس الاستقواء والوقوع ضحية وأسباب الاستقواء وأسباب الوقوع ضحية. كشفت نتائج الدراسة أن أبرز أسباب السلوك الاستقوائي من وجهة نظر المستقوين هي: أن الضحية يتظاهر بأنه شخص مهم، ينقل معلومات عن الطلبة للمعلمين، ليس لديه أصدقاء يدافعون عنه، علاماته سيئة في المدرسة، يتظاهر بأنه شخص غني. أما أبرز أسباب السلوك الاستقوائي من وجهة نظر الضحايا فكانت: صمت الضحية، وطاعة كل ما يقوله المعلم والغرور، ولباسه ومظهره المميزين، والفقر. في حين لم تكشف الدراسة عن فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية في أسباب السلوك الاستقوائي والوقوع ضحية له، تعزى لمتغيري الجنس ومكان السكن.

(الكلمات المفتاحية: الاستقواء، الوقوع ضحية).

## المقدمة:

»  
(Bully)  
(Victim)  
« (Juvonen, Graham & Shuster, 2003,p. 1231)  
» (Glew, Rivara & Feudtner, 2000,p. 184)  
» (Rigby, 2002,p. 6) .«  
.«

(Mynard & Joseph, 2000)  
(Olweus, 1993)

.(Olweus, 1993)

:

Clarke & )

(Kiselica, 1997

Nasel, Overpeck, Pilla, Ruan, Simons- )

.(Morton, & Scheidt, 2001

(Atkinson & Hornby, 2002)  
Smith, Shu & Madsen, )  
. (Schwartz, Dodge & Coie, 1993) (2001

. (Atkinson & Hornby, 2002)  
Carney & Merrell, )  
. (2001

Warden & ) . (Atkinson & Hornby, 2002)  
(Mackinnon 2003

10-9 (131)  
21

14 23

(Fox & Boulton, 2002)

(449)

11-9

(Connolly & O'Moore, 2003)

(Perren & Hornung, 2005)

(Patterson, 1982, 1986)

Demarey & Malecki, ) .(Carney &Merrell, 2001  
(2003)

Loeber & ) .(Stouthamer-loeber, 1986

Perry, Perry & ) (Kennedy, 1992  
(Georgiou, 2008)

McNamara & ) (Owleus, 1993) .(MacNamara, 1997

(2008)

(656)

(2009)

(978) (463) (515) (26) (67) (837) - (48)

(Carney & Merrell, 2001)

.(Elinoff, Chafouleas, & Sassu, 2004)

(Lagerspetz, Bjorkqvist, Berts, & King, 1982)  
(Olweus, 1991)  
(Deviant)

» (Kim, 2004)  
«

(134) (271) (405)  
(14-12)

( )

)

(

(Kim, 2004)

### مشكلة الدراسة:

(Bowsworth Espelage & Simon, 1999)  
(160000)

(2009 2008).

( )

:

1:

2:

3:

( )

**أهمية الدراسة:**

:

## التعريفات الإجرائية:

▪ :

(2009).

▪ :

(2009).

▪ :

▪ :

## الطريقة والإجراءات:

## مجتمع الدراسة:

## عينة الدراسة:

(1480)

( )



(16) (32)

(1480)

(16)  
185-150

-  
:

(3.5) : - 1  
( $119 = 3.5 \times 34$ )  
( $75 = 2.5 \times 30$ ) (2.5)  
(49)

(3.5) : - 2  
(2.5) ( $105 = 3.5 \times 30$ )  
(94) ( $85 = 2.5 \times 34$ )

(3.5) : / - 3  
(3.5) ( $119$ )  
( $105$ )

(77)

) : - 4  
(1218) (2.5)

(3.5 - 2.5) - 5  
(42)

-

(3.5 - 2.5)  
(14.51) (143)  
(1) (94) (49) (1.12)

أسباب السلوك الاستقوائي من وجهة نظر الطلبة المستقيمين والضحايا

( )		(1)		
105	%81.6	40	%69.1	65
38	%18.4	9	%30.9	29
<b>143</b>	<b>49</b>		<b>94</b>	
88	%59.2	29	%62.8	59
55	%40.8	20	%37.2	35
<b>143</b>	<b>49</b>		<b>94</b>	

أدوات الدراسة:

:

أولاً: مقياس الاستقواء:

(2009)

(38)

:

(0.83) (0.92) (0.87)  
 (0.81) (0.88) :  
 » « :  
 .«

ثانياً: مقياس الوقوع ضحية الاستقواء:

(38)

(2009)

:

(0.93)

(0.84) (0.88)  
 (0.92) :

» : (0.78)  
« » «

### ثالثاً: مقياس أسباب السلوك الاستقوائي:

(Lee & Kwak, 2000)

(35)

(4)

(0.80)

(3)

(32)

« »

(120)

(0.93 - 0.76)

(0.91).

### رابعاً: مقياس أسباب الوقوع ضحية الاستقواء:

(Lee & Kwak, 2000)

(35)

(4)

(0.80)

(32)

(3)

« »

(120)

(0.91 - 0.73)

.(0.86)

### تصحيح المقاييس:

4 =

5= ( )

2 =

3 =

.( 1 =

(1)

. ( )

### حدود الدراسة:

- 
- 

### منهج الدراسة:

## نتائج الدراسة:

## السؤال الأول:

( )  
:

(2)

1	69.4	34		1
3	61.2	30		10
4	59.2	29		26
5	49.0	24	( )	12
5	49.0	24		30
2	65.3	23		25
7	44.9	22		2
8	42.9	21		3
9	38.8	19		28
10	38.8	19		22
11	36.7	18		29
11	36.7	18		8
11	36.7	18		24
11	36.7	18		7
15	35.2	17		4
15	35.5	17		15
15	35.5	17		9
18	28.6	14		17
18	28.6	14	« »	20
20	26.5	13		19
20	26.5	13		21
20	26.5	13		5
23	24.5	12	« »	16
23	24.5	12		31
25	22.4	11		6
25	22.4	11	( )	11
27	20.4	10		18

أسباب السلوك الاستقوائي من وجهة نظر الطلبة المستقوين والضحايا

27	20.4	10	.	32
29	16.3	8	.	27
29	16.3	8	.	13
31	12.2	6	.	23
32	12.2	6	.	14

(2)

» (69.4 - 12.2)  
 » «  
 » «  
 .« ( )

## السؤال الثاني:

( ) .( )  
(3)

(3)

1	83.1	64	« »	16
2	67.0	52	.	24
3	54.5	42	.( )	11
4	50.6	39	.	29
5	49.4	38	.	31
6	36.4	28	.	18
6	33.8	26	.	23
8	32.6	25	.	15
9	31.2	24	.	32
10	29.9	23	.	28
11	29.9	23	.	1
11	29.9	23	.	4
13	27.7	21	.	2
13	27.7	21	.	6
13	27.7	21	.	8
16	23.4	18	.	17
17	22.1	17	.	27
17	22.1	17	.	14
17	22.1	17	.	26
20	20.8	16	.	5
20	20.8	16	.	21
20	20.8	16	.	22
23	19.5	15	.	19
23	19.5	15	.	3
25	18.2	14	.	7
25	18.2	14	.( )	12
26	16.9	13	.	13
26	16.9	13	« »	20
28	11.7	9	.	9
28	11.7	9	.	10
38	11.7	9	.	25

(3)  
(83.1 - 11.7)  
»  
» « ( )  
«  
» «  
« » «



### السؤال الثالث:

( )

»

: (7-4) «

أولاً: الجنس:

(4)

( )

0.567	0.038	6	28		1
		12.2	57.1		
0.140	2.112	6	16		2
		12.2	32.7		
0.314	0.726	5	16		3
		10.2	32.7		
0.489	0.149	5	25		10
		10.2	51.0		
0.253	1.080	3	21	( )	12
		6.1	42.9		
0.275	0.999	2	16		22
		4.1	32.7		
0.323	0.757	7	25		25
		14.3	51.0		
0.455	0.256	6	23		26
		12.2	46.9		
0.511	0.138	3	16		28
		6.1	32.7		
0.253	1.080	3	21		30
		6.1	42.9		

( ) (4)  
.(2.112 – 0.038)

( )  
:

(5)

( )

0.39	2.99	9 %9.6	17 %18.1	( )	11
0.50	0.44	10 %10.6	18 %19.1		15
0.93	0.01	14 %14.9	32 %34.0	« »	16
0.97	0.001	9 %9.6	20 %21.3		18
0.15	2.03	6 %6.4	23 %24.5		23
0.10	2.70	9 %9.6	32 %34.0		24
0.41	0.66	8 %8.5	13 %13.8		28
0.68	0.16	9 %9.6	23 %24.5		29
0.10	2.66	13 %13.8	18 %19.1		31
0.52	0.40	8 %8.5	14 %14.9		32

( ) (5)  
.(2.99 – 0.001)

ثانياً: مكان السكن:

(6)

( )

0.23	1.40	12	22		1
		%24.5	%44.9		
0.08	3.03	6	16		2
		%12.2	%32.7		
0.13	2.28	6	15		3
		%12.2	%30.6		
0.45	0.55	11	19		10
		%22.4	%38.8		
0.29	1.09	8	16		12
		%16.3	%32.7		
0.69	0.15	8	10		22
		%16.3	%20.4		
0.97	0.001	13	19		25
		%26.5	%38.8		
0.92	0.01	12	17		26
		%24.5	%34.7		
0.88	0.02	8	11		28
		%16.3	%22.4		
0.20	1.64	12	12		30
		%24.5	%24.5		

( ) (6)

.(3.03 - 0.001)

( )  
:

(7)

(7)

( )

0.68	1.49	11 %11.7	15 %16.0		11 ( ) .
0.50	0.44	9 %9.6	19 %20.2		15
0.36	0.82	15 %16.0	31 %33.0		16 « »
0.13	2.18	14 %14.9	15 %16.0		18
0.30	1.03	13 %13.8	16 %17.0		23
0.90	0.01	15 %16.0	26 %27.7		24
0.93	0.01	8 %8.5	13 %13.8		28
0.62	0.23	13 %13.8	19 %20.2		29
0.26	1.24	14 %14.9	17 %18.1		31
0.93	0.01	8 %8.5	14 %14.9		32

( ) (7)  
(2.18 - 0.01)

### مناقشة النتائج:

:

## النتائج المتعلقة بالسؤال الأول:

:

« »  
(kim, 2004) « »

« »

(Damon & Hart, 1988)

« »

Smith, Shu & )

.(Olweus, 1994)

(Madsen, 2001; Schwartz et al. , 1993  
(Olweus, 1993)

« »

(self efficacy)

« »

« »

« »

» « »  
«

» «

-

(self-efficacy)  
(2007)

» «

(Carney & Merrell, 2001)

Rigby, )

.(2002; Olweus, 1980

« »

...

(2009)

## وفيما يتعلق بنتائج السؤال الثاني

:

« »

Olweus, 1994; Smith et al. , 2001; )

(Schwarz et al. , 1993



»

«

«

»

»

«

»

«

« » .

...

« » .

« » :

« »

(Frude,1993).

(Olweus,1993)

« : »

:

« »

**أما فيما يتعلق بمناقشة نتائج السؤال الثالث الذي نص على:**

(Kim, 2004)

## التوصيات:

:

- 
- 
- 
- 
- 

( )

## المصادر والمراجع:

- .(2007) .
- .( ) .
- .(2009) .  
5 113-89
- .(2008) .  
4 124-109
- Atkinson, M. & Hornby, G. (2002). *Mental health handbook for schools*. London: Routledgefoelmer.

- Bosworth, K. , Espelage. D. L. , & Simon, T. R. (1999). Factors associated with bullying behavior in middle school students. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 19*, 341-362.
- Carney, A. G. & Merrell, K. W. (2001). Bullying in schools: Perspectives on understanding and preventing and international problem. *School Psychology International, 22*, 364-382.
- Clarke, E. ,& Kiselica, M. (1997). A systematic Counseling approach to the problem of bullying. *Elementary School Guidance, 31*, 310-325.
- Connolly, I. , & O'Moore, M. (2003). Personality and family relations of children who bully. *Personality and Individual Differences, 35*, 559-567.
- Damon, W. , & Hart, D. (1988). *Self understanding in childhood and adolescence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Demaray, M. K. , & Malecki, C. K. (2003). Perceptions of the frequency and importance of social support by students classified as victims, bullies, and bully/victims in an urban middle school. *School Psychology Review, 32*, 471-489.
- Elinoff, M. , Chafouleas, S. , & Sassu, K. (2004). Bullying: considerations for defining and intervening in school settings. *Psychology in the School, 41*, 887-897.
- Frude, N. (1993). Hatred between child In V. Varam (Ed. ), *How and why children hate*, London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Fox, M. & Boulton, M. (2006). Friendship as a moderator of the relationship between social skills problems and peer victimization. *Aggressive Behavior, 32*, 110-121
- Glew, G. , Rivara , F. , & Feudtner, C. (2000). Bullying: Children hurting children; *Pediatrics in Review, 21*, 183-190
- Juvonen, J. , Graham, S. , & Shuster, M. (2003). Bullying among young adolescent: The strong, the weak, and troubled. *Pediatrics, 112*, 1231-1238
- Kim, S. (2004). *A study of personal and invironmental factors influencing bullying*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation.
- Klarke, E., & Kiselica, M. (1997). A systematic counseling approach to the problem of bullying. *Elementary School Guidance & Counseling, 31*, 310-325.

- Lagerspetz, KMJ, Bjorkqvist, K., Berts, M., & King, E. (1982). Group aggression among school children in three schools. *Scandinavian Journal of psychology*, *23*, 45-52.
- Lee, C. & Kwak, K. (2000). Social concept and social support according to bullying types. *Korean Journal of Psychology: Development*, *13*, 65-80.
- Loeber, R. , & Stouthamer- Loeber, M. (1986). Family factors as correlates and predictors of juvenile conduct problems and delinquency. In. M Tonry & N. Morris (Eds), *Crime and justice: An annual review of research* (pp. 29-149). Chicago: University of Chicago.
- McNamara, B. , & McNamara, F. (1997). *Keys to dealing with bullies*. Hauppauge, N Y: Barron's.
- Mynard, H. , & Joseph, S. (2000). Development of the Multidimensional peer-victimization scale. *Aggressive Behavior*, *26*. 169-178.
- Nansel, T. R., Overpeck, M., Pilla, R. S., Ruan, W. J., Simons- Morton, B., & Scheidt, P. (2001) Bullying behavior among US youth: Prevalence and association with psychosocial adjustment. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 2094-2100.
- Olweus, D. (1980). Familial and temperamental determinants of aggressive behavior in adolescent boys: A causal analysis. *Developmental Psychology*, *16* (6), 644-660.
- Olweus, D. (1991). Bully/victim problems among schoolchildren: Basic facts and effects of a schoolbased intervention program. In K. Rubin & D. Pepler (Eds. ), *The development and treatment of childhood aggression*. Hillside, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at School: What we know and what we can Do*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Olweus, D. (1994). Annotation: Bullying at school: Basic fact and effects of a school based intervention program. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Dicipines*, *35*, 1171-1190.
- Patterson, G. R. (1982). *Coercive family process: A social learning approach*. Eugene: Castalia.

- Patterson, G. R. (1986). Performance models for antisocial behavior. *American Psychologist*, 41, 432-444.
- Patterson, G. R. , Reid, J. B. , & Dishion, T. J. (1992). *Antisocial boys*. Eugene: Castalia.
- Perren, S. , & Hornung, R. (2005). Bulling and delinquency in adolescence: victim's and perpetrators family and peer relations. *Swiss Journal of Psychology*, 64 (1), 51-64.
- Perry, D. G. , Perry, L. , & Kennedy, E. (1992). Conflict and the development of antisocial behavior. In C. Shantz, & W. Hartup (Eds.), *Conflict in child and adolescent development*, (pp, 301-329). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rigby, K. (2002). *New Perspectives on bullying*. London: Jessica kingsley publishers.
- Rigby, K. (2008). *New perspectives on bullying*. London: Jessica kingsley publishers.
- Schwartz, D. , Dodge, K. A. , & Coie, J. D. (1993). The emergence of chronic. Peer victimization in boys play groups. *Child Development*, 64, 1755-1772
- Smith, P. K. , Shu, S. ,& Madsen, K. (2001). Characteristics of victims of school bullying: developmental changes in coping strategies and skills. In J. Juvenon & S. Graham (Eds), *Peer harassment in school: the plights of vulnerable and victimized*. New York: Guildford, (pp,332-352).
- Warden, D. & Mackinnon, S. (2003). Prosocial children, bullies and victims: An investigation of their sociometric status, empathy and social problem solving strategies. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 21, 367-385.

\* \* \*

## Causes behind Bullying from the Point of View of Bullies and Victims

Dr. Muawia Abu Ghazal  
Faculty of Education, Yarmouk University  
Irbid, Jordan

### ABSTRACT

This study explores the causes behind bullying from the point of view of bullies and victims of bullying and whether causes differ according to student gender and/or place of residence. The sample consisted of (143) students from grade 7 to grade 10, (49) who were classified as bullies, and (94) as victims. Questionnaires containing scales were administered addressing bullying, victimization, causes for bullying, and possible reasons for being victimized. Results indicate that the most common causes for bullying from a bully's point of view are that the victim views him/herself as important, provides teachers with information about other students, has no friends, has poor grades, and gives the impression that he/she is wealthy. The most common causes for bullying from the victims' point of view are that they are always quiet, obey everything the teacher says, behave pretentiously, have a distinctive appearance and come from a lower class. No significant differences were found in the causes behind bullying and victimization due to student gender or residence.

(**Keywords:** Bullying, victimization).

\* \* \*