

## PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt / Egyptology

### RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT AND ANTI SOCIAL BEHAVIOR AT SECONDARY LEVEL

*Tahir Ali<sup>1</sup>, Zobia Kanwal<sup>2</sup>, Dr. Muhammad Mukhtyar<sup>3</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> MPhil (ELM) Scholar, The Superior College Lahore,

<sup>2</sup> Lecturer Education, The Superior College Lahore,

<sup>3</sup> Lecturer Physics, DPS Dera Ghazi Khan,

Email: [tahirali269241@gmail.com](mailto:tahirali269241@gmail.com) [zobiach@ymail.com](mailto:zobiach@ymail.com)

[Muhammadmukhtar98@yahoo.com](mailto:Muhammadmukhtar98@yahoo.com)

**Tahir Ali, Zobia Kanwal, Dr. Muhammad Mukhtyar. Relationship Between School Environment and Anti-Social Behavior At Secondary Level -- PalArch's Journal Of Archaeology Of Egypt/Egyptology 19(2), 1320-1334. ISSN 1567-214x**

**Keywords: School Environment, Antisocial Behavior, Secondary Level**

#### **ABSTRACT**

This study was quantitative in nature and was conducted to find out the relationship between school environment and antisocial behavior in terms of opinions of both students and teachers. Survey method was adopted to use the collect of data. All students and teachers of secondary schools of Punjab were the population of this study. Convenience sampling was used to collect data from 400 students and 100 teachers. The questionnaire included items related to behaviors such as teaching involvement, physical aggression, work pressure, staff support, innovation, rule breaking and social aggression. Data was analyzed using SPSS and the results indicated that there was no significant difference between the mean scores of male and female teachers, and students. Different social behaviors become permanent characteristics of individuals and are significantly related to the school environment. The study recommended to the government and schools to adopt policies to prevent children from developing anti social behavior from an early age.

#### **INTRODUCTION**

Students are future leaders of nations. Their leading abilities are polished under the Supervision of educational institutions; increase their knowledge, skills and values to refine their behaviors. It is an admitted fact that school education plays an important role In this regard. By and large, the basic obligation of education is to modify human Behaviors according to social values, norms and culture of a society. Education is not only preparation of an

individual for his personal life but also it is name of social Adjustment of man with society. If an individual plays his role according to social values and norms in his society, it means, shows positive behavior. Development of positive Behaviors in a learner is a fundamental responsibility of education. Positive behaviors Play vital role in an individual as well as his social life, society establishes educational Organizations so that they educate behaviors of its citizens (Rose & Gallup, 2005). Usually, school learners have to pass throughout an enormous multiplicity of Behavioral changes during their educational career. The academic environment of this Organization has great impact for executing these changes in the behaviors of learner. The fundamental purpose of schools is to provide learning environment to the students for the progress of social behavior On the other hand, due to certain factors such as social aggression, work pressure, Teachers 'involvement, physical aggression, rule breaking etc anti social behaviors create among the Students. These driving forces generally affect educational environment of institutions effectively in a negative sense. Therefore, Anti social behaviour and school environment are inter related because both are important for create positive environment among the students (Ruter, 1982 as cited in Iqbal, 2009). The behavioral problems have been vital concern of society. Many researchers have elaborated the mutual relationship between behaviour and learning environment of the pupils (Ruter, 1982). Glueck and Glueck (1960) Justify that anti social behaviour started from the age of seven among the kids and such type of children step by step turn down during academic career. Complexity in attentiveness and completion of responsibilities are linked low performance. Burnette & Marry (1966) stated that a number of previous research studies have suggested prediction of anti social behavior and planned prevention programmers for their maximum usefulness, it practiced until about the age of eight. Declared that previous studies have recommended anti social behaviour planned programmers for maximum effectiveness, it's about the age of 8.

Kruger, Gouws, & Diciker (1998) justify that values and norms are varying agents of society and these varying affect the development of children at the age of teenagers. All through human development, emotions rule over the way of teenagers stages act and interrelate with their environment. Anti-social behavior is practically an unapproachable or frightening action that suffering you or damages your worth of life (Home office of US Government, 2009). This kind of behavior is the general term used to incidentally illustrate or actions that Become reason of damage or affect the value of life of people in a social setup (Direct gov Website, 2010).

Anti Social behavior is a wide variety of individual own interest and unwanted behaviour that can affect the value of negativity in the whole society such Many kinds which include irritation, confusion are primary type of behaviour (Respect Website, 2009). Burney (2004) describes Anti social is a specific term described that its effect on the behaviour and character such as a type of violence. Justify the common violent behaviour, after the age of adolescent.

(DeWall & Anderson, 2011; Pinker, 2011), suggestive of aggressive behaviour is a natural factor of every individual behavior is a natural piece of

behaviour and every individual acts differently during period of life. Aggressiveness is not necessary showed by rude behaviour but sometimes practiced by those persons who is not compete of aggressive behaviour (Farrington, 2007).

### ***School environment***

All factors in surrounding which directly or indirectly involves in process of learning called school environment. Academic learning, behavior changing and relation building with other people of society. Teachers and principle of the school creates environment method in which they want to create a generation. Teachers and principals desired what would the philosophy of classroom according to needs in next generation. Principle develop different factors for better learning process. The positive relation between teachers and principle of the institute leads a good environment formation in which students gain in effective and interactive way. Efficient teacher make interactive teaching with aim to get effective learning results (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001; Tschannen- Moran & Hoy, 2000).

According to developmental psychologist (Rubin, Bukowski, & Parker, 1998) said that there are main four types of students reads in institutes. First popular children, second ignored children, third rejected children and forth one is controversial children. Popular children famous enough in their groups and have little bit hate from other students. Popular students recommended for best friends. According to Hartup (1983) described that popular children listen carefully and remain with open mind and did good communication with other peoples. Popular children always remain happy and passionate with high confidence. Rejected students always face trouble in peers they are involves in negative behavior activities and not recommended for friendship. Controversial students always remain at hit list in scene of friendship but not enough capable to make better communication with others. Ignored student feel shay in communication and try to involve in back bencher activities. Ignored students have lot of potential just need for proper guideline for shining in society.

According to researcher's students recognized by their company or circle of friends. Teachers and parents both are important scaffold in developing positive behavior in children. Society play Vitol role in lives of students. Actually education is the process of permanent positive change in someone lives. So school is place where education process done for developing character for serving in society so the environment of school has much importance in student's lives (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001; Tschannen- Moran & Hoy, 2000).

### ***School environment VS anti social behavior***

School is a place where children come to know the knowledge about norms, values, behaviour, attitude and socialism. In school education children learns to deal in different situation. School environment plays Vitol role in expanding

children's social behavior in society. In school environment students learn social and antisocial both behaviors.

Anti-social behavior refers to all misconducts occur in society. Misconducts alike use of drugs at public place, fighting with human being, disrespect to elders, harm to safety of the society and disobey the law and order. Anti-social behavior not accepted socially and its leads to involvement in criminal activities which may cause harmful for society (Garbarino, 1999).

Its responsibility of institute as well teachers to aware the students about negative behavior and take strict actions against students who's involved in anti social behaviour. Mostly institutes prefer to decrease the anti social behavior in institute by organizing healthy activities alike supports function, debate computation, easy writing, speech computation and proper counseling for promoting positive behavior in students for making them responsible citizen of country.

### ***Statement of the Problem***

Usually, learning is clear as to change in behaviors of learners into positive commands. The main objectives of this research study are to establish the educational environment and positive behaviors among the pupils. Students are belonging to different status, different social set up, different classes, and different ethics groups. They are come to educational environment with varieties of behaviour. So, students have different behaviour they reflects their behaviour different styles. Some student have positive behaviour but some students have negative behaviour similar these students are enter in schools and act differently in the educational institution like students absent from the school, engage in cheating practice, rule breaking, and steal things. All through those students affect negatively educational environment. All through, the researcher was designed at, to explore anti social behaviour and school environment of secondary schools.

### ***Objectives***

- To explore the school environment in developing anti social behavior?
- To compare the opinion of both students and teachers about the role of school environment in developing anti social behavior?

### ***Research Questions:***

1. What is the role of school environment in developing anti social behavior?
2. What are the Comparative opinions of both students and teachers about the role of school environment in developing anti social behavior?

### ***Significance of the Study***

The design of the study was to explore the anti social behaviors and secondary school environment. This is identifying the causes of the anti social behaviour

of learners as well as to suggest suitable measures to improve the secondary school environment. This study would be helpful for teachers to teaching the students and solve the behavioral problems and help the create positive environment among students in the light of the suggestions of the study. This study would be helpful for principal as controlling authorities of the institution and progress of the environment of the secondary schools the positive behaviour towards among the students. This study would also be beneficial for educationists; so that they establish the policies that will develop the school environment. This study would also be helpful for the curriculum developers, so that they develop such type of curriculum that would be positive values among pupils. This study would also be beneficial for the social order because society is considered as a vital role play in creating positive as well as anti social behaviors among pupils. This study would also be key fundamentals of the secondary school environment and behaviour of the students. This study will be helpful for the political leaders as they are the role model of new generation

### ***Delimitations of the Study***

There are a large number of schools working in public sectors. Due to lack of time and resources, practically, it was impossible for the researcher to collect the data from the whole population. So this study was too confined, to select the four schools only. It was also delimited to the SST school teachers, secondary school students as a targeted population.

### **METHONDOLOGY**

This study was descriptive in nature, this study was designed to compare between two variables school environment and anti social behaviour. In the educational institution students have different types of behaviour and teachers are faced them. The survey approach was adopted for its completion. This study was quantitative in nature. Survey design method are use to collect the data. This research study survey method was used to explore the anti social behaviour secondary school.

### ***Design of the study***

Design of this study was quantitative in descriptive nature. Survey method was adopted to use the collection of data. In which study the survey method used to explore the Anti social behavior of secondary school students therefore narrative design select the data collection.

### ***Population***

All selected students and teachers of secondary school considered as population. As the study was about to know explore the anti social behaviour in students and how much impact on school environment for this purpose selected students and teachers of secondary schools population of the study. Some factors used in questionnaire related to students and teachers to modify the anti social behaviour and role of school environment in developing anti social behaviour, the population of the study were

1. Students of 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> class studying in secondary schools.
2. SST school teachers teaching in secondary schools.

### ***Sample***

The sample of the study will consist Of 400 hundred students (100) respondents from each school including (100) students, 100 teachers were taken by convenience.

### ***Research Instrument***

The problem was explore in a quantitative way because the Anti social behaviors and educational environment of secondary schools can be analyzed better through the questionnaire than other research tools. The respondents can respond freely About the Anti social behaviors and clarity, teaching involvement, physical aggression, work pressure, staff support, innovation, rule breaking and social aggression of secondary schools. Therefore, questionnaires were designed. Questionnaire will design for the students of 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> class. Initially questionnaire for students will consist of 26 statements and second questionnaire will design for Teachers. Questionnaire for teachers was consist of 30 statements were polished in the light of faculty members 'suggestions and researchers 'comments.

### ***Data Collection***

The researcher went to collect data about study personally and administered questionnaire and describe the about questions before filling up 512 questionnaires were distributed in four schools two schools are urban and two schools are rural from government boys school. Convenient sampling techniques are used to collect the data selected secondary school of Okara Distt. 200 students are urban schools and 200 students are rural schools were selected students for data collection. While 50 teachers are urban school and 50 teachers are rural school are selected sample for data collection. The data collected to the SST teacher of secondary schools Okara.

### ***Data Analysis***

The collected data was enter to analyze with the help of Software Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20.0 by using statistical formulas of Factor analysis, simple mean, and percentage. Descriptive analysis was applied to find the level of role of school environment in developing anti social behaviour in students. T. test was applied data analysis. A finding report will be prepared after the obtaining data analysis results.

## **RESULTS**

Results obtained after data analysis are given below.

Independent Sample t-test for the Comparative Analysis of male and female role of school environment developing in anti social behavior in students.

**Student:**

**Social aggression:**

	<i>Statements</i>	<i>Male</i>		<i>Female</i>		<i>t</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
1	I blame others of my failures	3.48	1.177	4.09	.884	-5.859	.000
2	I made fun of others behind their back	3.72	1.103	4.03	1.065	-2.858	.004
3	I threat others while I am angry	4.23	.934	3.40	1.032	8.434	.000
4	I littered Male areas by smashing bottles, tipping trashcans etc	3.53	1.348	3.46	1.138	.561	.575
5	I exclude someone from group activities when angry with him/her	4.44	.563	3.86	.926	7.565	.000
6	I steal things	4.39	.556	4.60	.492	-3.903	.000
7	I give someone silent treatment when angry with him /her	3.44	1.110	4.58	.496	-13.26	.000
8	I steal property from school or work	4.83	.568	5.00	.000	-4.232	.000
9	I reveal someone's secrets when angry with him/her	3.61	1.177	4.77	.425	-13.05	.000
10	I get into fights more than the average person	4.01	.100	4.47	.500	-12.62	.000
11	I left home for an extended periods of time without telling family /friends	4.25	.478	4.38	1.150	-1.476	.141
12	I intentionally damage someone's reputation when angry with him/her	4.01	.071	4.62	.487	-17.68	.000
13	I try to turn others against someone with angry with him/her	4.00	.000	.953	.067	19.43	.000
14	I call someone's names behind his/her back while angry	4.74	.440	1.002	.071	22.60	.000
15	I try to hurt others feelings	4.14	.939	.397	.028	-.832	.406
16	I become rude towards others while angry	4.10	.07	1.01	.38	-17.1	.07
17	I feel trouble keeping a job due to inconsistent behavior	2.93	1.012	.966	.068	4.751	.000
18	I make negative comments about someone's appearance when angry with him/her	3.17	.986	1.044	.074	-2.609	.009
19	I shell drugs	5.00	.000	1.000	.000	-.20	.818
	Total	3.99	.2790	3.99	.22424	-.230	.818

It is indicated from the above table that the mean of the factor social aggression of male is M= 2.93 to 5.00.

It is indicated from the above table that the mean of the factor social aggression of female is M=.397 to 5.00

The total mean of the factor social aggression of male is M=3.99

The total mean of the factor social aggression of female is M=3.99

It is concluded that the mean of the factor social aggression in role of school environment developing in anti social behavior in students on the scale of “Disagree”.

The *t* value for the factor social aggression is not found significant.

***Physical aggression:***

	<i>Statements</i>	<i>Male</i>		<i>Female</i>		<i>T</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
1	I hit others when provoked	3.44	1.529	4.02	.122	- 5.301	.000
2	I swear or yell at others when someone commits something against my wish	2.02	.401	2.47	.850	- 6.772	.000
3	I get into physical fights when provoked by others	3.20	.50	3.12	.24	.503	.615
4	I break the window of an empty building	4.39	.499	2.67	.790	2.615	.009
5	I feel better after hitting someone while angry	4.49	.501	4.45	1.006	26.02	.000
	Total	3.78	.26310	3.60	.27737	6.474	.00

It is indicated from the above table that the mean of the factor physical aggression of male is M= 2.02 to 4.49.

It is indicated from the above table that the mean of the factor physical aggression of female is M=2.47 to 4.45

The total mean of the factor physical aggression of male is M=3.78

The total mean of the factor physical aggression of female is M=3.60

It is concluded that the mean of the factor physical aggression in role of school environment developing in anti social behavior in students on the scale of “Disagree”.

The *t* value for the factor physical aggression is found significant.

***Rule breaking:***

	<i>Statements</i>	<i>Male</i>		<i>Female</i>		<i>T</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
1	I was suspended, expelled, or fired from school or work due to misbehavior	4.74	.437	4.39	.489	293.0	.000
2	I fail to pay debts due to irresponsible behavior	2.03	.264	3.84	.939	230.1	.000
	Total	3.38	.26256	4.11	.64277	- 14.76	.000

It is indicated from the above table that the mean of the factor rule breaking of male is M= 2.03 to 4.74.

It is indicated from the above table that the mean of the factor rule breaking of female is M=3.84 to 4.39

The total mean of the factor rule breaking of male is M=3.38



The total mean of the factor rule breaking of female is  $M=4.11$

It is concluded that the mean of the factor rule breaking in role of school environment developing in anti social behavior in students on the scale of “Disagree”.

The  $t$  value for the factor rule breaking is found significant.

### **Teacher:**

#### **Involvement:**

	Statements	Male		Female		T	Sig.
		M	SD	M	SD		
1	I have very little say in the running of the school	1.28	.454	1.72	.454	-4.851	.000
2	Teachers show little interest in what is happening in other school	2.44	.675	2.00	.000	4.610	.000
3	I often feel lonely and left out of things in the staffroom	3.60	1.010	4.44	1.053	-4.071	.000
	Total	2.44	.53639	2.72	.33238	-3.138	.002

It is indicated from the above table that the mean of the factor involvement of male is  $M= 1.28$  to  $3.60$ .

It is indicated from the above table that the mean of the factor involvement of female is  $M=1.72$  to  $4.44$

The total mean of the factor involvement of male is  $M=2.44$

The total mean of the factor rule breaking of female is  $M=2.72$

It is concluded that the mean of the factor involvement in role of school environment developing in anti social behavior in students on the scale of “agree” by male and “neutral” by female.

The  $t$  value for the factor involvement is found significant.

### **Innovation:**

	Statements	Male		Female		t	Sig.
		M	SD	M	SD		
1	Teachers avoid talking with each other about teaching and learning	2.84	.997	3.48	.886	-3.392	.001
2	I am not expected to conform to a particular teaching style	1.00	.000	1.98	.141	-49.00	.000
3	Teachers are encouraged to be innovative in this school	1.64	.485	1.58	.499	.610	.543
4	Video equipments, tapes and films are readily available and accessible	1.64	.485	1.70	.453	-.633	.528
5	Many teachers attend in service and other and other professional development course	2.28	.701	2.00	.000	2.824	.007
6	New course or curriculum material are	2.04	.283	2.80	.990	-	.000

	seldom implement in the school					5.221	
7	Taps recorded and cassettes are seldom available	2.38	.780	3.12	1.003	- 4.119	.000
8	My classes are expected to use prescribed textbook and prescribed resource material	2.00	.000	2.00	.000		
9	There is much experimentation with different teaching approaches	2.64	.898	3.50	1.035	- 4.438	.000
10	I often feel lonely and left out of things in the staffroom						
11	Teachers are keen to learn from their colleagues	2.00	.000	2.00	.000		
12	Professional matters are seldom discussed during staff meeting	2.60	.926	3.08	1.007	- 2.481	.015
13	It is considered very important that I closely follow syllabuses and lesson plan	2.00	.000	2.00	.000		
	Total	2.10	.10412	2.41	.16445	- 11.02	.000

It is indicated from the above table that the mean of the factor innovation of male is M= 1.00 to 2.84.

It is indicated from the above table that the mean of the factor innovation of female is M=1.58 to 3.50

The total mean of the factor innovation of male is M=2.10

The total mean of the factor innovation of female is M=2.41

It is concluded that the mean of the factor innovation in role of school environment developing in anti social behavior in students on the scale of "Agree" by both male and female.

The *t* value for the factor innovation is found significant.

### **Work Pleasure:**

	<i>Statements</i>	<i>Male</i>		<i>Female</i>		<i>t</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
1	It is hard to keep with your work load	2.00	.000	2.00	.000		
2	You can take it easy and still get the work done	3.70	.463	2.98	.915	4.967	.000
3	There is no time for teacher to relax	2.00	.000	2.56	.907	- 4.365	.000
4	Teachers don't have to work very hard in this school	4.00	.000	3.50	.678	5.217	.000
5	Teachers have to work long hours to complete all their work	2.04	.283	3.28	.970	- 8.680	.000
6	There is constant to keep working pressure	2.00	.000	2.98	.979	- 7.077	.000
	Total	2.62	.08116	2.88	.21095	- 8.134	.000

It is indicated from the above table that the mean of the factor work pressure of male is M= 2.00 to 4.00.

It is indicated from the above table that the mean of the factor work pressure of female is  $M=2.00$  to  $3.50$

The total mean of the factor work pressure of male is  $M=2.62$

The total mean of the factor work pressure of female is  $M=2.88$

It is concluded that the mean of the factor work pressure in role of school environment developing in anti social behavior in students on the scale of “neutral” by both male and female.

The  $t$  value for the factor work pressure is found significant.

### ***Celerity:***

	<i>Statements</i>	<i>Male</i>		<i>Female</i>		<i>t</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
1	I feel that I have many friends among my colleagues at this school	2.16	.548	3.00	1.010	-5.168	.000
2	Most students are well mannered and respectful to the school staff	2.46	1.129	1.60	.782	4.428	.000
3	Most students are pleasant and friendly to teacher	2.00	.000	2.00	.000		
	Total	2.20	.34921	2.20	.32991	.098	.922

It is indicated from the above table that the mean of the factor celerity of male is  $M= 2.00$  to  $2.46$ .

It is indicated from the above table that the mean of the factor celerity of female is  $M=1.60$  to  $3.00$

The total mean of the factor celerity of male is  $M=2.20$

The total mean of the factor celerity of female is  $M=2.20$

It is concluded that the mean of the factor celerity in role of school environment developing in anti social behavior in students on the scale of “Agree” by both male and female.

The  $t$  value for the factor celerity is not found significant.

### ***Staff Support:***

	<i>Statements</i>	<i>Male</i>		<i>Female</i>		<i>t</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
1	It is very difficult to change anything in this school	2.64	.921	2.00	.000	4.916	.000
2	Decisions about the running of the school are usually made by the principle or a small group of teachers	2.00	.000	2.00	.000		
3	I am ignored by other teachers	4.00	.000	4.72	.454	-11.22	.000
4	I feel accepted by other teachers	3.04	.903	2.36	.485	4.693	.000
5	I am encouraged to make decisions without reference to a senior member of staff	4.00	.000	4.02	.820	-.172	.864
	Total	3.13	.34152	3.02	.16288	2.168	.034

It is indicated from the above table that the mean of the factor staff support of male is  $M= 2.00$  to  $4.00$ .

It is indicated from the above table that the mean of the factor staff support of female is  $M=2.00$  to  $4.72$

The total mean of the factor staff support of male is  $M=3.13$

The total mean of the factor staff support of female is  $M=3.02$

It is concluded that the mean of the factor staff support in role of school environment developing in anti social behavior in students on the scale of "Neutral" by both male and female.

The  $t$  value for the factor staff support is found significant.

## FINDINGS

### *Findings regarding students' anti social behavior*

1. We found out that the mean of the factor social aggression in role of school environment in developing anti social behavior in students on the scale of "Disagree".
2. We found out that the mean of the factor physical aggression in role of school environment in developing anti social behavior in students on the scale of "Disagree".
3. It was found out that the mean of the factor rule breaking in role of school environment in developing anti social behavior in students on the scale of "Disagree".

### *Findings regarding students' anti social behavior*

1. It was found out that the mean of the factor involvement in role of school environment in developing anti social behavior in students on the scale of "agree" by male and "neutral" by female.
2. The results indicate that the mean of the factor innovation in role of school environment in developing anti social behavior in students on the scale of "Agree" by both male and female.
3. We found out that the mean of the factor work pressure in role of school environment in developing anti social behavior in students on the scale of "neutral" by both male and female.
4. We found out that the mean of the factor celerity in role of school environment in developing anti social behavior in students on the scale of "Agree" by both male and female.
5. We found out that the mean of the factor staff support in role of school environment in developing anti social behavior in students on the scale of "Neutral" by both male and female.

## CONCLUSIONS:

The conclusions of the study were drawn based on previously mentioned results. Most of the students and teachers opine that students pass anti social remarks to one another in their daily life. Discussion shows authority physical aggression over their classmate. Main and important factor of anti social behavior is Rule breaking. Most of the teachers and students are involved in rule breaking. Most of the students drives the bike as fun while motorbikes

rules breaking are dangerous for pupils. It also concluded that one wheeling is Also kick for students. This study concludes that most of the teachers and students are of the view that does not dispirit one wheeling while very few Students think that one wheeling is unhealthy activity for pupils. Most of the students are agree social aggression is a anti part of our society.. Comparative analysis was made among male and female students regarding teaching involvement, innovation, Social aggression, work pressure, physical aggression issues, rule breaking problems and impact of staff support. Male students have more interaction than female students do. Similarly, the data show that there is no significant difference of the respondents about students'anti behaviors. Comparative analysis of area has no significant impact on anti Social behaviors of students. There is a difference of opinion among rural and urban Respondents regarding teaching social aggression, work pressure, physical issues, and rule breaking problems. Rural respondents have more connections than urban respondents do. Similarly, the data describes that there is no significant difference between rural and urban respondents 'anti social behaviors

### **DISCUSSION**

Educational institution is a introductory place where nearly all the process about tutoring Literacy takes place though a lot of literacy is being done outside the educational Institution. Thus, it should be managed duly, efficiently and professionally. The Main chain in education work is the scholars'a social behaviour. There are several essentials involved in it they always depend on others for everything.

Most of the parents are poor therefore they worried from to dusk to feed their children. That is why they cannot take care of their children. Moreover, some parents are unqualified and don't know what to do in circumstances. Such students make their social aggression Rules breaking. These social aggressions remain a source of danger and worries for other Students in school. Some students make habits Motorbike crimes. Students help them in the examination. They have insufficient faculties such seats, water, transport even classrooms. Education is a constant process in the result of knowledge that can change the Behavior of learner in a positive sense.

The major findings of the study showed that there was no significant difference between the mean scores of male and female teachers, and students. Different social behaviors become permanent characteristics of Individuals. The results of this study also agreed with the results of the study conducted By Fekees, Pijpers, Verloove (2005) who's explored that social aggression is considered as one of the critical anti social behavior for youths. This study also agreed with the Results of the Remus, Nancy, Susan and John (2003) which investigated that harassment and different affair as anti social behaviour.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

On the bases of above findings and conclusions, the following suggestions and Recommendations are made for government, policy makers, and heads of institutions, parents, Students, society and teachers.

1 Government makes rules and strictly implement on roads. Students do one wheeling and put danger their own and others life. Parents need to be aware own children's peers. Controversial discussion should be banned and pressure group should be banned.

2 School teacher is changing factor of student's social behaviour. The school teacher can change the school environment and create the positive environment because environment is helpful for suppression of anti social behaviour among students so, duty of class teacher to promote the positive behaviour in the students.

3 Students should Avoid keeping bad company of peers because a man is known by the company, so good company makes good character and bad company make the bad character. Social norms of a society as well as social ethics. Character building is very important for create positive environment.

4 Educational environment and home environment are very important factor in character building of students; the school culture is full of anti social behaviour such as aggression and bully. so social aggressive also avoided in homes.

### RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES

Finding based study further suggestions that the same type of study can be conducted in primary level, and secondary level. This study reveals that anti social behaviour but individually research can be conducted for community and anti social behaviour of school heads. For researcher it is difficult to cover all aspects and described.

### References

- Burnette, E., & Marry, B. (1966). *Conduct Disorder Need Early Treatment, Monitor of the American Psychological Association October.*
- DeWall, C. N., & Anderson, C. A. (2011). The general aggression model. *Directgov (2010). Young people: Anti- social Behaviour[online]. Availableat: [http://www.direct.gov.uk/en/YoungPeople/CrimeAndJustice/TypesOfCrime/DG\\_10027673](http://www.direct.gov.uk/en/YoungPeople/CrimeAndJustice/TypesOfCrime/DG_10027673). [Accessed: 12th February 2010].*
- Farrington, D. P. (2007). Origins of violent behavior over the life span.
- Fekkes, M., Pijpers, F. I., & Verloove-Vanhorick, S. P. (2005). Bullying: Who does what, when and where? Involvement of children, teachers and parents in bullying behavior. *Health education research, 20(1)*, 81-91.
- Garbarino, J. (1999). Child neglect. *Neglected children: Research, practice, and policy, 1.*
- Garbarino, J. (1999). Lost Boys: Why Our Sons Turn to Violence and How We Can Save Them. *Reaching Today's Youth: The Community Circle of Caring Journal, 3(4)*, 7-10.
- Glueck, & Glueck, E. (1960). *Unreavlling Delinquency.* London: Oxford, Open university Press.
- Hartup, W. W. (1983). Peer relations. *Handbook of child psychology: formerly Carmichael's Manual of child psychology/Paul H. Mussen, editor.*
- Harwell, S. H. (2003). Teacher professional development: It's not an event, it'sa process.
- Home Office (1996). Housing Act. London: HMSO*

- Hoy, W. K., & Sweetland, S. R. (2001). Designing better schools: The meaning and measure of enabling school structures. *Educational administration quarterly*, 37(3), 296-321.
- Iqbal, M. (2017). *Negative Social Behaviors and Educational Environment of Secondary Schools in Pakistan* (Doctoral dissertation).
- Kruger, N., Gouws, E., & Dicker, A. (2011). *The Adolescents: An Educational Perspective*. Only Study Guide for GED-201W.
- Pinker, S. (2011). Taming the devil within us. *Nature*, 478(7369), 309-311.
- Rose, L. C., & Gallup, A. M. (2005). The 37th annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup poll of the publics attitudes toward the public schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 87(1), 41-57.
- Rubin, Kenneth H., William M. Bukowski, and Jeffrey G. Parker. "Peer interactions, relationships, and groups." (2006).
- Rutter, M. (1982). *Fifteen thousand hours: Secondary schools and their effects on children*. Harvard University Press.
- Rutter, M. (1982). *Helping Troubled Children*, London: Penguin Books, (First edition), 267-299.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, W. K. (2000). A multidisciplinary analysis of the nature, meaning, and measurement of trust. *Review of educational research*, 70(4), 547-593.