

Students' Violence at the University of Jordan*

Salah H. Al-Louzi* and Yahya I. Farhan**

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the attitudes of undergraduate students at the University of Jordan towards the causes and consequences of violence, culture and violence, and the proposed solutions to curb this phenomenon. Data were gathered from a proportional stratified sample of 629 male and female students through a questionnaire.

The data were analyzed by using the SPSS software. Descriptive statistics, including frequencies, percentages, and means were used to characterize the sample. Quantitative statistics were also employed, including one-way ANOVA and Cornobach's Alpha. For all analysis, the level of significance was set at $\alpha = 0.05$.

The findings show that the most common causes of students' violence in campus from the respondents' perspective included tribal fanaticism, masculinity, lack of fear from punishment, inadequate socialization, and poor investing of free time. Furthermore, the main consequences of violence included creating a bad reputation about campus, destroying university property, creating a negative image about campus among foreign students, and a feeling of insecurity inside campus. Moreover, the proposed solutions to reduce violence included launching awareness campaigns among students, publicizing the identity of violent students, increasing extra-curricular activities, encouraging students to respect the concept of national unity, creating more informal interactions between students, administrators, and teaching staff. Finally, the respondents viewed violence as unethical, contradictory with the teachings of Islamic and Christian religions, human values, and societal expectations from students. Upon the findings of the study, many recommendations were made.

Keywords: Students' violence, Campus, Causes, Consequences, Culture, Proposed solutions.

INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of violence is as old as the creation of human beings, since the oldest documented crime in religious prescriptions dates back to the assassination of Adam's son Abel by his brother Cain. This paper sheds light on the phenomenon of students' violence at the University of Jordan. The University of Jordan is the oldest Jordanian university which was established in 1962. The university is a state-run institution and has the

largest campus in Jordan. Having a huge number of young students attending one campus may represent a fertile soil for violence. From a social work perspective, violence includes physical assault, intimidation, threatening behavior, aggression, as well as ethnic and sexual harassment. Indeed, among Jordanian universities, the University of Jordan witnessed the most frequent events of violence, including the ethnic ones. Henrik (2006) illustrated that in the United States, for example, the interaction of expansion in higher education and economic decline with youth bulges increases the risk of some types of violence. The World Health Organization defined violence as:

The intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person, or against a group or community, that either results

* This study is partially funded by Deanship of Academic Research, the University of Jordan.

** Social Work Institute, University of Jordan.

*** Department of Geography, University of Jordan.

Received on 22/5/2008 and Accepted for Publication on 26/4/2009.

in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment or deprivation (Krug, et al., 2002, P. 4).

Many causes were given to explain violence among the youth, including students, such as dysfunctional families, TV violence, latchkey homes, child abuse, domestic violence, drugs, gangs, poor cognitive and emotional development, family breakups, inequitable educational opportunity, and poverty (Edwards, 2001; Huston, 1992; Arllen et al., 1994; Ascher, 1994). The prevention of injury and violence in campus is an indicator of having a healthy campus, specifically through the reduction of physical fighting, weapon carrying, homicides, physical assaults, sexual and emotional abuse, and intimate partner violence (American College Health Association, 2002). However, most theories consider violent behavior as a learning behavior rather than stemming from instincts (Pierson and Thomas, 2006).

PROBLEM OF THE STUDY:

Previous literature on the subject of students' violence in campus arrived to heterogeneous causes, consequences, and recommendations on the subjects since this phenomenon could be understood from a cross-cultural perspective. So this study concentrates on causes, consequences, relationship with culture, and recommended solutions related to violence from the perspective of students attending the University of Jordan.

Significance of the Study:

The findings of previous research found violence to be most common in late adolescence (Pastore and Maguire, 2000), and is more common among college students (Cogan and Porcerelli, 2003). Indeed, increasing knowledge which might result in reducing college violence will eventually reduce the level of violence in the whole society (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2000). In Jordan, there is no clear and scientific understanding of this phenomenon. As a result, understanding the causes, effects, and solutions as reported by students themselves may help in finding the best techniques and intervention plans to limit the incidence of this phenomenon in

campus. Generally, the study of violence, as reported by Galtung, (2000), offers a new vision, ethics, and ideology that enhance harmonious relations. In sum, this study is essential for building what Boulding (2000) considered a culture for peace.

PURPOSES OF THE STUDY:

This study aims at identifying the following:

1. Causes of violence among students.
2. Different consequences of violence.
3. The relationship between students' violence and societal culture.
4. Proposed solutions to limit students' violence.

Literature Review:

The related literature on the subject of students violence, mainly that in the fields of social work, psychology, sociology, psycho-sociology, health, and education yielded many characteristics. To begin with, there are multiple causes of violence that could be found in the political, economic, moral, psychological, and religious domains of human life (Marsella and Noren, 2003). Indeed, safety and violent-related behaviors are shaped through a socio-ecological approach which combines different levels of influence, including individual, group, community, along with public policy and societal influences (Stokols, 1996; Chalk and King, 1998). Examples of each level were illustrated by Langford (2006). In terms of individual influences, they are related to faculty, student, and staff beliefs and attitudes about violence. In addition, group or interpersonal influences are related to responses of bystanders to violence and group norms about appropriate behavior. Further, institutional influences are related to factors, such as high level of alcohol consumption inside campus and campus policies and procedures. Furthermore, community influences included factors related to the extent of community law enforcement, and high level of violence and drug selling in the neighboring community. Finally, public policy and societal influences are related to factors such as law enforcement and media images, as well as male gender role socialization that glamorize violence.

Expectations, social networks, and changing roles may affect attitude malleability (Visser and Krosnick, 1998). Students' attitudes are affected by college experience during the years of the study (Lottes and Kuriloff, 1994). Brand and Anastasio (2005) sampled 145 undergraduate students attending a course on violence by using a questionnaire. The respondents completed the questionnaire two times; at the beginning and end of the semester-long course. Some of the findings showed that students' support for death penalty, catharsis, and punishment decreased. Similarly, while students' belief in the role of biological influences on violent behavior did not change over the course period, their acceptance of environmental influences increased.

Physical fighting, sexual harassment and assault, weapon carrying, gang activities, psychological harassment, alcohol consumption, and ethnic violence are common in school, college campuses, and universities. Under such circumstances, educational institutions experiencing such incidences become hazardous to students and reflect an unsafe environment (David, 1995; Pezza and Bellotti, 1995). Sweet et al. (2005) conducted a study on 451 undergraduate students in the United States. The study identified 35 respondents as fight-seekers. The findings showed that fight-seekers were mostly males, with friends who seek out fights, fight when drunk, with others who were drunk, and fought three times as frequently as non-fight-seekers. Some of these findings were congruent with some previous research on the subject, such as that of Moffitt (1993) and White et al. (2001). Most pieces of evidence show that violence is a learned behavior (American Psychological Association, 1993).

In the United States, most teen-age homicides are males, including teenagers, killing other men or children. It is important to see, understand, and act toward the warning signs of violence in order to reduce it. It is equally important to teach boys at an early age how to talk about their pain. Many high school boys participate in a fight every year. On television, boys are more likely to be presented in violent acts than girls and that violence characterizes patriarchic male dominance and character

(Stark, 2004; Courtenay, 1999). Male students are more involved in violence than their female counterparts. This could be attributed, as explained by Bowker (1981), to difference in the socialization process where females are socialized to be more law abiding. Similarly, younger students are more likely to commit crimes than older people. Sampson and Laub (1990) explained that when people grow up and have children, they lose more by being involved in deviant behavior. The responses of an American university male student, as reported by Puddifoot and Cooke (2002), showed that carrying guns is a symbol of power, independence, freedom, control, danger, and to a lesser degree protects from crime. Nichols (1995) reported that the use of firearms by students on campus could be a reflection of its availability and use in the outside society, as is the case in the United States. Bell and Forde (1999) conducted a study on 229 undergraduate students attending a university in the southern United States. The study investigated interpersonal conflict resolution among students. The findings showed that while 30% of the respondents would call the police in response to a potential harm doer, 45% would use physical force. In addition, the study found male students to be more likely to resort to force. Finally, the study found that younger students were less likely to call police than older students. A British study found a positive correlation between heavy alcohol consumption and vandalism on campus (West et al., 1990). Similar findings were confirmed by another large scale study conducted on a sample of students attending universities and colleges from every state in the United States (Engs and Hanson, 1994).

Faltnery and Quinn-Leering (2000) pointed out that students' exposure to violence could be related to antisocial behavior and psychological trauma. Loos and Alexander (1997) found a positive relationship between undergraduate students' level of anger and aggression and their past parental maltreatment, such as experiencing physical and verbal abuse. A study by Lopez (2001) reported that both marital conflict and student gender were significantly related to their college adjustment, including academic adjustment. Fujihara et

al. (1999) conducted a study on 632 male and female university students from Japan, Spain, and the United States. It was concluded that in defensive situations, physical aggression was more justified by the American than by the Spanish and Japanese students. Jakupcak and Tull, (2005) assessed the effect of traumatic exposure and posttraumatic stress disorder symptoms on aggression, anger, and violence. A sample of 72 male respondents (students, faculty, and staff) included one trauma group (32) and another non-trauma group (40) was selected from the campus of the University of Massachusetts-Boston. The Findings showed that respondents who were exposed to a potentially traumatic event and reported symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder express more internal anger, hostility, and trait anger. These findings are consistent with the previous findings by Navaco and Chemtob (2002) that compared between male combat veterans with and without trauma related syndromes, and the findings of Dutton (1995) regarding trauma histories in clinical samples of violent males. Forke et al. (2007) conducted a study on 910 students from three colleges in the United States and found that only 34 (12%) of those who experienced one or more types of abuse used campus resources, such as counseling. The most commonly reported reasons for not using available resources on campus included: being unaware of available resources, handling the problem privately, personal issues, not trusting available resources on campus, seeking external resources, and not needing resources.

Roark (1987) suggested many preventive intervention measures to reduce the level of campus violence. Some of these interventions include: training in social skills, sexual decision making, assertiveness, and anger and stress management.

Previous literature on the subject of students' violence yielded different solutions and techniques to reducing campus violence. Some of these solutions include: teaching students coping strategies such as time management (Macan and Trusty, 1995), discouraging drug and alcohol use, punishing and treating violent students, and optimizing learning and academic

atmosphere (Whitaker and Pollard, 1993), teaching students appropriate behavior in different settings (Conklin and Robinson, 1993), reducing poverty (Monsey, 1995), and teaching students necessary skills to resolve their differences without resorting to violence in schools before entering colleges and universities (Bodine, 1995). One of the suggested ways to reduce violence is to involve students and professionals, including instructors, in some courses in youth violence protection (American Medical Association, 2000; American Psychological Association, 1998). Similarly, a study by Rodriguez-Frau and Mirabal-Colon (2005) reported that 95% of undergraduate students attending a course on violence at the University of Puerto Rico had their understanding of youth violence increased and improved. However, since each student has unique needs and problems, there is no specific method or solution to avoid violence in different circumstances (Bennett-Johnson, 1997). Dwyer et al. (1998) emphasized the importance of having a crisis intervention plan to be used when some students are suspicious of having some warning signs of violence. Programs related to violence protection on campus, as explained by Carr (2005), have to be evaluated to determine its efficacy.

Generally, the previous literature on students' violence stemmed from many fields of knowledge, including social and behavioral sciences. Further, different studies employed different techniques and methodologies causing the comparison between their findings to be difficult. Furthermore, most studies dealt with topics related to the causes and consequences of violence. Yet, the findings and conclusions of the previous literature may not be completely applicable on the community of the study for many reasons, including cultural differences. As a result, analyzing the phenomenon of students' violence should be viewed from a cross-cultural perspective that respects cultural privacy and sensitivity.

METHODOLOGY:

a) Population of the Study:

The population "community" of the study consisted

of all undergraduate students registered at the University of Jordan during the second semester of the academic year 2006/2007. The total number was 31350 students (19848 females and 11502 males). All undergraduate students were included, regardless of their gender, nationality, specialization, and academic level.

b) Sampling:

The respondents were selected through a

proportional stratified sample. The sample was stratified based on each of the two variables of college type (pure or social science) and gender (male or female). Indeed, a sample size of 2% was randomly chosen from each gender attending every college. Consequently, a sample size of 629 undergraduate students (231 males and 398 females) was used as presented in Table (1) below.

Table (1): Deriving Sample from the Community of the Study

Name of College	Male Students	2%	Female Students	2%	Total Students	Total 2%
Sciences	0577	12	2275	46	2852	58
Islamic Studies	0189	04	0990	20	1179	24
Medicine	0682	14	0371	07	1053	21
Agriculture	0385	08	0842	17	1227	25
Nursing	0766	15	0586	12	1352	27
Education Sciences	0394	08	1989	40	2383	48
Eng. and Tech.	2940	59	1657	33	4597	92
Law	0516	10	0542	11	1058	21
Phys. Education	0284	06	0387	08	0671	14
Pharmacy	0385	08	1217	24	1602	32
Dentistry	0218	04	0458	09	0676	13
Arts	0553	11	3157	63	3710	74
Business Adm.	1794	36	2196	44	3990	80
Social Sciences	0634	13	1850	37	2484	50
Rehabilitation Sciences	0124	02	0362	07	0486	09
Information Tech.	1017	20	0840	17	1857	37
Arts and Design	0044	01	0129	03	0173	04
Total	11502	231	19848	398*	31350	629*

* Differences are related to rounding in some previous cells.

c) Instrumentation:

A questionnaire was used to collect data from the respondents. The questionnaire consisted of two parts. The first part comprised qualitative data related to some characteristics of the respondents, such as college type, gender, academic year, type of admission to school, and place of residence. The second part included statements designed on Likert Scale. The statements were related to four components, namely: causes of violence (9

statements), consequences of violence (7 statements), students' violence and society's culture (5 statements), and suggestions to reduce students' violence (9 statements). Since the obtained value of Cornobach's Alpha was 0.86, then there was enough internal consistency among the items of the "Scale of Violence."

d) Limitations of the Study:

The findings of this study cannot be generalized on any other student population, whether inside or outside

Jordan. Similarly, the findings are applicable to the community of the study only during the time of the study. Finally, the findings of this study could not be applicable to graduate students since they were excluded from the study.

e) Statistical Analysis:

The data were analyzed by using the SPSS software (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). Two types of statistics were used; qualitative and quantitative. The qualitative statistics included means, frequencies, percentages, and standard deviations to characterize the

sample. Similarly, the qualitative statistics included one-way ANOVA to test statistical differences between the means of responses by the qualitative variables of the respondents; and Cornobach's Alpha to measure the internal consistency among different statements of the ordinal scale. For all analysis, the level of significance was set at $\alpha = 0.05$ level or a level of significance of 95%.

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY:

First) Respondents' Characteristics:

Table (2) illustrates the frequencies and percentages of some demographic characteristics of the student sample.

Table (2): Respondents Distribution by Some of their Demographic Characteristics

Gender	Frequency	Percentage	College Type	Frequency	Percentage
Male	232	36.9	Hard Sciences	313	49.8
Female	397	63.1	Human Sciences	316	50.2
Total	629	100	Total	629	100
Academic Year	Frequency	Percentage	Acceptance Type	Frequency	Percentage
Freshmen	123	19.6	Competitive	259	41.2
Sophomores	182	28.9	Royal Grant	181	28.8
Juniors	158	25.1	Military	089	14.1
Seniors	166	26.4	Others	100	15.9
Total	629	100	Total	629	100
Place of Residence	Frequency	Percentage	Nationality	Frequency	Percentage
City	554	88.1	Jordanian	579	92.1
Village	058	09.2	Non	050	07.9
Camp	009	01.4	Jordanian	629	100
Badia "Desert"	008	01.3	Total	629	100
Total	629	100	-----	-----	-----

The data presented in Table (2) illustrate that the majority of the respondents were female students (63.1%), residing in cities (88.1%), attending specializations in fields of humanities and social sciences (50.2%), and have a Jordanian nationality (92.1%). Similarly, the respondents' distribution among the different undergraduate levels ranged between 19.6% for freshman students and 28.9% for sophomores. Finally, while 41.2% of the total sample were admitted

on a competitive basis, the rest were accepted either through the royal grant (28.8%), the military (14.1%), or through other methods (15.9%).

Second) Causes of Violence:

The first component of the Scale of Violence is related to "Causes of Violence." This component included ten statements. Table (3) shows percentages, means, and standard deviations for statements related to causes of violence.

Table (3): Percentages, Means, and Standard Deviations for Statements Related to “Causes of Violence”

#	Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean	S. D.
01	Tribal fanaticism	54.4	37.5	05.6	01.6	01.0	4.43	0.75
02	Being not afraid of punishment	41.8	43.4	08.1	05.2	01.4	4.19	0.90
03	Improper investing of free time	32.8	36.6	19.1	09.5	02.1	3.88	1.04
04	Accepting students with low grades	19.6	28.6	27.3	17.2	07.3	3.36	1.19
05	Bad socialization characterizes students involved in violence	36.4	40.2	16.5	04.8	02.1	4.04	0.95
06	Having light course requirements	13.4	18.6	16.7	30.0	21.3	2.73	1.34
07	Cultural shock facing some students increases their aggressive behavior	20.2	35.0	26.6	15.3	03.0	3.54	1.07
08	Not being sociable enough to interact with female students	22.1	25.8	21.6	19.4	11.1	3.28	1.31
09	Needy students participate more in violence than non-needy students	5.9	08.7	19.6	29.7	36.1	2.19	1.18
10	Male students participate more in violence than female students	59.1	29.1	06.0	03.0	02.7	4.39	0.93
All Statements		30.6	30.4	16.7	13.6	08.8	3.60	0.50

The data presented in Table (3) illustrate that the descendant sorting of the causes of violence as perceived by the respondents placed tribal fanaticism at the top of all statement (Mean = 4.43, S.D. = 0.75), being a male student since males are more likely to engage in violent acts than female students (Mean = 4.39, S.D. = 0.93), being not afraid of punishment (Mean = 4.19, S.D. = 0.95), being socialized in a bad way (Mean = 4.04, S.D. = 0.95), improper investing of free time (Mean = 3.88, S.D.= 1.04), going through a cultural shock (Mean = 3.54, S.D. = 1.07), having low grades

(non-competitive) when accepted (Mean = 3.36, S.D. = 1.19), and then not being sociable enough to interact with female students (Mean= 3.28, S.D. = 1.31). Conversely, the respondents did not agree with the image or proposition that needy students participate in violence more than other students (Mean = 2.19, S.D. = 1.18), and the idea that having light course requirements could be one of the reasons encouraging violence (Mean = 2.73, S.D. = 1.34). Table (4) illustrates results of the one-way ANOVA for statements representing the component of “Causes of Violence.”

Table (4): Findings of One-Way ANOVA for Statements of the Component of “Causes of Violence”

Gender	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	Sig.
Male	3.62	0.54	0.29	0.59
Female	3.59	0.48		
Nationality	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	Sig.
Jordanian	3.60	0.50	0.10	0.76
Non Jordanian	3.62	0.58		

Academic Year	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	Sig.
Freshman	3.59	0.58	0.16	0.93
Sophomore	3.61	0.47		
Junior	3.62	0.47		
Senior	3.58	0.52		
College Type	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	Sig.
Hard Sciences	3.61	0.48	0.11	0.75
Human Sciences	3.60	0.52		
Place of Residence	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	Sig.
City	3.60	0.51	0.65	0.59
Village	3.67	0.47		
Camp	3.46	0.44		
Badia	3.66	0.55		
Acceptance Method	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	Sig.
Competition	3.66	0.49	1.96	0.12
Royal Grant	3.56	0.50		
Military	3.60	0.53		
Others	3.55	0.53		

The findings of the one-way ANOVA, as presented in Table (4), showed that there were no statistically significant differences in the respondents' attitudes toward the component of "Causes of Violence" according to characteristics related to each of; gender ($F = 0.29, \alpha = 0.59$), nationality ($F = 0.10, \alpha = 0.76$), academic year ($F = 0.16, \alpha = 0.93$), college type ($F = 0.11, \alpha = 0.75$), place of residence ($F = 0.65, \alpha = 0.59$), and

acceptance method ($F = 1.96, \alpha = 0.12$).

Third) Effects of Violence:

The second component of the Scale of Violence is related to the "Effects of Violence." This component included seven statements. In terms of percentages, means, and standard deviations for statements related to "Effects of Violence", see Table (5).

Table (5): Percentages, Means, and Standard Deviations for Statements Related to "Effects of Violence"

#	Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean	S. D.
11	Students feel less secure	36.9	46.6	09.9	4.5	2.2	4.11	0.91
12	Negatively affect instruction process	28.8	47.5	13.5	8.7	1.4	3.93	0.95
13	Destroy some of university's property	50.2	40.9	06.7	1.6	0.6	4.38	0.74
14	Create a bad reputation about campus	65.5	26.4	05.9	1.1	1.1	4.54	0.75
15	Could be negatively invested and used by mass media	42.8	40.7	11.4	2.7	2.4	4.19	0.91
16	Leave a bad image among foreign students	47.1	37.5	10.8	3.7	1.0	4.26	0.86
17	Leave a bad reputation about Jordan	39.9	33.9	15.3	6.7	4.3	3.98	1.10
All Statements		44.5	39.1	10.5	4.1	1.9	4.20	0.56

According to Table (5), students' violence has many negative and bad effects. The most common reasons, as perceived by students, in a descendant order according to the mean values were: creating a bad image and reputation about the University of Jordan (Mean = 4.54, S.D. = 0.75), destroying different types of university properties (Mean = 4.38, S.D. = 0.74), leaving a bad image about the university among foreign students (Mean = 4.26, S.D. = 0.86), investing violence in a negative way by the mass media (Mean = 4.19, S.D. =

0.91), having a feeling of insecurity among non-violent students (Mean = 4.11, S.D. = 0.91), and giving a bad reputation about Jordan (Mean = 3.98, S.D. = 1.10). On the contrary, respondents did not believe or agree that campus violence disturbs the process of instruction inside campus (Mean = 3.93, S.D. = 0.95). Regarding the findings of the one-way ANOVA for items representing the component of "Effects of Violence," see Table (6).

Table (6): Findings of One-Way ANOVA for Statements of the Component of "Effects of Violence"

Gender	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	Sig.
Male	4.14	0.61	4.73	0.03
Female	4.24	0.52		
Nationality	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	Sig.
Jordanian	4.19	0.56	1.01	0.32
Non Jordanian	4.28	0.54		
Academic Year	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	Sig.
Freshman	4.20	0.58	0.63	0.60
Sophomore	4.25	0.49		
Junior	4.17	0.62		
Senior	4.18	0.54		
College Type	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	Sig.
Hard Sciences	4.14	0.59	7.05	0.01
Human Sciences	4.26	0.52		
Place of Residence	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	Sig.
City	4.20	0.56	2.32	0.07
Village	4.28	0.52		
Camp	3.76	0.83		
Badia	4.14	0.47		
Acceptance Method	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	Sig.
Competition	4.22	0.52	0.71	0.55
Royal Grant	4.18	0.57		
Military	4.25	0.58		
Others	4.15	0.59		

The results of the one-way ANOVA, as presented in Table (6), showed that there were statistically significant differences in students' attitudes toward the component of "Effects of Violence" by each of the characteristics related to their gender ($F = 4.73, \alpha = 0.03$) and type of college ($F =$

$7.05, \alpha = 0.01$). On the contrary, there were no differences with a statistical significance in the respondents' attitudes by each of the variables of nationality ($F = 1.01, \alpha = 0.32$), academic year ($F = 0.63, \alpha = 0.60$), place of residence ($F = 2.32, \alpha = 0.07$), and acceptance method ($F = 0.71, \alpha = 0.55$).

Fourth) Controlling Violence:

The third component of the Scale of Violence is related to "Controlling Violence." This component

included nine statements. In terms of percentages, means, and standard deviations for statements related to the component of "Controlling Violence", see Table (7).

Table (7): Percentages, Means, and Standard Deviations for Statements Related to the Component of "Controlling Violence"

#	Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean	S. D.
18	Increasing non-curriculum activities	43.4	40.7	09.4	03.5	03.1	4.18	0.95
19	Launching awareness campaigns about concepts of national unity	39.4	41.7	15.1	02.4	01.4	4.15	0.86
20	The university must review its acceptance policy	39.4	26.9	19.2	08.6	05.9	3.85	1.20
21	Launching more awareness about negative effects of violence	41.0	45.9	09.4	02.9	00.8	4.24	0.80
22	Names of students participating in violence should be publicized	48.3	32.9	11.8	04.6	02.4	4.20	0.98
23	Campus should not be accessible for outsiders without screening	36.7	26.4	22.3	08.6	06.0	3.79	1.19
24	Dismissed students due to violence should not be accepted at other schools	19.6	18.0	25.8	22.3	14.5	3.06	1.33
25	Having more meetings between colleges, departments and students	39.1	40.1	15.7	02.2	02.9	4.10	0.94
26	Designing and distributing posters encouraging students coexistence	36.6	44.5	15.6	01.9	01.4	4.13	0.84
All Statements		38.2	35.2	16.0	06.3	04.3	3.97	0.52

As explained in Table (7), students gave different weights to suggested solutions and actions to limit or control students' violence in campus. The most commonly reported reasons, included in a descendant order according to the mean values: creating and implementing more awareness efforts and plans targeting students regarding negative effects of violence (Mean = 4.24, S.D. = 0.80), publicizing names and identities of students participating in violence inside and outside campus (Mean = 4.20, S.D. = 0.98), increasing extra-curricular activities (Mean = 4.18, S.D. = 0.95). Indeed, having such activities has many advantages for students, such as having new relationships, integrating students with different backgrounds, cultures, religions, genders, nationalities, etc. together with gaining new

skills, and investing free time in a positive way.

Other suggested solutions to reduce violence include: launching awareness campaigns encouraging students to understand and respect the concept of national unity (Mean = 4.15, S.D. = 0.86), distributing posters in different parts of campus which encourage students' coexistence (Mean = 4.13, S.D. = 0.84), holding more meetings between colleges and academic departments on the one hand, and between students on the other (Mean = 4.10, S.D. = 0.94), re-evaluating the process of accepting students with low high school averages (Mean = 3.85, S.D. = 1.20), screening outsiders when entering campus (Mean = 3.79, S.D. = 1.19), and preventing dismissed students due to their violence in campus from getting admission at other higher education institutions in

Jordan (Mean = 3.06, S.D. = 1.33). In relation to the findings of the one-way ANOVA for statements

representing the component of “Controlling Violence,” see Table (8).

Table (8): Findings of One-Way ANOVA for Statements of the Component of “Controlling Violence”

Gender	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	Sig.
Male	3.95	0.56	00.64	00.42
Female	3.98	0.51		
Nationality	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	Sig.
Jordanian	3.97	0.52	00.15	00.70
Non Jordanian	3.94	0.54		
Academic Year	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	Sig.
Freshman	4.01	0.53	00.96	00.41
Sophomore	3.99	0.49		
Junior	3.97	0.53		
Senior	3.91	0.55		
College Type	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	Sig.
Hard Sciences	3.90	0.55	11.86	0.001
Human Sciences	4.04	0.49		
Place of Residence	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	Sig.
City	3.97	0.53	00.68	00.57
Village	4.02	0.47		
Camp	3.75	0.70		
Badia	3.93	0.51		
Acceptance Method	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	Sig.
Competition	3.99	0.54	01.67	00.17
Royal Grant	3.89	0.53		
Military	4.01	0.55		
Others	4.00	0.56		

Results of the one-way ANOVA, as shown in Table (8), assert that there were statistically significant differences in students’ attitudes toward the component of “Controlling Violence” by the variable of college type (F = 11.86, α = 0.001). On the other hand, there were no statistically significant differences in the respondents’

attitudes by each of the variables of gender (F = 0.64, α = 0.42), nationality (F = 0.15, α = 0.70), academic year (F = 0.96, α = 0.41), place of residence (F = 0.68, α = 0.57), and acceptance method (F = 1.67, α = 0.17).

Fifth) Violence and Culture:

The fourth component of the Scale of Violence is

related to "Violence and Culture." This component included five statements. In terms of percentages, means,

and standard deviations for statements related to the component of "Violence and Culture", see Table (9).

Table (9): Percentages, Means, and Standard Deviations for Statements Related to the Component of "Violence and Society's Culture"

#	Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean	S. D.
27	Contradicts with human values	55.8	36.7	06.4	0.3	0.8	4.46	0.70
28	Contradicts with the principles of Islam and Christianity	64.9	25.1	08.6	0.6	0.8	4.53	0.75
29	Contradicts with the value system of the Jordanian culture	39.4	34.2	15.1	7.0	4.3	3.97	1.10
30	Contradicts with society's expectations from university students	40.5	42.3	12.7	3.2	1.3	4.18	0.86
31	Unethical behavior as seen by society	68.5	22.6	05.2	2.5	1.1	4.55	0.80
All Statements		53.8	32.2	09.6	2.7	1.7	4.34	0.57

The findings from Table (9) show that the respondents consider students' violence as an anti-social behavior. Campus violence, from the perspective of students, is unethical (Mean = 4.55, S.D. = 0.80), contradicts with the doctrines of Islam and Christianity (Mean = 4.53, S.D. = 0.75), contradicts with human values (Mean = 4.46, S.D.= 0.70), contradicts with societal expectations from

university students (Mean = 4.18, S.D. = 0.86), and that students' violence contradicts and is inconsistent with the value system of the Jordanian culture (Mean = 3.97, S.D.= 1.10). Table (10) presents the results of the one-way ANOVA for statements of the component of "Violence and Society's Culture."

Table (10): Findings of One-Way ANOVA for Statements of the Component of "Violence and Society's Culture"

Gender	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	Sig.
Male	4.21	0.64	19.67	0.001
Female	4.41	0.51		
Nationality	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	Sig.
Jordanian	4.34	0.57	00.02	0.90
Non Jordanian	4.33	0.55		

Academic Year	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	Sig.
Freshman	4.36	0.54	01.01	0.39
Sophomore	4.37	0.54		
Junior	4.35	0.60		
Senior	4.27	0.59		
College Type	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	Sig.
Hard Sciences	4.30	0.57	02.75	0.10
Human Sciences	4.38	0.56		
Place of Residence	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	Sig.
City	4.36	0.55	07.76	0.001
Village	4.32	0.56		
Camp	4.13	0.49		
Badia	4.43	0.72		
Acceptance Method	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	Sig.
Competition	4.39	0.52	02.03	0.11
Royal Grant	4.30	0.58		
Military	4.38	0.52		
Others	4.25	0.68		

The findings of the one-way ANOVA, as presented in Table (10), show that there were statistically significant differences in students' attitudes toward the component of "Violence and Society's Culture" by each of the variables of gender ($F = 19.67, \alpha = 0.001$) and place of residence ($F = 7.76, \alpha = 0.001$). Conversely, there were no statistically significant differences in the

respondents' attitudes by each of the variables of nationality ($F = 0.02, \alpha = 0.90$), academic year ($F = 1.01, \alpha = 0.39$), college type ($F = 2.75, \alpha = 0.10$), and acceptance method ($F = 2.03, \alpha = 0.11$).

Sixth) Overall Scale of Violence:

Table (11) illustrates the results of the one-way ANOVA for all statements of the Scale of Violence.

Table (11): Findings of One-Way ANOVA for Statements of the "Scale of Violence"

Gender	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	Sig.
Male	3.93	0.42	3.44	0.06
Female	3.98	0.35		
Nationality	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	Sig.
Jordanian	3.96	0.38	0.08	0.78
Non Jordanian	3.98	0.36		

Academic Year	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	Sig.
Freshman	3.98	0.40	0.77	0.51
Sophomore	3.99	0.34		
Junior	3.96	0.39		
Senior	3.93	0.40		
College Type	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	Sig.
Hard Sciences	3.92	0.40	6.25	0.01
Human Sciences	4.00	0.36		
Place of Residence	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	Sig.
City	3.96	0.39	1.97	0.12
Village	4.01	0.34		
Camp	3.72	0.32		
Badia	3.81	0.41		
Acceptance Method	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	Sig.
Competition	4.00	0.38	2.22	0.09
Royal Grant	3.91	0.36		
Military	3.99	0.41		
Others	3.93	0.37		

The results of the one-way ANOVA, as presented in Table (11), show that there were differences with a statistical significance in students' attitudes toward all statements of the "Scale of Violence" by the characteristic of college type ($F = 6.25$, $\alpha = 0.01$). In contrast, there were no statistically significant differences in the students' attitudes by each of the variables of gender ($F = 3.44$, $\alpha = 0.06$), nationality ($F = 0.08$, $\alpha = 0.78$), academic year ($F = 0.77$, $\alpha = 0.51$), place of residence ($F = 1.97$, $\alpha = 0.12$), and acceptance method ($F = 2.22$, $\alpha = 0.09$).

DISCUSSION

The current study reached many conclusions in relation to the causes and effects of violence, methods of controlling violence, and the relationship between violence and culture as viewed by respondents. To begin with, the findings indicated that male students at the University of Jordan are more involved in violence than females, which is consistent with the previous literature carried out by Sweet et al.

(2005); and this reflects differences in the socialization process as explained by Bowker (1981). Almost all societies socialize females from an early age to be less powerful, more obedient and dependent, and less confident, dominant and aggressive than males (Kendall, 2003; Zanden, 1990; Roos, 1985; Kanter, 1977). Indeed, male violence characterizes dominance and power (Stark, 2004; Puddifoot and Cooke, 2002; Courtenay, 1999). Females are socialized to be more law obedient, disciplined, and involved in time management. This is partially supported by the fact that most top graduating students in different departments at the University of Jordan were females.

In response to the major causes of violence, as reported by the respondents, the responses included tribal fanaticism, being a male student, not being afraid of punishment, improper socialization, and not investing free time. Some of these findings are enhanced by previous research on the subject (White et al., 2001; Moffitt, 1993).

As for the main consequences of violence, the responses included creating a negative reputation about the university, destroying public property, leaving a bad impression among foreign students, presenting a negative image about campus by mass media, feeling of insecurity among students, and creating a bad impression about Jordan.

The suggested actions proposed to limit students' violence included having more awareness efforts and campaigns among students, publicizing the names of violent students, having more extra-curricular activities, encouraging students to respect national unity, distributing posters encouraging coexistence, having more meetings between students, administrators, and teaching staff; preventing students with low averages in high school from acceptance; and preventing violent students from transferring into other universities in Jordan. Many of the above suggestions were reported and recommended by previous research (Bodine, 1995; Macan and Trusty, 1995; Conklin and Robinson, 1993; Whitaker and Pollard, 1993).

Finally, regarding the relationship between students' violence and culture, the respondents believed that violence is unethical, contradicts with Islamic and Christian doctrines, inconsistent with human value system and societal expectations from university students, and contradicts with the Jordanian cultural norms. In fact, the respondents considered students' violence as anti-cultural. Culture is powerful in constructing our reality (Marsella, 2005). Indeed, cultural components could be a major cause of violence and that understanding such cultural components may help in preventing violence (Soriano et al., 2004). For example, a study in the United States by Finkelhor and Ormrod (2000) concluded that 19% of adult crime victims and 22% of juvenile crime victims were minorities.

CONCLUSION:

The current study arrived at many conclusions in relation to the causes and effects of violence, methods of controlling violence, and the relationship between violence and culture as viewed by the respondents. To begin with, the findings indicated that male students at

the University of Jordan are more involved in violence than females. The latter are more socialized, more law obedient, more disciplined, and more involved in time management. This is partially supported by the fact that most top graduating students in the different departments are females. On the other hand, the major causes of violence as reported by the respondents included tribal fanaticism, being a male student, paying no need to punishment, poor socialization, and not investing free time. Further, the main consequences of violence included creating a negative reputation about the university, destroying public property, leaving a bad impression among foreign students, presenting a negative image about campus by mass media, feeling of insecurity among students, and creating a bad impression about Jordan. Furthermore, the proposed actions to limit students' violence included having more awareness efforts and campaigns among students, publicizing the names of violent students, having more extra-curricular activities, encouraging students to respect national unity, distributing posters encouraging coexistence, having more meeting between students, administrators, and teaching staff; preventing students with low averages in high school from being admitted to the university; and preventing violent students from transferring into other universities in Jordan. Finally, regarding the relationship between students' violence and culture, the respondents believed that violence is unethical, contradicts with Islamic and Christian doctrines, inconsistent with the human value system and societal expectations from university students, and contradicts with the Jordanian cultural norms. Indeed, it seems that Jordanian cities, such as Amman, witnessed a huge modernization process over the last four decades, it is still described as a tribal city as reported by Malarkey (1974). For example, even though the University of Jordan is located in the Jordanian capital; Amman, much of the witnessed violence is related to ethnic factors.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

In the light of the findings of the study, the following recommendations may be put forward to limit students'

violence on campus:

* Training teaching staff and administrators on the skills of detecting and coping with the warning indicators of violence among students. Such students need to be referred to a professional unit that has to be established to provide free guidance and counseling services on campus. Such unit needs to include some qualified and experienced staff, mainly psychiatrists and social workers.

* Investing students' free time through different procedures. Some of these may include creating and motivating students to participate in extra-curricular activities, asking students for more theoretical and field research inside and outside campus, encouraging students, namely needy ones, to secure a part-time employment inside or outside campus.

* Respecting and understanding the relationship between the cultures of different ethnicities of students, namely those participating in violent acts. This is critical and important since, as reported by Pedersen (2001), the inclusion of cultural factors in conflict mediation has many advantages, such as the role of culture in offering understanding and solutions into the causes, processes, and effects of conflict. Indeed, understanding such cultural factors is important for the success of any intervention plan as reported by many studies (Devore and Schlesinger, 1999; Herberg, 1993).

* Encouraging students to respect the concept of national unity. This could be achieved through different tools. Some of these may include having curriculum dealing with and respecting national unity and understanding, in stead of fanaticism, and having more activities inside and outside campus through the Deanship of Student Affairs and the Community Service Office to involve students from different ethnicities and nationalities in different activities.

* Having a coalition working on the issue of students' violence where many other universities could also be

involved. This is beneficial for having mutual experience and getting more feedback on the subject of violence. Other candidate parties in this coalition may include the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Higher Education, mass media, and non-governmental organizations working on or interested in the subject of violence.

* Many students who participated in violence, mainly ethnic violence, were admitted on a non-competitive basis. This category of student obtained exemption from meeting a competitive criterion, such as being from marginalized and/or disadvantaged geographical areas in Jordan. So, the university should find a way to screen their criminal history before being admitted.

* In different occasion, students who were involved in violence were not punished by the university. This may motivate these students or others to be involved in some violent acts on campus. So there is a critical need for creating and implementing very powerful procedures and punishment system for those who are behind creating violence on campus.

* In the case of many violent events, some outsiders ignited or participated in violent acts on campus. This category should be prevented from entering campus to avoid future problems.

* Religion is a vital and basic component of any given culture (Durkheim, 1961), including the Jordanian culture. Hence, religious men and institutions, inside and outside campus should be involved in any awareness campaign targeting university students. Such campaign should present religion as a symbol of tolerance, coexistence and inclusion, instead of violence, conflict, and exclusion. Religious preachers, including those working in mosques should also present these pillars to the public. Mass media and curriculum at universities and pre-higher educational institutions should help in presenting Islam as an ethical religion instead of tracking extreme choices rejected by the Islamic doctrine.

REFERENCES

- American College Health Association. 2002. *Healthy Campus 2010: Making It Happen*. Baltimore, MD: American College Health Association.
- American Medical Association. 2000. *Youth and Violence: Medicine, Nursing and Public Health: Connecting the Dots to Prevent Violence*. Chicago, IL: American Medical Association.
- American Psychological Association. 1998. *Training EMS in Violence Prevention*. A Report by the American Psychological Association to the Emergency Medical Services for Children and Services Administration. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- American Psychological Association. 1993. *Summary Report of the American Psychological Association Commission on Violence and Youth*. (Vol. 1). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Arlen, N. et al. 1994. Toward an Understanding of Origins of Aggression. *Preventing School Failure*. 38(8): 18-23.
- Ascher, C. 1994. *Gaining Control of Violence in the Schools: A View from the Field*. ERIC Digest No. 100. New York: Eric Clearinghouse on Urban Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 377256).
- Bell, Marianne, and Forde, David. 1999. A Factorial Survey of Interpersonal Conflict Resolution. *Journal of Social Psychology*. 139(3): 369-377.
- Bennett-Johnson. 1997. The Emergence of American Crime and Violence on the College and University Campus. *College Student Journal*. 31(1): 129-136.
- Bodine, R. 1995. Creating the Peaceable School Mission. Paper Presented at the *Annual Meeting of the American Association of School Administrators*. New Orleans, February 10-13, 1995.
- Boulding, E. 2000. A New Chance for Human Peacefulness? Peace and Conflict. *Journal of Peace Psychology*. 6(3): 193-215.
- Bowker, L. (ed.). 1981. *Women and Crime in America*. New York: Macmillan.
- Brand, Pamela and Anastasio, Phyllis. 2005. Heart Follows Head: Influencing Violent-Related Attitudes in Classrooms. *Social Psychology of Education*. 8(5): 395-405.
- Carr, Joetta. 2005. *American College Health Association Campus Violence White Paper*. Baltimore, MD: American College Health Association.
- Chalk, R. and King, P. 1998. *Violence in Families: Assessing Prevention and Treatment Programs*. Washington D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Cogan, Rosemary and Porcerelli, John. 2003. Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy with People in Abusive Relationships: Treatment Outcomes. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment and Trauma*. 7(1/2): 29-46.
- Conklin, D. and Robinson, N. 1993. Administrative Perspectives on Disruptive Students Conduct. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy*. 8(2): 299-244.
- Courtenay, Will. 1999. Youth Violence? Let's Call it What it is. *Journal of American College Health*. 48(Nov.): 141-142.
- David, Nichols. 1995. Violence on Campus. *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*. 64(6): 1-5.
- Devore, Wynetta and Schlesinger, Elfriede. 1999. *Ethnic-Sensitive Social Work Practice*. Needham Heights: MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Durkheim, Emile. 1961. *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*. New York: Collier.
- Dutton, D. 1995. Trauma Symptoms and PTSD Like Profiles in Perpetrators of Intimate Abuse. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*. 8(2): 299-316.
- Dwyer, K. et al. 1998. *Early Warning, Timely Response: A Guide to Safe Schools*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Edwards, Clifford. 2001. Student Violence and the Moral Dimension of Education. *Psychology in the Schools*. 38(3): 249-257.
- Engs, Ruth and Hanson, David 1994. Boozing and Brawling on Campus: A National Study of Violent Problems Associated with Drinking Over the Past Decade. *Journal of Criminal Justice*. 22(2):171-180.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. 2000. *Uniform Crime Reports for the United States-1998*. Washington: US

- Printing Office.
- Finkelhor, D. and Ormrod, R. 2000. *Characteristics of Crime against Juveniles*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency.
- Flannery, Daniel and Quinn-Leering, Kathleen. 2000. Violence on College Campuses: Understanding Its Impact on Student Well-Being. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*. 24(10): 839-855.
- Forke, Christine et al. 2007. Interpersonal Violence: Knowledge and Utilization of Available Campus Resources. *Journal of Adolescent Health*. 40(2): S16.
- Fujihara, Takehiro et al. 1999. Justification of Interpersonal Aggression in Japanese, American, and Spanish Students. *Aggressive Behavior*. 25(3): 185-195.
- Galtung, J. 2000. *Conflict Transformation by Peaceful Means: The Transcend Method. Participant's Manual*. New York: United Nations Disaster Management Training Program.
- Henrik, Urdal. 2006. A Clash of Generations? Youth Bulges and Political Violence. *International Studies Quarterly*. 50(3): 607-629.
- Herberg, Dorothy. 1993. *Frameworks for Cultural and Racial Diversity*. Toronto, Ontario: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Huston, A. et al. 1992. *Big World Small Screen: The Role of Television in American Society*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska.
- Jakupcak, Matthew and Tull, Matthew. 2005. Effects of Trauma Exposure on Anger, Aggression, and Violence in a Nonclinical Sample of Men. *Violence and Victims*. 20(5): 589- 598.
- Kanter, Rosabeth. 1977. *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kendall, Diana. 2003. *Sociology in our Times*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Krug, E. et al. 2002. *World Report on Violence and Health*. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization.
- Langford, Linda. 2006. *Preventing Violence and Promoting Safety in Higher Education Settings: Overview of a Comprehensive Approach*. The Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse and Violence Prevention. Newton, MA: Education Development Center
- Loos, M. and Alexander, P. 1997. Differential Effects Associated with Self-Reported Histories of Abuse and Neglect in a College Sample. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 12(3): 340-360.
- Lopez, Frederick. 1991. Patterns of Family Conflict and their Relation to College Student Adjustment. *Journal of Counseling and Development*. 69(Jan-Feb): 257-260.
- Lottes, I. and Kuriloff, P. 1994. The Impact of College Experience on Political and Social Attitudes. *Sex Roles*. 31(1/2): 31-54.
- Macan, T. and Trusty, M. 1995. Personal Control: Effects of Reward Contingency and Locus of Control. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*. 10(1): 201-214.
- Malarkey. 1974. *Amman, Jordan: An Urban Landscape Study*. Unpublished Master Thesis. Department of Geography, University of Oregon, USA.
- Marsella, Anthony. 2005. Culture and Conflict: Understanding, Negotiating, and Reconciling Conflicting Constructions of Reality. *International Journal of International Relations*. 29(6): 651-673.
- Marsella, A. and Noren, G. 2003. *Costs and Consequences of War and Violence*. *Peace and Policy*. 8: 7-19.
- Moffitt, T. 1993. Adolescence-Limited and Life-Course-Persistent Antisocial Behavior: A Developmental Taxonomy. *Psychological Review*. 100(4): 674-701.
- Monsey, B. 1995. *What Works in Preventing Rural Violence: Strategies, Risk Factors, and Assessment Tools*. St. Paul: Amberst H. Wilder Foundation.
- Navaco, R. and Chembtob, C. 2002. Anger and Combat-related Posttraumatic Stress Disorder. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*. 15(2): 123-132.
- Nichols, W. 1995. Violence on Campus. *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*. 64(6): 1-5.
- Pastore, A. and Maguire, K. 2000. *Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics 1999*. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Pedersen, P. 2001. The Cultural Context of Peacemaking. In D. Christie et al. (Editors). *Peace Conflict and*

- Violence: Peace Psychology for the 21st Century*. PP. 183-192. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Pezza, Paul and Bellotti, Ann. 1995. College Campus Violence: Origins, Impacts, and Responses. *Educational Psychology Review*. 7(1): 105-123.
- Pierson, John and Thomas, Martin. (Principal Editors). 2006. *Collins Dictionary of Social Work*. Glasgow, Britain: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Puddifoot, John and Cooke, Claire. 2002. Representations of Handguns by Young Adults in the US and UK. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*. 12(4): 256-270.
- Roark, M. 1987. Preventing Violence on College Campuses. *Journal of Counseling Development*. 65(7): 367-371.
- Rodriguez-Frau, Maria and Mirabal-Colon, Brenda. 2005. Youth Violence Prevention Curriculum for Undergraduate Nursing and Allied Health Students. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*. 29(5S2): 211-214
- Roos, Patricia. 1985. *Gender and Work: A Comparative Analysis of Industrial Societies*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.
- Sampson, Robert and Laub, John. 1990. Crime and Deviance over the Life Course: The Salience of Adult Social Bonds. *American Sociological Review*. 55(5): 609-627.
- Soriano, Fernando et al. 2004. Navigating between Cultures: The Role of Culture in Youth Violence. *Journal of Adolescent Health*. 34(3): 169-176.
- Stark, Rodney. 2004. *Sociology*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Stokols, D. 1996. Translating Social Ecological Theory into Guidelines for Community Health Promotion. *American Journal of Health Promotion*. 10(4): 282-298.
- Sweet, Bruce et al. 2005. An Introduction to Fight-Seeking, and its Role in Peer-to-Peer Violence on College Campuses. *Personality and Individual Differences*. 38(4): 953-962.
- Visser, P. and Krosnick, J. 1998. Development of Attitude Strength over the Life Cycle: Surge and Decline. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 75(6): 1389-1410.
- West, R. et al. 1990. Alcohol Consumption, Problem Drinking and Anti-social Behaviour in a Sample of College Students. *British Journal of Addiction*. 85(4): 479-486.
- Whitaker, L. and Pollard, J. 1993. *Campus Violence: Kinds, Causes, and Cures*. Binghamton, NY: Haworth Press.
- White, H. et al. 2001. Adolescence-Limited Versus Persistent Delinquency: Extending Moffitt's Hypothesis into Adulthood. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*. 110(4): 600-609.
- Zanden, James. 1990. *The Social Experience: An Introduction to Sociology*. New York: McGraw- Hill Publishing Company.

(629)

.(0.05) =

:

.2009/4/26 2008/5/22