

YOUTH VIOLENCE: A QUESTIONNAIRE BASED STUDY IN "MISR UNIVERSITY FOR SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY"

Nancy M. Zaghloul*, Sarah A. Khater*, Mona M. Ali**, Sherif A. Hetta***

*Lecturer of forensic medicine and clinical toxicology, Misr University for Science and Technology, **Lecturer of forensic medicine and clinical toxicology, Cairo university, ***Lecturer of community medicine, Misr University for Science and Technology.

ABSTRACT

Rationale and Background: Youth violence presents a significant public health problem in Egypt, particularly among early university students. The aim of this study was to describe the prevalence and the characteristics of violence and violence-related behaviors among early adulthood university students. **Participants and Methods:** Questionnaires were distributed to 300 Misr University for Science and Technology university students' (18-24 years), either during the study day or at university facilities. All students at each site were asked several questions about recent violence-related behaviors (including use of threats, fighting, weapon carrying, and weapon use). Prevalence of each violence-related behavior was reported within, and stratified by gender, age, and other characteristics expected to influence the behaviors. **Results:** Age group from 21 to 22 years represented (56%), females were (55.67%), single (97.67%). The majority was Egyptian (82.33%) and the fifth academic year students were (40.67%). Most of the participants were living with family (74.33%), had religious education (84.33%) and non-smokers (85.67%) with no drug or alcoholic consumption (97.00%). **Conclusion:** Most of the participants never ever stabbed someone or had weapon involvement and most of them were not threatened to hit anyone or were threatened by any one respectively but, (55.67%) was yelled at someone and (39.67%) of the participants had recent fight behavior, (30.25%) of them was hurt and (26.67%) of participants were exposed to sexual harassment and a statistically significant relation was present between academic level affection, various measured predisposing factors and youth violence.

Key words: violence; youth; fighting; weapons; wounds.

INTRODUCTION

Youth violence means violent acts committed by young people who are not described as fully mature. "Youth" often refers to young people who are legally adults (Bushman et al., 2016).

Violent that acts in early adulthood can include a wide range of behaviors; physical aggression, fighting, threats or attempts to hurt others and use of weapons (Mahajan et al., 2011).

Theories about the causes of youth violence implicate multiple factors which occur in complex combinations over differing time scales that lead to acts of violence (David-Ferdon and Simon, 2014).

Family relations play multiple roles that may increase or decrease the risk of youth violence as well as neurobiological risk factors, media violence, alcohol intake, substance abuse and access to

guns may play a role in youth violence (Bushman et al., 2016).

Data from multiple studies suggested that academic achievement during the school years as well as the school engagement predicted lower rates of urban youth violence (Herrenkohl et al., 2012).

AIM OF THE STUDY

The aim of the current study was to spread light on the prevalence of violence and weapon usage among university students and to explore predisposing factors of youth violence and its effect on study and grading outcome.

PARTICIPANTS & METHODS:

The current study was a cross-sectional study, conducted on 300 medical students (in the age group between 18 and 24 years) and based on an already prepared questionnaire. The

participants included 133 adult males and 167 adult females, they were classified according to their ages into 3 groups; Group I: From 18 to <20 years, Group II: From 20 to <22 years and Group III: From 20 to <24 years. The study was conducted at Misr University for Science and Technology (MUST) either during the study day or at university facilities in the period between the 1st of October and the 1st of November 2016 after taking the faculty authorities' permission and the student oral consent.

According to the distributed questionnaire form, all students at each site were asked several questions about recent violence-related behaviors (including use of threats, fighting, weapon carrying, and weapon use). Prevalence of each violence-related behavior was reported within, and stratified by gender, age, and other characteristics expected to influence the behaviors (**Table 1**).

Table (1): The distributed questionnaire form

1- Age	14- Were you threatened by anyone? "mention the doer"
2- Sex	15- Were you ever yelled at some one? "mention the doer"
3- Nationality	16- Were you ever insulted by someone? "mention the doer"
4- Academic year	17- Were you involved in recent fighting behavior?
5- Marital status	18- Did that result in serious injuries?
6- Are you smoker?	19- Did you ever carry a weapon?
7- Are you living with your parents?	20- Did you face any legal punishments?
8- Do you believe in the religious education to stop domestic violence?	21- Were you ever physically abused?
9- Are you suffering from any physical illness?	22- Were you exposed to sexual harassment? "mention its type"
10- Are you suffering from any mental illness?	23- Did violence affect your academic level?

11- Are you receiving any treatment for that?	24- Did your GPA decrease?
12- Are you consuming any drugs or alcoholics? "mention types"	25- Did you ever fail a class?
13- Did you threaten anyone?	

STATISTICAL METHODS

• Data were coded and analyzed using the **Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS)** version 22. Data was summarized using frequencies (number of cases) and relative frequencies (percentages) for categorical variables. For comparing categorical data, Chi-square (χ^2) test was performed. Exact test

was used instead when the expected frequency is less than 5 (**Chan, 2003**). P-values less than 0.05 were considered as statistically significant.

• The questionnaire was reliable and valid
Reliability by: Cronbach's Alpha (Table 2 and 3)

Table (2): Reliability statistics

	Alpha
Demographic and social habits	0.561
Verbal violence	0.736
Fight & Weapon related behaviors	0.752
Sexual abuse	0.579
Consequences of violence	0.728

Table (3): Validity statistics

	Content validity	Face validity	% of validity
		2.97	99.00
Q6	2.8		93.33
Q7	3		100.00
Q8	3		100.00
Q9	3		100.00
Q10	3		100.00
Q11	3		100.00
Q12		3	100.00
Q13	3		100.00
Q14	3		100.00
Q15	3		100.00
Q16	3		100.00
Q 17	3	2.98	99.33

Q18	2.8		93.33
Q19	3		100.00
Q20	3		100.00
Q21	3		100.00
Q22	3		100.00
Q23	3		100.00
Q24	3		100.00
Q25	3		100.00

RESULTS

A cross-sectional study was conducted on 300 medical students. The sample size was estimated by using stratified quota sampling and calculated by sample size calculator with confidence level 95 % and margin of error 5 % from population 1250.

1- Demographic data:

In the participants, the most commonly presenting age group was from 20 to <22 years (56%), females were (55.67%) and single (97.67%). the majority were Egyptian (82.33%) and, in fifth academic year (40.67%), as shown in table (4 and 5).

Table (4): Number and percentage of the participants in different age groups as well as their gender

	N	%
Age Group		
18-<20 Years	66	22.00
20-<22 Years	168	56.00
22-<24 Years	66	22.00
Gender		
Male	133	44.33
Female	167	55.67

Table (5): Number and Percentage of nationality, present academic year as well as marital status of the participants

Nationality		
Egyptian	247	82.33
Not Egyptian	53	17.67
Academic year		
first	34	11.33
second	7	2.33
third	20	6.67
fourth	96	32.00
Fifth	122	40.67
Sixth	21	7.00

Marital status		
Single	293	97.67
Married	5	1.67
Divorced	2	0.67

2- Social relations and habits:

Most of the participants were living with their families (74.33%), had religious education (84.33%), and non smokers

(85.67%) with no drug or alcoholic consumption (97.00%), as shown in table (6).

Table (6): Social relations, religious education and personal habits of the participants

	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
Living with family	223	74.33	77	25.67
Religious education	253	84.33	47	15.67
Smoker	43	14.33	257	85.67
Consuming any drugs or alcoholics	9	3.00	291	97.00

3- Exposure to verbal violence:

In table 7; (64.67%, 73.00%) of the participants did not threaten anyone and were not threatened by any one

respectively with a statistically significant value ($p < 0.001^{**}$) but (55.67%) was yelled at some one.

(Table 7): Verbal violence behavior among the participants.

	Yes		No		total		Chi-square	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	X ²	P-value
Did you threaten anyone?	106	35.33	194	64.67	300	100.00	25.813	<0.001*
Were you ever threatened by anyone?	81	27.00	219	73.00	300	100.00	63.480	<0.001*
Were you ever yelled at someone?	167	55.67	133	44.33	300	100.00	3.853	0.050

Significance was set at p value <0.05

4- Fighting and weapon related behaviors:

In table 8; (39.67%) of the participants had recent fight behavior and (30.25%) of them was hurt with a statistically significant value but most of the

participants never ever stabbed someone or had weapon involvement (98.67% and 81.33%) respectively, (26.67%) of participants were exposed to sexual harassment (p value <0.001** for all).

Table (8): Fighting and weapon related behaviors among the participants

	yes		No		Total		Chi- square	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	X ²	P-value
Recent fighting behavior	119	39.67	181	60.33	300	100.00	12.813	<0.001*
Do you Hurt in a physical fight?	36	30.25	83	69.75	119	100.00	18.563	<0.001*
Do you stab someone?	4	1.33	296	98.67	300	100.00	284.213	<0.001*
Do you ever exposed to sexual harassment	80	26.67	220	73.33	300	100.00	65.333	<0.001*
Do you carry a weapon?	56	18.67	244	81.33	300	100.00	117.813	<0.001*

Significance was set at p value <0.05

5- Consequences of violence:

Almost all the studied group did not face any legal punishment (99.00%) but their academic level was affected in (18%), grade point average (GPA) decreased in (30%) and (28.33%) failed a class with a statistically significant value ($p < 0.001^{**}$), as shown in table (9).

Table (9): Consequences of violence

	Yes		No		Total		Chi-square	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	X ²	P-value
Faced any legal punishments	3	1.00	297	99.00	300	100.00	288.120	<0.001*
Affected academic level	54	18.00	246	82.00	300	100.00	122.880	<0.001*
GPA decrease	90	30.00	210	70.00	300	100.00	48.000	<0.001*
Failed a class	85	28.33	215	71.67	300	100.00	56.333	<0.001*

Significance was set at p value <0.05

6- Social relations & habits in relation to threat anyone:

There was no statistically significant relation between living with family, religious education and threat to hit and

violence however, statistically significant relation was present with smoking and drugs or alcohol consumption (p value <0.001* and 0.046* respectively), as shown in table (10).

Table (10): Social relations & habits in relation to threat anyone

		Threat anyone						Chi-Square	
		Yes		No		Total		X ²	P-value
		N	%	N	%	N	%		
Family relation	Yes	73	68.87	150	77.32	223	74.33	2.56	0.109
	No	33	31.13	44	22.68	77	25.67		
Religious education	Yes	93	87.74	160	82.47	253	84.33	1.43	0.231
	No	13	12.26	34	17.53	47	15.67		
Smoker	Yes	30	28.30	13	6.70	43	14.33	26.0	0.001*
	No	76	71.70	181	93.30	257	85.67		
	No	98	92.45	186	95.88	284	94.67		
Consuming any drugs or alcoholics	Yes	6	5.66	3	1.55	9	3.00	3.98	0.046*
	No	100	94.34	191	98.45	291	97.00		

Significance was set at p value <0.05

7- Social relations & habits in relation to being threatened by anyone:

Table (11) showed a statistically significant relation between smoking,

drugs or alcohol consumption and being threatened by anyone (p value <0.001* and 0.006* respectively).

Table (11): Social relations & habits in relation to being threatened by anyone

		You were threatened by anyone						Chi-Square	
		Yes		No		Total		X ²	P-value
		N	%	N	%	N	%		
Living with family	Yes	54	66.6	169	77.1	223	74.3	3.418	0.064
	No	27	33.3	50	22.8	77	25.6		
religious education	Yes	68	83.9	185	84.4	253	84.3	0.012	0.912
	No	13	16.0	34	15.5	47	15.6		
smoker	Yes	22	27.1	21	9.59	43	14.3	14.86	0.001*
	No	59	72.8	198	90.4	257	85.6		
consuming any drugs or alcoholics	Yes	6	7.41	3	1.37	9	3.00	7.407	0.006*
	No	75	92.5	216	98.6	291	97.0		

Significance was set at p value <0.05

8- Social relations & habits in relation to yelling at some one:

There was a statistically significant relation between smoking, drugs or

alcohol consumption and yelling at someone ($p < 0.044^*$ and 0.042^* respectively), as shown in table (12).

Table (12): Social relations & habits in relation to yelling at someone

		Ever yelled at						Chi-Square	
		Yes		No		Total		X ²	P-value
		N	%	N	%	N	%		
Family relation	Yes	123	73.65	100	75.19	223	74.33	0.09	0.762
	No	44	26.35	33	24.81	77	25.67		
Religious education	Yes	139	83.23	114	85.71	253	84.33	0.34	0.557
	No	28	16.77	19	14.29	47	15.67		
Smoking	Yes	30	17.96	13	9.77	43	14.33	4.04	0.044*
	No	137	82.04	120	90.23	257	85.67		
Consuming any drugs or alcoholics	Yes	8	4.79	1	0.75	9	3.00	4.15	0.042*
	No	159	95.21	132	99.25	291	97.00		

Significance was set at P value < 0.05

9- Relation between demographic data and social habits and being involved in a physical fight:

Table (13) showed a statistically significant relation between age, sex,

living with family, smoking and drugs or alcohol consumption and being involved in a physical fight (p value $< 0.018^*$, 0.001^* , 0.001^* , 0.001^* and 0.001^* respectively).

Table (13): Demographic data and social habits in relation to being involved in a physical fight in the different age groups

		Being involved in a physical fight						Chi-Square	
		Yes		No		Total		X ²	P-value
		N	%	N	%	N	%		
Age Group	18-<20 Years	22	18.49	44	24.3	66	22.0	8.00	0.018*
	20-<22 Years	61	51.26	107	59.1	168	56.0		
	22-<24 Years	36	30.25	30	16.5	66	22.0		
Sex	Male	87	73.11	46	25.4	133	44.3	66.1	$< 0.001^*$
	Female	32	26.89	135	74.5	167	55.6		
Nationality	Egyptian	93	78.15	154	85.0	247	82.3	2.37	0.124
	No Egyptian	26	21.85	27	14.9	53	17.6		
Family relation	Yes	57	31.84	62	51.2	119	39.6	11.3	0.001*
	No	122	68.16	59	48.7	181	60.3		
Religious education	Yes	98	82.35	155	85.6	253	84.3	0.58	0.444
	No	21	17.65	26	14.3	47	15.6		
Smoker	Yes	29	24.37	14	7.73	43	14.3	16.1	0.001*
	No	90	75.63	167	92.2	257	85.6		

consuming any drugs or alcoholics	Yes	9	7.56	0	0.0	9	3.00	14.1	<0.001*
	No	110	92.44	181	100	291	97.0		

Significance was set at p value <0.05

10- Relation between demographic data and social habits and being exposed to sexual harassment:

There was a statistically significant relation between sex, nationality,

academic year, marital status and being exposed to sexual harassment (p value <0.001*, 0.002*, 0.043* and 0.049* respectively), as shown in table (14).

Table (14) Demographic data & social habits in relation to being exposed to sexual harassment

		Were you exposed sexual harassment?						Chi-Square	
		Yes		No		Total		X ²	P-value
		N	%	N	%	N	%		
Age Group	18-<20 Years	16	20.0	50	22.73	66	22.0	0.664	0.717
	20-<22 Years	44	55.0	124	56.36	168	56.0		
	22-<24 Years	20	25.0	46	20.91	66	22.0		
Sex	Male	20	25.0	113	51.36	133	44.3	16.52	<0.001*
	Female	60	75.0	107	48.64	167	55.6		
Nationality	Egyptian	75	93.7	172	78.18	247	82.3	9.775	0.002*
	Not Egyptian	5	6.25	48	21.82	53	17.6		
Academic year	One	7	8.75	27	12.27	34	11.3	11.472	0.043*
	Two	3	3.75	4	1.82	7	2.33		
	Three	8	10.0	12	5.45	20	6.67		
	Four	28	35.0	68	30.91	96	32.0		
	Five	24	30.0	98	44.55	122	40.6		
Marital status	Single	76	95.0	217	98.64	293	97.6	6.034	0.049*
	Married	2	2.50	3	1.36	5	1.67		
	Divorced	2	2.50	0	0.00	2	0.67		
Family relation	Yes	62	77.5	161	73.18	223	74.3	0.573	0.449
	No	18	22.5	59	26.82	77	25.6		
Religious education	Yes	71	88.7	182	82.73	253	84.3	1.61	0.204
	No	9	11.2	38	17.27	47	15.6		
Smoker	Yes	10	12.5	33	15.00	43	14.3	0.299	0.585
	No	70	87.5	187	85.00	257	85.6		

Consuming any drugs or alcoholics	Yes	3	3.75	6	2.73	9	3.00	0.211	0.646
	No	77	96.2	214	97.27	291	97.0		

Significance was set at p value <0.05

11- Relation between demographic data and social habits and carrying weapon:

Table (15) showed a statistically significant relation between sex,

academic year, marital status, religious education, smoking, drugs or alcohol consumption and carrying weapon (p value <0.002*, 0.009*, 0.001*, 0.033*, 0.001* and 0.001* respectively).

Table (15): Demographic data and social habits in relation to carrying weapon

		Ever carry a weapon?						Chi-Square	
		Yes		No		Total		X ²	P-value
		N	%	N	%	N	%		
Age Group	18-<20 Years	7	12.5	59	24.1	66	22.0	4.08	0.130
	20-<22 Years	37	66.0	131	53.69	168	56.00		
	22-<24 Years	12	21.4	54	22.13	66	22.00		
Sex	Male	35	62.5	98	40.16	133	44.33	9.20	0.002*
	Female	21	37.5	146	59.84	167	55.67		
Nationality	Egyptian	46	82.14	201	82.38	247	82.33	0.002	0.967
	No Egyptian	10	17.86	43	17.62	53	17.67		
Academic year	One	4	7.14	30	12.30	34	11.33	15.290	0.009*
	Two	0	0.00	7	2.87	7	2.33		
	Three	2	3.57	18	7.38	20	6.67		
	Four	18	32.1	78	31.97	96	32.00		
	Five	22	39.2	100	40.98	122	40.67		
	Six	10	17.8	11	4.51	21	7.00		
Marital status	Single	51	91.0	242	99.18	293	97.67	14.647	0.001*
	Married	3	5.36	2	0.82	5	1.67		
	Divorced	2	3.57	0	0.00	2	0.67		
Family relation	Yes	36	64.2	187	76.64	223	74.33	3.643	0.056
	No	20	35.7	57	23.36	77	25.67		
Religious education	Yes	42	75.0	211	86.48	253	84.33	4.540	0.033*
	No	14	25.0	33	13.52	47	15.67		
Smoker	Yes	21	37.5	22	9.02	43	14.33	30.095	<0.001*
	No	35	62.5	222	90.98	257	85.67		
Consuming any drugs or alcoholics	Yes	8	14.2	1	0.41	9	3.00	30.136	<0.001*
	No	48	85.7	243	99.59	291	97.00		

Significance was set at p value <0.05

12- Relation between academic level affection and violence:

Statistically significant relations were noticed between academic level affection

and threatening, yelling, physical and sexual violence (p value <0.05* for all), as shown in table (16).

Table (16): Academic level affection in relation to violence

		Academic level affection						Chi-Square	
		Yes		No		Total		X ²	P-value
		N	%	N	%	N	%		
Threat anyone	Yes	27	50.00	79	32.11	106	35.33	6.200	0.013*
	No	27	50.00	167	67.89	194	64.67		
Threatened by anyone	Yes	36	66.67	45	18.29	81	27.00	52.571	<0.001*
	No	18	33.33	201	81.71	219	73.00		
Ever yelled at someone	Yes	46	85.19	121	49.19	167	55.67	23.251	<0.001*
	No	8	14.81	125	50.81	133	44.33		
Involved in a physical fight	Yes	35	64.81	84	34.15	119	39.67	17.402	<0.001*
	No	19	35.19	162	65.85	181	60.33		
Exposed to sexual harassment	Yes	27	50.00	53	21.54	80	26.67	18.334	<0.001*
	No	27	50.00	193	78.46	220	73.33		
Carry a weapon	Yes	15	27.78	41	16.67	56	18.67	3.601	0.058
	No	39	72.22	205	83.33	244	81.33		

Significance was set at p value <0.05

13- Relation between GPA decrease and violence:

Statistically significant relations were present between GPA decrease and

threatening anyone, been threatened by anyone, yelling and sexual violence (p< 0.03*, 0.001*, 0.0024* and 0.001* respectively) as shown in table (17).

(Table 17): Shows GPA decrease in relation to violence.

		Did your GPA decrease						Chi-Square	
		Yes		No		Total		X ²	P-value
		N	%	N	%	N	%		
Threat anyone	Yes	40	44.44	66	31.43	106	35.33	4.671	0.031*
	No	50	55.56	144	68.57	194	64.67		
Threatened by anyone	Yes	41	45.56	40	19.0	81	27.00	22.46	<0.001*
	No	49	54.44	170	80.95	219	73.00		
Ever yelled at someone	Yes	59	65.56	108	51.43	167	55.67	5.095	0.024*
	No	31	34.44	102	48.57	133	44.33		
Involved in a physical fight	Yes	42	46.67	77	36.67	119	39.67	2.632	0.105
	No	48	53.33	133	63.33	181	60.33		
Exposed sexual harassment	Yes	36	40.00	44	20.95	80	26.67	11.6	0.001*
	No	54	60.00	166	79.05	220	73.33		
Carry a weapon	Yes	21	23.33	35	16.67	56	18.67	1.84	0.174
	No	69	76.67	175	83.33	244	81.33		

Significance was set at p value <0.05

DISCUSSION

In the present study, the most commonly presenting age group was from **20-<22 years** (56%), single students presented (97.67%), females were (55.67%) and fifth academic year students (40.67%).

These results were in accordance with those of **Loeber and Farrington (2012)** who stated that, incidents of violence increase in frequency during adolescence and early adulthood for a subset of individuals, and then rapidly and continuously decrease throughout life. A disproportionate amount of violent crime in the United States is committed by 15 to 24 years old (**Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2013**).

These results were also in agreement with **Bushman et al. (2016)** who detected that, youth violence disproportionately affected males and youth from ethnic/racial minority groups, although rates varied for different kinds of violence.

These findings were consistent with **Mahajan et al. (2011)** who reported that, male sex was the most important predictive risk factor for witnessing and perpetrating violence ($p \leq 0.001$) while victims were predominantly females.

Most of the participants never ever stabbed someone (98.67%) or had weapon involvement (81.33%). Moreover, (64.67%) of the participants were not threatened to hit anyone or were threatened by any one (73%) but (55.67%) was yelled at some one. Furthermore, (39.67%) of the participants had recent fight behavior and (30.25%) of them was hurt.

These results were in contrast to those of **Mahajan et al. (2011)** who reported

that, 96% of students had witnessed violence in real life and 28% were of serious nature. Bullying was prevalent. Violence exposure is prevalent in the lives of Indian adolescents and gender differences exist.

Almost all the studied groups did not face any legal punishment (99.00%) although their academic level was affected in (18%). A statistically significant relation was present between academic level affection, GPA decrease and violence.

These results were in agreement with **Bushman et al. (2016)** who stated that, violence perpetrators often have average or better than average intelligence and academic achievement (41% mostly As and Bs). Similarly, **Mahajan et al. (2011)** reported that, those having exposure to violence had poorer school performance and adjustment scores ($p \leq 0.05$).

There was a statistically significant relation between smoking, drugs or alcohol consumption and yelling at someone or being threatened by anyone.

Moreover, there was a statistically significant relation between age, sex, living with family, smoking and drugs or alcohol consumption and being involved in physical fight.

These results were in agreement with those of **Lehrer et al. (2007)** who showed that, attendance to religious services and living with the parents while attending college have protective effects.

The results of the current study were in accordance with those of **Steinberg (2000)** who concluded that, children from homes characterized by negative parenting were at risk for problems regardless of their ethnicity or income and regardless of whether their parents were

married, divorced, single, or remarried. In other words, the quality of the parent-child relationship influenced much more than the social demographics of the household.

Furthermore, the results of the present study were on the same line with **Bushman et al. (2016)** who stated that, school shooters are commonly assumed to be loners, but ethnographic and archival research indicates otherwise (e.g., only 34% were classified as “loners” in the Secret Service study).

The reports of the National Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS) in (2015) showed that the prevalence of current cigarette use decreased significantly from 28% percent in 1991 to 11% in 2015. Since 1991, the percentage of high school students who had been in a physical fight at least once during the past 12 months decreased from 42% to 23% (**CDC's YRBSS, 2016**). The findings obtained in the current study were matching with those results.

Alcohol and violence could be considered as a common risk factor that contributed to the risk of both heavy drinking and violent behavior (**Moeller et al., 2001**).

In 2009, **Tharp-Taylor and his colleagues** showed a relationship between middle school bullying and substance use. They reported in their study that, youth who were victims of mental (such as name calling and threats) or physical (such as hitting, kicking, or other bodily contact) bullying were significantly more likely to use alcohol, smoke cigarettes, smoke marijuana, or use inhalants.

Females who reported being bullied were more likely to use alcohol and

cigarettes than females who had not been bullied, but among male participants, bullying was associated with depressive symptoms but not with substance use (**Luk et al., 2010**).

In addition, 26.67% of participants were exposed to sexual harassment with a significant relation between sex, nationality, academic year, marital status and exposure to sexual harassment.

These results were in agreement with those of **Lehrer et al. (2007)** who stated that, rape, attempted rape, and other types of sexual victimization were detected by 9.4%, 6.2%, and 15.6% of respondents respectively and, 17.2% reported some form of sexual victimization in the past 12 months alone also low parental education, childhood sexual abuse, and witnessing inter-parental violence are associated with increased odds of sexual victimization by the age of 14.

The percentage of high school students who were currently sexually active (had sexual intercourse during the past three months) had decreased from 38% in 1991 to 30% in 2015 (**CDC's YRBSS, 2016**).

Significant relation was present between sex, academic year, marital status, religious education, smoking, drugs or alcohol consumption and carrying weapon.

This was consistent with the Secret Service study done by **Vossekuil et al. (2002)**. They reported that, 63% of the shooters had a known history of weapons use.

Youth risk behavior surveillance—United States (2009), reported that 17.5% of students had carried a weapon on at least 1 day in the last 30 days.

CONCLUSION

Most of the participants never ever stabbed someone or had weapon involvement and most of them were not threatened to hit anyone or were threatened by any one respectively but (55.67%) was yelled at someone and (39.67%) of the participants had recent fight behavior, (30.25%) of them was hurt and (26.67%) of participants were exposed to sexual harassment.

A statistically significant relation was present between academic level affection and violence. There was also a statistically significant relation between smoking, drugs or alcohol consumption and yelling at someone or being threatened by anyone. Similarly, a statistically significant relation was found between age, sex, living with family, smoking and drugs or alcohol consumption and being involved in physical fight and carrying weapon. Furthermore, a statistically significant relation between sex, nationality, academic year, marital status and exposure to sexual harassment was also present.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Special thanks and deep gratitude to **Hebat Allah Tarek Ismael, Mohamed Gamal Mohamed, Naeif Gassem Elshagy** (Misr university medical students) for their great and honest effort in data collection and presentation.

REFERENCES

Bushman, B.J.; Calvert, S.L.; Dredze, M. et al. (2016): Youth Violence: What We Know and What We Need to Know. American

Psychological Association. 71(1): 17–39.

CDC Releases Youth Risk Behaviors Survey Results | Features | CDC (2016): <https://www.cdc.gov/features/yrbs/>- Jun 9.

Chan YH (2003): Biostatistics 103: Qualitative Data –Tests of Independence. Singapore Med J. 44(10): 498-503.

David-Ferdon, C., & Simon, T. R. (2014): Preventing youth violence: Opportunities for action. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2013): Uniform Crime Reports. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Herrenkohl, T. I., Lee, J., & Hawkins, J. D. (2012): Risk versus direct protective factors and youth violence: Seattle social development project. American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 43: S41–S56.

Lehrer, J. A., Lehrer, V.L., Lehrer E.L. and Oyarzun, P. (2007): sexual violence in college students in Chile, Discussion Paper No. 3133, University of Illinois at Chicago, Economics Department.

Loeber, R., & Farrington, D. P. (Eds.). (2012): From juvenile delinquency to adult crime: Criminal careers, justice policy, and prevention. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Luk, J. W.; Wang, J., & Simons-Morton, B. G. (2010): Bullying victimization and substance use among U.S. adolescents:

- mediation by depression. *Prevention Science*. 11: 355–359.
- Mahajan, S.; Arora, A.K.; Gupta, P. et al. (2011):** adolescent violence: an emerging challenge. *J Punjab Acad Forensic Med Toxicol*. 11(1): 34-36.
- Moeller, F.G and Dougherty, D.M. (2001):** antisocial personality disorder, alcohol and aggression. *alcohol research & health*. 25:5-11.
- Steinberg, L. (2000):** youth violence, do parents and families make a difference? *National Institute of Justice Journal*: 31-38.
- Tharp-Taylor, S.; Haviland, A., and D'Amico, E. J. (2009):** Victimization from mental and physical bullying and substance use in early adolescence. *Addictive Behaviors*, 34: 561–567.
- Vossekuil, B., Fein, R. A., Reddy, M., Borum, R., & Modzeleski, W. (2002):** The final report and findings of the safe school initiative: Implications for the prevention of school attacks in the United States. Washington, DC: U. S. Secret Service and Department of Education.
- Youth risk behavior surveillance—United States, (2009):** *MMWR, Surveillance Summaries*, 59(SS-5).

الملخص العربي

العنف في مرحلة الشباب: دراسة استقصائية من "جامعة مصر للعلوم والتكنولوجيا

نانسى زغلول*، سارة خاطر*، منى محمد على**، شريف حتة***

*مدرس الطب الشرعى والسموم الاكلينكية جامعة مصر للعلوم والتكنولوجيا

**مدرس الطب الشرعى والسموم الاكلينكية جامعة القاهرة

***مدرس بطب المجتمع جامعة مصر للعلوم والتكنولوجيا

يمثل العنف الذي يمارسه الشباب مشكلة صحية هامة في مصر، وخاصة بين طلاب الجامعات. و الهدف من هذه الدراسة هو وصف انتشار وخصائص العنف والسلوكيات المرتبطة بالعنف بين طلاب مرحلة البلوغ المبكر.

المشاركون والطرق: تم توزيع الاستبيانات على ٣٠٠ طالب في جامعة مصر للعلوم والتكنولوجيا من سن (١٨-٢٤ سنة)، إما خلال يوم الدراسة أو في مرافق الجامعة المختلفة. وتم طرح عدة أسئلة في هذا الاستبيان حول السلوكيات المتعلقة بالعنف والمنتشرة مؤخرا (حيث تضمنت أسئلة عن استخدام التهديدات، والانخراط بالقتال، وحمل السلاح، واستخدام السلاح) على جميع الطلاب المشاركين في كل موقع وتم جمعها بعد الانتهاء. وقد تم عمل احصاء عن انتشار كل سلوك ذي صلة بالعنف، وتصنيفه حسب الجنس والعمر والخصائص الأخرى المتوقع أن تؤثر على مثل هذه السلوكيات.

وكانت النتائج كالتالي: كانت الفئة العمرية من ٢١ إلى ٢٢ سنة ممثلة (٥٦٪)، وكانت الإناث (٦٧،٥٥٪)، ومعظم المشاركين كانوا من الفئة الغير مرتبطة بنسبة (٩٧،٦٧٪). وكان معظمهم من المصريين (٨٢،٣٣٪) (حيث يوجد بالجامعة جنسيات مختلفه)، وكان طلاب السنة الدراسية الخامسة بكلية الطب يمثلون الفئة العظمى بنسبة (٤٠،٦٧٪). وكان معظم المشاركين يعيشون مع أسرهم (٧٤،٣٣٪)، وكان معظم يؤمنون بأهمية الوعظ الديني في الحث على عدم العنف بنسبة (٨٤،٣٣٪) وكان نصيب غير المدخنين (٨٥،٦٧٪) مع عدم وجود المخدرات أو استهلاك للكحول بنسبة (٩٧،٠٠٪).

وختاما: معظم الطلبة المشاركين في الاستبيان لم يكن لهم سابق نشاط عنيف بالطعن او المشاركة باستخدام سلاح ولم يتعرض معظمهم للتهديد بضرب أي شخص أو للتهديد من قبل أي شخص على التوالي، ولكن بنسبة (٥٥،٦٧٪) تعرض للعنف اللفظي بالصياح او التهديد، و (٣٩،٦٧٪) من المشاركين اشتركوا في سلوك عنيف او قتالي مؤخرا وتعرض (٣٠،٢٥٪) منهم للأذى وقد تعرض (٢٦،٦٧٪) من المشاركين للتحرش الجنسي، وكانت هناك علاقة كبيرة بين تآثر المستوى الأكاديمي، ومختلف العوامل المقاسة والعنف بين الشباب.

الكلمات المفتاحية: العنف، الشباب، التشاجر، الاسلحة، الجروح.