



Impact of College Environment on the Male Youth Violent Behavior in Pakistan

Dr. Muhammad Babar Akram, Dept. of Sociology, International Islamic University Islamabad. Email: babar.akram@iiu.edu.pk, drmbabar@gmail.com

Dr. Zaheer Abbas, Dept. of Sociology, International Islamic University Islamabad. Email: sociologistiui@gmail.com

Dr. Muhammad Ali Tarar, Associate Professor/Chairman, Dept. of Sociology, Ghazi University, Dera Ghazi Khan. Email: alitarar2000@yahoo.com

Dr. Javed Iqbal, Associate Professor/Chairman, Dept. of Education, Ghazi University, Dera Ghazi Khan. Email: jdiqbal@gudgk.edu.pk

Amina Hanif Tarar, Dept. of Psychology, Govt. College University, Lahore. Email: aminaafzal909@gmail.com

Abstract

The present study was based on primary data. The data was collected through the field surveys/visits. The surveys were conducted in three districts of Punjab province namely; Gujranwala, Gujrat and Jhelum respectively. The category of the sample includes only the male students of the study districts who are currently enrolled in the government/public sector colleges of three districts. Proportionate random sampling technique was used to draw the sample from the total population of three study areas. An interview schedule consisting of both open and close ended questions was constructed to obtain the relevant data from the students who were currently pursuing their studies in the colleges located in the respective districts. The interview schedule consisted of the questions in portions regarding the socio-economic and regarding of the research topic. After the collection of data, it was analyzed through the use of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The findings of the study revealed that college environment has profound impact on the violent behavior of the youth.

Keywords: Youth, College Environment, Violent Behavior

Introduction

Violence has become a social fact of the modern society. The penetration of violence into daily life has been seen an ever more common reality in many countries (Krug et al., 2002). While violence is not unique to the specific society, the often challenging economic, social and political environment of many societies increases the rate, intensity and impact of violence. Furthermore, increase in violence is related to the existence and exacerbation of so-called cultures of violence. This increasing trend is blurring the lines between different types of violence and, accordingly, between the actors involved in its perpetration (Moser and McIlwaine, 2004).

The diversity and wide scope of contemporary violence has led to it being seen as the democratization of violence (Rodgers, 2003), resulting in endemic fear and insecurity (Moser and McIlwaine, 2004), or societies of fear. Most often associated with countries that have recently undergone political transformation, or with those currently in transition, increasingly arbitrary and random violence has significant effects both in terms of insecurity and in terms of the perpetuation of violence as a means of expression and defense.

Pakistan is considered to be one of the most multi-cultural and polarized societies due to its geo-political position and participation in proxy wars and as a potentially fertile land for violent youth (Haleem, 2003). Legal studies highlight the plight of the violence in Pakistan. In Peshawar, 62% of violent acts are committed by male youth between the ages 20–39 years (Marri et al. 2006). Some reports indicate a higher level of violence of 74% among males between 20–40 years of age in Karachi, according to the incidents reported in selected hospitals of Karachi (Chotani, Razzak, and Luby, 2002).

Farooq et al. (2010) portrays the situation as being even worse, where the victims were between ages 16–45 years (in 77% incidents) reported in Rawalpindi hospitals. The male youth involved in these violent acts were aged between 16–20 years (41%).

Violence carried out by youth is all the more alarming because the country has one of the highest youth population in the world. Pakistan has 36million youth (ages 20–24 years) and 58million below 15 years of age, which counts for 60% youth of the whole population (Yusuf 2008). Among them, almost 70,000 children are ‘on the streets’ (Iqbal, 2008), and about an equal number of them are ‘off the streets’, but are vulnerable to joining the violent youth in the near future due to ever-deteriorating socio-economic and political conditions in Pakistan.

Perrone, et al. (2004) conducted a study namely, “Parental Efficacy, Self-Control, and Delinquency: A Test of a General Theory of Crime on a Nationally Representative Sample of Youth”. The study focused on the relationship between parental efficacy, self-control and delinquency. The data for the research was drawn from the first wave of the Add Health study, conducted by researchers at the Carolina Population Center (Resnick et al., 1997).

The Add Health study used a stratified random sample of all high schools in the United States of America. The study concluded that parental efficacy had been considered to play a significant role to maintain a strong and stable relationship with delinquency.

Matsueda et al. (2006) explains the relationship between crime and violence with perceived risk. The research illustrates different theories and models in order to have better understanding to explain this relationship. The study documented that increase in perceived risk was negatively associated with the number of violent acts. For instance, increase in perceived risk will cause a decrease in the number of violent acts. Different models namely; Bayesian learning model of perceived risk information, rational choice model, and the model of criminal behavior were used to make significant association between variables. The study reported that neighborhood, individual, rational choice, and prior delinquency were the factors which contributed to delinquent behavior among individuals.

Herrenkohl et al. (1999) reviewed the study namely, "Developmental Factors for Youth Violence". The study explored the factors affecting violent behavior among youth within a developmental frame. Data was collected by the Seattle Social Development Project (SSDP). Potential factors such as individual, peer group, family and community factors were measured for violence between age groups of 10-18 years. The results described that some factors are strongly associated in preventing or promoting violence among youth.

Objectives of the Study

- To know about the socio-economic conditions of the area.
- To know about the level of violent behavior among the college students in the study area.
- To find out the role of college environment in preventing or promoting violent behavior among youth.

Methodology

The present study was based on primary data. The primary data was collected through the field surveys/visits. The surveys were conducted in three districts of Punjab province namely; Gujranwala, Gujrat and Jhelum respectively. The category of the sample includes only the male students of the study districts who are currently enrolled in the government/public sector colleges of three districts. Proportionate random sampling technique was used to draw the sample from the total population of three study areas. An interview schedule consisting of both open and close ended questions was constructed to obtain the relevant data from the students who were currently pursuing their studies in the colleges located in the respective districts. The interview schedule consisted of the

questions in portions regarding the socio-economic and regarding of the research topic. After the collection of data, it was analyzed through the use of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Different statistical tests were applied to examine the strength of the relationship between independent and dependent variables. The sample size was drawn through Yamane and Taro

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + Ne^2}$$

Where (Population Size) N=34175, (sampling error) e= .05 and (sample size) n= 395.43

College Factors

Students' Commitment to College

This variable comprised three items about the respondents' commitment to college. The first item was about the importance of college work which was assigned to the students in college. The second item was students view about the learning in college and its effect on their future life. In addition to this third item indicated the sample enjoyment during college timing with their fellows.

Student-Student Relationship

In college factor the second indicator which was measured by the researcher was i-e student-student relationship. This variable was covered by three items. The first item was about the respondents' supportiveness to one another. The second item was measured by students' role to control those students 'who were unfair with others'. The last indicator of this variable was students' live together most of the time in college.

Student-Teacher Relationship

This variable also included three items that was about the student and teachers attachment in college. The first indicator was about the teachers' behavior that they praise pupils most of the time in the college. The second item was about teachers' that they treat students fairly. The last indicator of this variable was that, teacher takes the time to help the respondents on equality basis. There was no difference among the students in study.

Student-Administration Relationship

This variable i-e students and administration relationship comprised four items. The first indicator was management has made a code of conduct in college for the students. The second item was about the administration that they encourage the respondents to report the violent cases. Furthermore, the third indicator of this variable was that the students'

have easy access to inform administration about any problem. The last item of this statement was that the management takes the strict action against any reported violent case in college.

Results and Discussion

The study is quantitative in nature, in this study, SPSS was utilized for the examination of primary data. The data then has been displayed in plain frame with clarification, description and interpretation. Keeping in view the objectivity of the study, the researcher has attempted to present data without joining his preference and disliking. Nonetheless, towards the end of every clarification underneath the table, the researcher has deconstructed the statistics which delineates the researcher's close to home assessment or pretty much subjective approach. This part comprised tables and their interpretation where every table represents measurable and illustrative data.

Univariate Analysis

Table No. 1: Distribution of the respondents with respect to demographic variables

Variable (College name of the Students)	Frequency	Percentage
Government College G.T Road Jhelum	69	19.4
Government Post Graduate College Jhelum	40	11.3
Government Post Graduate College Islamia Gujranwala	48	13.5
Government College G.T Road Kharian	55	15.5
Government Degree College Sarai i Alamgir	48	10.7
Government Degree College Islamia Gujranwala	105	29.6
Age of the Respondents		
16 – 18	122	34.3
19 – 21	175	39.3
22 – 24	58	16.4
Siblings of the Respondents		
1 – 3	80	22.5
4 – 6	208	58.6
7 – 9	56	15.7
10+	11	3.2
Family Income of the Respondents		
Up to 10000	27	2.6
10001 – 20000	81	22.8
20001 – 30000	73	20,6

30001 – 40000	34	9.5
40001 – 50000	72	20.3
50000 and above	68	19.2
Background of the Respondents		
Urban	199	56.1
Rural	156	43.9
Family Type		
Nuclear	195	54.9
Joint	144	40.6
Extended	16	4.5

The tableNo. 1 illustrates the demographic profile of the survey respondents i.e. college name, age, sibling and family income. There were three districts from where the sample was collected; two colleges were selected from each district namely Gujranwala, Gujrat and Jhelum. The findings highlighted that majority of the respondents i.e. 195 was selected from district Gujranwala, 116 and 84 respectively from Gujrat and Jhelum districts. They fell in the age brackets of 16-24 years. The table shows that little less than half of the sample (49.3%) belongs to 19-21 year of age group. Table also reflects the siblings of the respondents. It shows that more than half of the respondents (58.6%) had 4-6 siblings.

Demographic/background variables of the respondents play a decisive role in analyzing results from the data. Table shows the demographic variables of the respondents i.e. respondents' category, locale/residence, family income, age, father's education of the respondents, mother education of the students, family type and father occupation.

The table shows the age of the respondents. Little less than half majority of the respondents (49.3%) were in the age category of 19-21. Almost one third (34.3%) of the respondents fell in the age category of 16-18, those who fell in the category of 22-24 made only 16.4% of the total respondents. The table also shows the frequency and percentage distribution of father education of the respondents. It can be seen in the table that 24.6% of the respondent's father was having matriculation degree. Which indicates that majority of the respondent's father was educated. Furthermore, Family monthly income of the respondents is also presented in the table which indicates that the respondents who fell in the category of 20000-30000 made 20.6% of the total respondents whereas 9.5% of the respondents were having family monthly income between 300001-40000 rupees. Urban dwellers constituted 56.1 percent of the respondents, while rural inhabitant made up to 43.9 percent.

Table also portrays that more than half of the respondents (54.9%) belonged to nuclear families, while less than half of the respondents (40.6%) were backed by joint families and 4.6 percent of the respondents came from extended families. Table also shows the father occupations of the respondents. One fourth the student's father (25.9%) were doing Government job while twenty two percent owned their business, Table also represents the last degree division of the students. Findings showed that less than half (46.8%) of the students got second division in their last degree. Furthermore, 32.4 percent of the sample passed their last exam with first division while 20.8% of the students received third division in their last degree.

The Table No. 2 depicts the descriptive results of independent variable i. e Students Commitment to College. There were three items through which this variable was measured. The first item was about students' perception on the meaningfulness and importance of college work. The results showed that almost half of the respondents (51.8%) always on the assumption that college work was meaningful and significant for them. In addition to this, 34.7 % of the respondents also often that college work was important for the students and could make significant contribution in learning process. However, there were only 5.3% of the respondents considered college work as important and significant while 6.5% of the respondents remained neutral.

The second item measured respondents' view about the learning in college and its effect on their later life. The findings revealed that more than half of the respondents (59.7%) said that college learning always could affect their future life. 31.0% of the sample said that college learning often had an effect on their upcoming life. However, only 1.4% of the respondents seldom consider college learning as important for their later life. There

Students' Commitment to College Frequency (Percent)					
Statement	Always	Often	Sometim e	Seldo m	Never
How often do you feel the college work you are assigned is meaningful and important?	184 (51.8)	141 (34.7)	23 (6.5)	53 (5.3)	6 (1.7)
How important do you think the things you are learning in college are going to be for your later life?	212 (59.7)	110 (31.0)	26 (7.3)	5 (1.4)	2 (.6)
How often do you enjoy being in college?	149 (42.0)	118 (33.2)	75 (21.1)	7 (2.0)	6 (1.7)

Table No. 2: Students' Commitment to Colleg

were few respondents (.6%) who said that learning in college was never fruitful for their future life, while 7.3% of the respondents said that learning in college sometime to useful for further life.

In measuring students' commitment to college, the third item refers to the students' enjoyment during college time period. The data describes that less than half of the respondents (42%) always enjoyed in college. 33.2% often enjoyed during college timing; however there were only two percent of the respondents who seldom enjoy.

Table No. 3: Student-Student Relationship in college

Student-Student Relationship Statement	Measurement scale: Frequency(Percent)				
	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Students are kind and supportive of one another.	113 (31.8)	191 (53.8)	34 (9.6)	16 (4.5)	1 (0.3)
Students stop other students who are unfair or disruptive.	73 (20.6)	139 (39.2)	84 (23.7)	41 (11.5)	18 (5.0)
Students get along well together most of the time.	98 (27.5)	169 (47.6)	62 (17.5)	18 (5.1)	8 (2.3)

The Table No. 3 illustrates the descriptive results of independent variable i. e Students-Students relationship. There were three indicators through which this variable was measured. The first item was students' cooperation to one another. The results showed that more than half (53.8%) of the respondents agreed that they were helpful to one another. While (31.8%) strongly agreed with the notion that students were kind and supportive to one another.

The second item measures respondents' view about the statement "students stop other students who are biased or disruptive". The findings showed that 39.2% of the respondents agreed that students try to stop those who were unfair with others,while 20.6% of the sample strongly agreed with theabove-mentioned statement. The third item encompasses that student spent most of the time with friends. Less than half of the respondents (47.6%) agreed that students spent most of the time with their friends.

Table No.4: Student-Teacher Relationship in college

Student-Teacher Relationship	Measurement Scale: Frequency (Percent)				
Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Teachers praise students more often than they criticize them.	102 (28.7)	158 (44.5)	62 (17.5)	23 (6.5)	10 (2.8)
Teachers treat students fairly.	126 (35.6)	156 (43.9)	37 (10.4)	26 (7.3)	10 (2.8)
Teachers take the time to help students work out their differences.	114 (32.1)	124 (34.9)	52 (14.6)	38 (10.7)	27 (7.7)

The Table No. 4 illustrates the descriptive findings of student and teacher association in class room. The variable of student-teacher relationship was measured by three items. The first item showed that teachers praised student more than they criticized them. The findings unleashed that less than half of the respondents (44.5%) agreed that teachers praise the students in college more than they criticize them.

The second item reflects the respondents' views about the statement "Teachers treat students fairly". The findings revealed that less than half of the respondents (43.9) agreed that there is no gap between teachers and students. Teachers treat students equally in the class. While (35.6%) of the sample strongly agreed with the statement that teachers treat them fairly. The third item signifies that teachers help the students without any discrimination. The findings disclosed that most of the respondents (34.9%) agreed that instructors give them time equal in college. No priorities were given to any student in the college.

Table No. 5: Student-Administration Relationship in college

Student-Administration Relationship	Measurement Scale: Frequency (Percent)				
Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Administration has made a code of conduct for the students.	95 (26.8)	167 (47.0)	44 (12.4)	29 (8.2)	20 (5.6)
Administration encourages students to report aggression cases of their	73 (20.6)	147 (41.4)	77 (21.7)	35 (9.8)	23 (6.5)

fellow students.					
Students feel free to ask for help from administration if there is a problem with a student.	88 (24.8)	138 (38.9)	60 (16.9)	52 (14.6)	17 (4.8)
Administration takes strict actions against delinquents when students report violation of the code of conduct.	69 (23.2)	151 (42.5)	82 (19.4)	38 (10.7)	15 (4.2)

The Table No. 5 typifies the descriptive findings of dependent variable i.e. Student-Administration relationship in the respective colleges. The first item shows that the code of conduct for the students was implemented by the administration. The findings delineated that less than half of the respondents (47%) agreed that administration had made a code of conduct for the students. While 26.8% of the respondents strongly agreed that there were rules and regulations in college implemented by the administration. Likewise, some of the respondents (8.2%) disagreed to the notion that administration had made a code of conduct for the students in corresponding colleges. Similarly, 21.1% of the respondents did not show their decision and remained neutral.

The second item includes that administration encourages students to report violent cases of their peers. The findings revealed that less than half of the respondents (41.4%) agreed that administration encourages student to report the violent cases while, 39.4% of the sample strongly agreed that college executive authority motivated students to report aggression cases of their fellows. The third item was that students can easily call for help from management if they face any problem in college. The data revealed that one third of the respondents (38.9%) agreed that they can freely ask for help to administration if they feel any problem in college. The last indicator of the said variable depicts that management takes strict action against offenders when students report violation of the regulations. Less than half of the respondents (42.5%) agreed that administration take strict action if someone is found in breaking the code of conduct.

Relationship between Delinquency as a violent behavior and Students' Commitment to College

Null Hypothesis: There is no inverse relationship between students' commitment to college and delinquent as a violent behavior among college youth.

Alternate Hypothesis: There is an inverse relationship between students commitment to college and delinquency violent behavior among college students.

Table 6: Relationship between Delinquency as a violent behavior among college students and Students' Commitment to College		
		Students' Commitment To College
Delinquency	Pearson Correlation	-0.009**
	N	355

*P<.01=, P<.001=**, P<.0001=***

Table 6 reveals that the correlation between perception of students regarding respondents' commitment to college with delinquency as a violent behavior was negative ($r = -0.009^{**}$ $p < .001$). These results imply that students' commitment to college was inversely related to delinquency as a violent behavior. By implication, changes in students' commitment to college among college youth were likely to have a corresponding effect on delinquent violent behavior and the reverse is also true. Moreover, there will be a higher tendency to commit violence (delinquency) whenever; there will be a low level of students' commitment to college.

Conclusion

Numerous factors contribute to the relative risk for the development of violence and no single factor is associated with all aggression or provides absolute prediction. Assessing the youth potential, violent behavior requires an organized approach that draws our attention towards having our familiarity with all possible factors involved in violent behavior among youth. Aggressive behavior is a product of multiple factors operating on many levels in the absence of protective factor which affects youth largely within the context of their environment and experiences. The present study was aimed to explore all possible environmental factors involved in creation of violent behavior among youth.

The current study was an effort to understand the reasons for the said cause. This will ultimately be very helpful in understanding the college environment that affect the behavior of individuals in Pakistani society and to formulate the strategies to tackle them accordingly. Studies utilizing multiple factors provide stronger prediction of violence and demonstrate the interaction and increased cumulative risk of these influences. The research work was carried out to assess the various factors in college study time period of male youth violent behavior in the study areas. The current study indicated that no single factor or unique situation causes an individual to engage in violent behavior. The

information considered for this research focused on violence defined as physical or any other type of violent behavior toward other individuals. There is a need to develop the strategies accordingly to tackle the situation in order to have conformity in the youth of Pakistani society.

References:

- Chotani, Habib A., Junaid A. Razzak, Stephen P. Luby (2002) Patterns of Violence in Karachi, Pakistan. "Injury Prevention" 8: 57-59.
- Perrone, D., Sullivan, C. J., Pratt, T. C., & Margaryan S. (2004). Parental efficacy, self-control, and delinquency: A test of a general theory of crime on a nationally representative sample of youth. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 48(3), 298 - 312
- Farooq, U., Majeed, M., Bhatti, J. A., Khan, J. S., Razzak, J. A., & Khan, M. M. (2010). Differences in Reporting of Violence and Deliberate Self Harm Related Injuries to Health and Police Authorities, Rawalpindi, Pakistan. *PLoS One*, 5 (2), 1-7.
- Haleem, I. (2003) Ethnic and sectarian violence and the propensity towards praetorianism in Pakistan. *Third World Quarterly* 24 (3): 463-477.
- Herrenkohl, T. I., Maguin, E., Hill, K. G., Hawkins, J. D., Abbott, R. D., & Catalano, R. F. (1999). Developmental risk factors for youth violence. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 26(3), 176-186.
- Iqbal, M. W. (2008) Street Children: An Overlooked Issue in Pakistan. "Child Abuse Review" 17 (3): 201-209.
- Krug, E. G., Mercy, J. A., Dahlberg, L. L., & Zwi, A. B. (2002). The world report on violence and health. *The Lancet*, 360 (9339), 1083-1088.
- Marri, A., Etienne, G. Krug, , James, A. Mercy, Linda, L. Dahlberg., Anthony, B. Zwi, (2006). The world report on violence and health *Clinical child and family psychology review*, 12(2), 127-156.
- Matsueda, R. L., Kreager, D. A., & Huizinga, D. (2006). Deterring delinquents: A rational choice model of theft and violence. *American Sociological Review*, 71(1), 95-122.
- Moser, C. O., & McIlwaine, C. (2004). Latin American urban violence as a development concern: towards a framework for violence reduction. *World development*, 34(1), 89-112.
- Resnick, M. D., Bearman, P. S., Blum, R. W., Bauman, K. E., Harris, K. M., Jones, J., & Ireland, M. (1997). Protecting adolescents from harm: findings from the National Longitudinal Study on Adolescent Health. *Jama*, 278(10), 823-832.
- Rodgers, D. (2003). Youth gangs in Colombia and Nicaragua: new forms of violence, new theoretical directions?. *Breeding Inequality-Reaping Violence, Exploring Linkages*

and Causality in Colombia and Beyond, Outlook on Development Series, Collegium for Development Studies, Uppsala, 111-141.

Yusuf, M. (2008), Prospects of Youth Radicalization in Pakistan: Implications of U.S. Policies. Brookings Institute Analysis Paper.