Big Five Personality Factors and Aggression Among School Students

Fadwa A Alsadi, Abdulkarim Ayyoub, Shadi Abualkibash*

Psychology Department, An-Najah National University, Nablus, Palestine

*Corresponding author:

Shadi Abualkibash

Psychology Department, An-Najah National University, Nablus, P400, Palestine, Phone: +972568351821, E-mail: shadi.k@najah.edu

ABSTRACT

The study sought to determine the impact of the Big Five personality characteristics on aggressiveness among school children aged 12 to 16 in the Jenin governorate. The study employing the Big five-factor scale of Macri and Costa and the scale of ag-gressive behaviour in three areas [aggressive behaviour against oneself, aggressive behaviour against others, and aggressive behaviour against property]. The sample size in this study was 314 students. The quantitative study tool [the questionnaire] revealed the following correlation between the five major personality factors and aggression: neuroticism [+], openness [-], conscientiousness [-], extraversion [-], agreeableness [-]. The most prevalent main personality variables were conscientious-ness and neuroticism. The degree of aggressiveness in the Jenin governorate was relatively low on the overall scale.

Keywords: The Big Five-Factor, Aggression, Neuroticism, Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Research on student behaviours has a long tradition. Many studies tend to focus on student behaviours that impede the de-velopment of learning and instruction. These behaviours are impacted directly or indirectly by the particular persona of the learner [1].

Personality traits are the universally constant characteristics of thought, behaviour, mentation, manner, and effect expressed by an organism in various situations [2]. These characteristics have a persistent driving force on an organism's actions and thoughts, having this in mind, specific behaviour manifestations will change depending on the circumstances [3]. Personality models differ in their overall knowledge of nature and the number of basic elements that influence behaviour [4].

Recent theoretical developments have revealed that existing personality models include numerous qualities that fall into the broad approach dimension, such as extraversion for McCrae & Costa, the Behavioural Approach System for

Corr, liveliness for Cattell, positive emotionality for Tellegen, neuroticism for McCrae and Costa, emotional stability for Cattell, the Behaviour-al Inhibition System for Corr, and negative emotionality for Tellegen [5].

For decades, one of the most popular ideas in literature has been McCrae & Costa's methods. For instance, the Big Five per-sonality factors refer to a hierarchical organization of five basic dimensions of personality features. These factors are [a] Neuroticism, [b] Extraversion, [c] Openness to Experience, [d] Agreeableness, and [e] Conscientiousness [6].

McCrae and Costa stated the link between basic and characteristic trends, they stated that the core of their theory is "the distinction between fundamental tendencies and typical adaptations, the very difference we have to make on personality stability" [7].

Human conduct reveals a particular endeavour that a person complies with to achieve their needs. The demands of the en-deavour are various, and they might push the individual to commit acts that are socially unacceptable or, on the contrary, perform actions that are praise-worthy [8].

There are growing appeals Human conduct. Aggression in teenagers nowadays is one of the most frequent concerns. In re-cent years, the degree of aggressiveness and violence among teenagers has dramatically grown [9].

The current research focuses on identifying the relationship between the Big Five personality factors and aggressive among school students from the age category of [12-16 years] in the Jenin governorate.

To achieve the research study goals, a prior assessment of the Big Five personality factors and aggressive were tested. Then, the associations between them are examined.

The Big Five Factors Model

The personality characteristics of every human being are different from one another. Various kinds of cultures in this world make the personality characteristics of each nation vary [10].

Personality is conceptualized at a different degree of abstraction or scope from a range of theoretical viewpoints. The most frequent unit for measuring individual differences remains unchanged in personality research. Today, a consensus appears to arise as a broad taxonomy of Goldberg's personality traits known as the Big Five. Plaisant et al., [11] reveal that the Big Five personality factors are five abstract personality factors that are mostly presented by the personality approach, which consist of conscientiousness, emotional stability, openness to experience, agreeableness, and extroversion.

Pervin, Cervone & John [12] said the Big Five personality factor is a factor theory approach. The five categories of factors can be included in emotionally, activity, and sociability factors.

Landy and Conte [13] reveal that the five-factor model is the introduction of five different components. When they are pre-sented together will give a true picture of how a person's type responds to a situation or to another person. These compo-nents consist of conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, neuroticism, and openness to experience.

Several psychologists including Louis L. Thurstone, Raymond B. Cattell, and Donald W.Fiske used factor-analytic approaches to personality trait descriptors in the 1940s and 1950s. Thurstone and Fiske discovered that their data could be explained by five main personality variables. They did not follow up on their discoveries and instead went on to other study projects. Cattell claimed to have discovered over 12 variables but in reality, only five were replicated in reanalysis of his data [14].

The model of personality is known as 'The Big Five' outlines the five main aspects that make up our personality. Paul Sinclair, a psychologist and psychometrics specialist, supported this overview and explanation [15].

Many psychologists have studied and verified the Big Five super characteristics. Moreover, they are at the foundation of many other personality surveys [WT Norman 1963, McCrae & Costa 1987, Brand & Egan 1989, LR Goldman 1990, and P Sinclair 1992]. While Raymond Cattell discovered 16 characteristics in the creation of the 16PF using factor analysis [a statis-tical method of eliminating many unrelated clusters], no one else has been able to duplicate his work [15].

Aggression

Schools seek to provide a secure learning environment and avoid mishaps. Inappropriate conduct, intimidation, bullying, stealing, and hostility are just a few examples of unwanted behaviours from students. That is why schools invest in a strong trusting connection, a nice working environment, and clear guidelines for how you should treat one another. But

also, through recognizing and responding to unacceptable behaviour in a timely manner.

Several theoretical models have suggested a link between aggressive cognitions and violent conduct in the past, with aggres-sive cognitions seen as a link between furious emotions and aggressive action. [16].

Aggressive cognitions relate to a mindset that involves a disdain for and unfavorable assessment of others, cynicism, and mistrust [17], While stereotypes induce expectations about intergroup affect [emotional bias] and conduct [action readiness]. In like manner, emotions are the most important proximal effect on how stereotypes are converted into action [18].

According to Karneli, Neviyarni & Yulidar [19], aggressive conduct is physical or verbal behaviour that is meant to hurt or injure other people, causing pain and both physical and psychological discomfort. Over-aggression can range from verbal hostility to killing, and there have been several examples of physical and verbal abuse.

Aggressive behaviours have been a major focus in the health promotion of children and adolescents across the world. It has been proven that bully behaviours impact at least 8% of children worldwide, with around 50% of them including aggres-siveness. Behavioural issues such as adolescent disobedience, adult aggression, and criminal activity may stem from early childhood exposures to aggressive behaviours [20].

Aggressive behaviour of school-age children arises at the age of 6–14 years old in the form of anger, irritation, envy, greed, jealousy, and the desire to criticize [21].

Failures in a child's formation as a person are one of the primary causes of aggressive conduct, whether he is 3-4 years old, 10, or a teenager [22], The comparative studies identify the following economic, family, school, and social variables as the primary drivers of aggressive /violence. [23]

There are many forms of aggressive behavior and vary according to the theoretical approaches that explain aggressive be-havior, such as Delut in [24] and Buss in [21].

The researcher chose three manifestations of aggressive behavior in her research study, which are aggressive behavior to-wards oneself, aggressive behavior towards others, and aggressive behavior towards property.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Participants

The study used the descriptive-analytical method due to its relevance to the nature of the current study. " The Relationship Between the Big Five Personality Factors and Aggression Among School Students from the Age Category of [12-16 Years] in Jenin Governorate." This approach includes research on what is now in the life of man and society.

The study sample consisted of 314 male and female students, Table 1 and 2 shows for the Distribution and characteristics of the sample members according to demographic variables.

Table 1. Distribution and characteristics of the sample members according to demographic variable Academic achievement

Variable	Repetition	percentage
Academic achievement		
Weak	26	8.28%
Good	55	17.5%
very good	135	43%
Excellent	98	31.21%
Total Summation	314	100%

Table 2. Distribution and characteristics of the sample members according to demographic variables Gender and Place of residence

Variable	Repetition	percentage	Variable	Repetition	percentage
Gender			**Place of residence**		
Male	81	26%	Village	92	29.25%
Female	233	74%	Camp	8	2.5%
			City	214	68.15%
Total Summation	314	100%	Total Summation	314	100%

Methods

The researcher used two tools for the study:

•   List of the Big Five Factors prepared by McCrae and Costa [25] and Arabization of Al-Ansari [26]

The first version of the list appeared in 1989, and McCrae and Costa [25] prepared it. The things on the list were translated from English into simple Standard Arabic by Al-Ansari [26], and the translation was then subjected to various review cycles by professionals. It is considered the first objective tool to measure the basic dimensions of personality through a set of items [60 items] extracted by factor analysis of a large number of items derived from many personality tests. It has 180 items, and many studies have been conducted on it and various normal samples. Some modifications were made to it to reduce the number of items until the second version of the list was released in 1992, which has 60 items and includes five factors: [1] Openness [2] Conscientiousness [3] Extraversion [4] Agreeableness [5] Neuroticism.

Each sub-factor has twelve statements, each with a five-option response scale: [Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree] These options are rated on a scale of [1-5]. The list assesses five personality traits known as the Big Five Personality Factors by the creators, The study conducted a reliability analysis using Cronbach's alpha and discovered that the personality scale has a high level of reliability, which is 86%.

•   The Aggressiveness scale that was prepared by Al-Saleh [8].

The study employed a scale developed by Al-Saleh [8] to quantify aggressive behaviour. The scale consists of two axes, each branching into multiple fields. Finally, there will be 34 paragraphs spread over the three axes to manifestations of aggressive behaviour [Verbal and physical aggressive behaviour towards oneself, Aggressive behaviour towards others, Aggressive be-haviour directed towards property].

Each with a five-option response scale: [Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree] These options are rated on a scale of [1-5], Regarding the aggression scale's reliability, it was discovered that the scale's stability is reliability high, at 95%, which is ideal for the study.

RESULTS

The level of aggression

The researcher used One Sample T-Test to calculate levels of aggression, [See table 3]

The research found that, on average, the level of aggression among school students in the age group [12-16 years] in Jenin Governorate; t [308] = 3.4, p = .001.

Table 3. One-Sample Test, the levels of aggression

	M	S.D.	DF	Test Value = 2.6 T	P	Test Value = 1.8 T	P
LEVEL1	2.1917	.81045	312	-8.913	.000	8.551	.000
LEVEL2	1.8860	.78959	311	-15.974	.000	1.923	.055
LEVEL3	1.6974	.67022	311	-23.787	.000	-2.703	.007
LEVELS	1.9319	.67852	308	-17.307	.000	3.418	.001

From table [3], it is clear that the manifestations of aggressive behaviour as seen by the sample members appeared among middle school students aged [12-16] in Jenin governorate, with an arithmetic mean of [1.93] and a standard deviation of [.67] on the total score of the domains and its Low. Where the arithmetic averages of the study indicated that individuals' responses to the domains ranged between [2.19-1.6].

With regard to the ranking of the domains, the highest average of individuals' responses to the domain of Verbal and physi-cally aggressive behaviour towards oneself, where the arithmetic means were [2.19, SD = .81] and are Low grade, and in the second rank, Aggressive behaviour towards others, where the arithmetic mean was [1.88, SD = .78] and are low grade, while in the third rank, the area of aggressive behaviour towards the property, where it had arithmetic mean of [1.69, SD = .67] and are very low grade.

The most common major personal factors

The researcher used Mauchly's Test of Sphericity to adjust the degrees of freedom for the averaged tests of significance. Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption of sphericity had been violated, $\chi2$ [9] = 52.351, p < .05. Therefore, degrees of freedom were corrected using Huynh–Feldt estimates of sphericity [ε = .940].

The difference between the means is statistically significant, F = [6.76, 1161.7] = 19.57, p = 0.000 The statistically significant differences between the arithmetic averages of the Big Five personality traits [p = 0.000].

Table 4. Tests of Within-Subjects Contrasts

Source	Per	Type III Sum of Squares	df	M S	F	P.
Per	N vs. C	.686	1	.686	1.959	.163
	E vs. C	13.455	1	13.455	39.147	.000
	O vs. C	8.611	1	8.611	35.107	.000
	A vs. C	16.109	1	16.109	46.543	.000
Error(per)	N vs. C	108.210	309	.350		
	E vs. C	106.205	309	.344		
	O vs. C	75.792	309	.245		
	A vs. C	106.947	309	.346		

When the four factors are compared, it is evident that the conscientiousness component is the most prevalent, followed by the neurotic factor by a tiny difference, and the other three factors are the least common.

the most common five major personality factors among middle school students aged 12–16 in Jenin Governorate are the Conscientiousness factor, with arithmetic, a mean of [3.70]. Then it is followed by the Neuroticism factor, with an arithmetic mean of [3.65]. In the third place, Openness [3.53]

was followed by the Extraversion factor in the fourth place, with an arithmetic mean of [3.49], and in the fifth and last place was the Agreeableness factor, with an arithmetic mean of [3.47].

The Relationship between the Big Five Personality Factors and Aggression due to the Demographic Variables

In order to know the relationship between aggression and the Big Five factors, gender, place of residence, and academic

achievement, using the regression models in table [5] were used. [The Big Five factors, gender, place of residence, and academic achievement] were considered as explanatory variables and aggression as a dependent variable.

Table 5. Regression Result [stepwise]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		t	P	R	R Square	F	P
		B	Std. Error						
1	(Constant)	3.360	.199	16.919	.000	.471	.222	56.419	.000
	Conscientiousness	-.033-	.004	-7.511-	.000				
2	(Constant)	2.386	.269	8.884	.000	.537	.289	43.833	.000
	Conscientiousness	-.042-	.005	-9.193-	.000				
	Neuroticism	.031	.006	5.154	.000				
3	(Constant)	2.869	.273	10.527	.000	.580	.337	41.431	.000
	Conscientiousness	-.032-	.005	-6.526-	.000				
	Neuroticism	.035	.006	5.979	.000				
	Agreeableness	-.027-	.005	-5.358-	.000				
4	(Constant)	2.778	.264	10.509	.000	.601	.361	38.713	.000
	Conscientiousness	-.032-	.005	-6.899-	.000				
	Neuroticism	.032	.006	5.522	.000				
	Agreeableness	-.029-	.005	-5.854-	.000				
	place of residence	.254	.054	4.692	.000				
5	[27]	2.991	.267	11.188	.000	.611	.373	34.357	.000
	Conscientiousness	-.029-	.005	-6.232-	.000				
	Neuroticism	.033	.006	5.774	.000				
	Agreeableness	-.029-	.005	-6.147-	.000				
	place of residence	.234	.054	4.375	.000				
	academic achievement	-.108-	.032	-3.401-	.001				
6	[27]	3.081	.268	11.499	.000	.618	.381	30.023	.000
	Conscientiousness	-.024-	.005	-4.641-	.000				
	Neuroticism	.035	.006	6.177	.000				
	Agreeableness	-.026-	.005	-5.183-	.000				
	place of residence	.217	.054	4.045	.000				
	academic achievement	-.096-	.032	-3.002-	.003				
	Openness	-.014-	.006	-2.387-	.018				
7	[27]	2.972	.272	10.932	.000	.393	.155	26.606	.000
	Conscientiousness	-.026-	.005	-4.931-	.000				
	Neuroticism	.037	.006	6.449	.000				
	Agreeableness	-.029-	.005	-5.557-	.000				
	place of residence	.201	.054	3.724	.000				
	academic achievement	-.091-	.032	-2.856-	.005				
	Openness	-.020-	.007	-3.032-	.003				
	Extraversion	.011	.005	2.050	.041				

The regression model results showed a statistically significant relationship between aggressiveness and the explanatory variables.

This can be inferred from the value of t and its associated significance. It shows the strength of the relationship between the dependent variable [aggressive] and the explanatory variables. And it takes into account the beta value, which shows the relationship between the aggressive variable and the explanatory variables.

When looking at the value of F and its significance, it can be concluded that the model is valid and that there is a correlation between aggressiveness and explanatory variables.

Thus, the results refer to the following equation:

Aggressive = 3.360 + -.033 * b + 2.386 *c + 2.869 * d + 2.778 * e + 2.991 * f + 3.081 * g + 2.972 * h

b. Predictors: [27], C

c. Predictors: [27], C, N

d. Predictors: [27], C, N, A

e. Predictors: [27], C, N, A, place of residence

f. Predictors: [27], C, N, A, place of residence, academic achievement

g. Predictors: [27], C, N, A, place of residence, academic achievement, O

h. Predictors: [27], C, N, A, place of residence, academic achievement, O, E

According to correlation between aggression and big five factors personality, proved to be negatively correlated with Extra-version [r = -.232; p < 0.01] and Openness [r = -.376; p < 0.01] and negatively with Agreeableness [r = -.385; p < 0.01] and Conscientiousness [r = -.393-; p < 0.01].

The researcher notes that the Neuroticism factor entered the regression equation, indicating the relationship with aggression. It did not have a statistically significant correlation in the correlation table, but in the regression results, the effect was positive and statistically significant [B = .031; p < 0.05].

Looking at Table [5] [the variables included in the regression model], the gender variable is excluded because it does not affect the average responses of individuals on the scale.

The regression equation "academic achievement" was inserted, and the relationship was negative [B = -.108-, SE = .032, P < 0.05] statistically significant functions on the scale score at the p<.05. Given the data entered statistically from "weak" academic achievement to "excellent" academic achievement, the relationship is negative with aggression. Therefore, the higher the academic average, the less aggressive the student is.

The regression equation " place of living " was inserted, and the relationship was positive [B = .254, SE = .054, P < 0.05] statistically significant functions on the scale score at the p<.05. Given the data entered statistically from "camp" place of living to "city" place of living, the relationship is positive with aggression. Therefore, the higher the place of living, the most aggres-sive the student is.

DISCUSSION

The results revealed that the conscientiousness factor was more prevalent among school students in the age range [12–16] in Jenin Governorate than the other five factors, with the neurotic factor ranking second. This shows that most students are motivated to succeed and endure in completing numerous assignments with merit and tenacity. However, some of the pupils exhibit neuroticism [impulsivity and hostility].

The results revealed that concerning the ranking of the domains, the highest average of individuals is responses to the do-main of verbal and physically aggressive behaviour towards themselves and others. The third rank was the area of aggres-sive behaviour towards a property.

The findings indicated that Jenin Governorate middle school pupils had a very low level of aggressiveness on the overall scale in the three areas of aggression [aggressive behaviour against oneself, violent behaviour towards others, and hostile conduct towards property]. The findings are nearly identical to those of Saleh's [8] study, which found moderate hostility among the [6–15] age range in the northern West Bank.

The study attributes this to parents who do everything in their efforts to raise their children correctly and soundly. Also, families' efforts to protect their children from anything that may cause behavioural deviation as well as to protect them from Israeli occupation practices in light of the conditions under which the Palestinian people live. School also aims to raise a con-scious generation educated on good behaviour.

The emergence of results about the family and the school may result from the existing cooperation between these two environments [the family and the school] because the school and the home are com-plementary to each other, and the school's keenness on behaviour before education.

Whereas animosity against oneself was higher than in the other groups, students are hiding psychological discomfort, which might be due to a lack of psychological unloading mechanisms in their lives.

When considering the correlations between the five factors of personality and aggression found in this study, there were significant positive relationships between neuroticism and aggression. As a result, people with high neuroticism scores are more likely to exhibit aggressive emotions and aggressive behaviour. In addition, it concurred with some of the findings of the Cavalcanti and Pimentel [28] study. Their study found a positive association between aggression and neuroticism. It also stated that there is a negative relationship between aggression and conscientiousness. At the same time, the results differed with a positive relationship between aggressiveness, extroversion, and openness.

The relationship with the other four [extraversion [-], agreeableness [-], openness [-], and conscientiousness [-]] associated factors was inverse. This is to say, the higher the level of the factor in the personality, the less aggressive it was. This agrees with Gitonga, Chege, and Karuku's [29] study, which showed a negative correlation between personality factors and aggres-sion and agreed with Ang et al. [2004] study. According to the findings of Barlett and Anderson [30], there are both direct and indirect correlations between violent behaviour and the five characteristics. The present study confirms this.

It agrees with Antoanzas's [31] study of the existence of a correlation and the effect of the five major personality factors on aggression.

Results also stated that there is an inverse relationship between extroversion and aggression. In other words, the higher the extroversion, the less aggressive the person is, so that the person is introverted and their level of aggression increases. The researcher attributed this to psychological pressures experienced by the student, whether at home or school.

It is tied to the student's self-esteem; the lower his self-esteem, the more violent sentiments and hostile conduct he shows against himself, others, or his belongings.

According to social and educational culture, extroverted people are defined by friendliness, social politeness, and a degree of emotional equilibrium accompanying the situation and managing its actions, according to Bakhshi and Sharma's [32] study.

However, to describe the three components of extroversion, openness, and conscientiousness that are adversely connected with aggressiveness, it may be stated that people with low extroversion scores are non-social and inactive. They do not wish to speak and express their feelings correctly.

People who lack openness do not embrace moral and social traits concepts and therefore have poorer health and behavioural stability. Furthermore, those who lack conscientiousness are non-purposeful, irregular, less conscientious, and less successful in managing their conduct [33]. It agreed with the study of Kokkinos, Karagianni, & Voulgaridou [27] that adolescents with poor conscientiousness were more likely to engage in reactive relational aggression when they made hostile attributions to relational provocations.

As a result, people with less control over their conduct are more prone to exhibiting violence. They also had a weak propen-sity to experience fear, a combination of low empathy, contempt for, and lack of intimate ties with others, leading to excessive proactive aggressiveness.

Neurotic people can have excessive emotional and behavioural responses. Because they are worried and easily agitated, they are predisposed to mental disease when emotional stress increases. As a result, they are more aggressive than people who exhibit emotional equilibrium. According to the findings of Gitonga, Chege and Karuku [29], various personality types would react to circumstances in either an aggressive or non-aggressive manner. People who are unable to resist their urges and temptations and engage in aggressive conduct are considered to have high degrees of neurosis. Furthermore, excessive flexi-bility can occasionally lead to violent conduct [33].

The agreeableness component describes people who are inclined toward interpersonal interactions and the needs of others. Trust, straightforwardness, altruism, compliance, humility, and tender-heartedness are all aspects

of agreeableness. Antago-nism is the polar opposite of agreeableness. Furthermore, people with high antagonism tend to mistrust and have a poor regard for others, and as a result, they act in ways that exclude or snub those who are despised or inferior. Antagonistic peo-ple may lack emotional expressiveness and interpersonal attachment—"they are frigid or cold, disdainful, heartless, and un-feeling." [34].

Surprisingly, data suggests that the existence of high neuroticism may not be sufficient on its own to encourage aggressive and violent conduct but must be combined with low agreeableness. Thus, one interpretation of the interaction between neuroticism and agreeableness is that high neuroticism makes the individual more sensitive to situational triggers such as provocations or perceived insults, which may facilitate hostile and aggressive behaviour when combined with low agreeable-ness. In turn, this might contribute to the detrimental influence on mental health associated with high neuroticism, since frequent aggressive and confrontational encounters with others may negatively reinforce the propensity to view the world and others' motives [35].

The findings revealed no statistically significant differences [a = 0.05] in the averages of students' replies on the overall scale based on gender. The result agreed with the study of Al-Damour [36].

The researcher attributes this reason to the fact that both genders have relatively complete freedom in expressing their feelings and behaviour. Also, they have openness to the world. Education helps in that, no matter how different the mani-festations of aggressive behaviour between the sexes are, it eventually falls under aggressive behaviour.

The researcher might not expect similar findings in other contexts if those contexts significantly differ from the gender-equal environment of Jenin. They would likely consider these contextual factors when generalizing their findings. It's important to note that gender dynamics are complex and multifaceted, so predictions about findings in other contexts would require a thorough understanding of those contexts' unique characteristics.

It can be said that the similarity of the social environment and the public policy in which both sexes live helped ensure that there was no difference between them.

The findings revealed an effect statistically significant of the

Big Five personality factors on aggression at the significance level [α = 0.05] among school students from the age category of [12-16 years] in the Jenin governorate due to the variable aca-demic achievement.

The impact favoured low academic achievement, and aggressiveness rates were lower among kids with high academic achievement. The study by Barthelemy and Lounsbury [2009] demonstrates this and is consistent with Barthelemy's [37] study on the relationship between aggressiveness and student achievement scores.

Studies confirm the positive predictive relationship between school refusal and high levels of aggressive behaviour. As a re-sult of these behaviours, characterized by a lack of emotional control, violent conduct may arise as a method of escape. How an individual respond in different situations may impact the expression of emotions such as rage or aggression, raising the chance of impulsive or violent conduct that may result in school rejection. As a result, emotionally susceptible children may behave aggressively to cope with difficult school settings. They exhibit symptoms of anxiety and depression [38].

In terms of predictive analysis, school refusal serves as a positive and statistically significant predictor of violence. The link between the two variables implies that, in most cases, the various causes of school rejection operate as predictors of high aggressiveness scores.

The findings revealed a favourable association between the averages of the students' responses and the overall score on the scale in favour of the city's pupils. The results showed high levels of aggressive behaviour among the students of the city's residents compared to the students of the camp and the village.

This may be attributed to the peculiarity of the city of Jenin in the face of repeated attacks by the occupation on a frequent basis.

Where the occupation stormed the city of Jenin and abused its residents, made its youth prisoners, and caused the martyr-dom of others.

In fact, when such confrontations occur between the occupation and the youth in general, especially those aged 11–14, the temperamental, volatile, and unbalanced moods are exacerbated in some different situations in everyday life.

The loss and martyrdom of a person affect individuals as a whole from pent-up grief that comes out in a negative way in one way or another.

In contexts marked by chronic political violence and exposure to traumatic events, such as in the Jenin Governorate, post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) has been shown to significantly influence adolescents' emotional and behavioral regu-lation. Prior studies (e.g., Dam et al., 2023) [39] indicate that PTSD symptoms—especially hyperarousal and intrusive thoughts—can exacerbate aggressive tendencies. This may partially explain the elevated internalized forms of aggression (e.g., self-directed aggression) observed among some students in the present sample. Incorporating PTSD as a covariate in future models could enhance the understanding of aggression's multifactorial nature in conflict-affected settings. The emerging field of psychoceuticals has highlighted the potential role of pharmacological agents in modulating aggres-sion-related symptoms, particularly among individuals with elevated neuroticism or mood dysregulation. According to Zhang H, et al. [40], certain psychoceuticals have demonstrated efficacy in reducing impulsivity and irritability in adolescent popula-tions. Although this study did not directly assess medical interventions, such findings suggest that integrated psychoso-cial-pharmacological approaches may be beneficial for high-risk students identified through personality screening [41].

CONCLUSION

The study found that middle school students in Jenin Governorate displayed a high level of conscientiousness, with the neu-rotic factor ranking second. While there was some evidence of aggressive behavior, the overall level of aggressiveness was low, particularly towards others and property. The study attributes this to the efforts of families and schools to raise children with good behavior and protect them from external factors. There was a positive correlation between neuroticism and ag-gression, with other factors like extraversion, openness, and conscientiousness having an inverse relationship with aggres-siveness. The study highlights the importance of psychological unloading mechanisms and self-esteem in preventing aggres-sive behavior. The findings suggest that different personality types react to circumstances in either an aggressive or non-aggressive manner, and people with less control over their conduct are more prone to exhibiting violence.

interventions targeting the Big Five personality factors could be implemented through a comprehensive SEL program, while addressing school refusal and supporting emotionally susceptible children requires early detection, personalized plans, emo-tional regulation training, peer support, collaboration with families, and access to professional counseling. This multi-faceted approach aims to create a nurturing and supportive school environment that reduces aggression and promotes emotional well-being.

Acknowledging the limitations of the sample size and discussing potential biases is indeed a crucial aspect of maintaining the credibility and validity of any research. A larger and more diverse sample could enhance the generalizability of the findings, and a multi-regional study would provide a broader perspective on the topic. This would allow researchers to better under-stand how the observed relationships might vary across different cultural and demographic contexts.

Additionally, further investigations into the representativeness of the sample within the Jenin governorate would provide a more accurate understanding of how well the study's findings can be applied to the entire population of school children in that region. This, in turn, would contribute to a more comprehensive assessment of the implications of the research and the potential interventions that could be developed based on the results.

LIMITATIONS

The primary limitations of this research will be:

1.   Sample of this research: a random sample of 314 male and female school students from the age category of [12-16 years] was selected to complete this study.

2.   Study instruments include [Big-Five Factor Markers & Scales that measure aggression].

3.   Time of this study. It took place in the first semester of the academic year 2021-2022.

4.   And there were certain roadblocks, such as the Corona virus's health precautions, which limited direct engagement with schools and pupils, so they were reached by phone, social media, or by visiting their houses.

ETHICAL CONSIDERATION

Obtaining permission from An-Najah National University to

carry out the study and gather data in order to achieve the desired outcomes. Inform the Palestinian Ministry of Education about the research community that will be used for the study. Obtaining formal permission from the student's guardian to participate in the survey research.

FUNDING

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

No conflict of interest.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

1. Kazak E, Koyuncu V. (2021). Undesired student behaviors, the effects of these behaviors and teachers' coping methods. Anadolu Journal of Educational Sciences International. 11(2):637-659.

2. Kenrick DT, Funder DC. (1988). Profiting from controversy. Lessons from the person-situation debate. Am Psychol. 43(1):23-34.

3. Fleeson W. (2004). Moving personality beyond the person-situation debate: The challenge and the opportunity of with-in-person variability. Current Directions in Psychological Science. 13(2):83-87.

4. Markon KE. (2009). Hierarchies in the structure of personality traits. Social and Personality Psychology Compass. 3(5):812-826.

5. Satchell LP, Kaaronen RO, Latzman RD. (2021). An ecological approach to personality: Psychological traits as drivers and consequences of active perception. Social and personality psychology compass. 15(5):e12595.

6. Diener E, Lucas RE. (2023). Personality traits. In: Biswas-Diener R & Diener E, (Eds). Noba textbook series Psychology. Champaign, IL: DEF publishers. Available at: http://noba.to/96u8ecgw

7. Feist J, Feist GJ, Roberts T. (2006). Theories of Personality (6th Editio). New York: McGraw-Hill.

8. Al-Saleh T. (2012). The degree of manifestations and causes of aggressive behavior among primary school students in gov-ernment schools in the northern West Bank governorates, and ways to treat them from the teachers' point of view.

9. Wani MA, Sankar R, Raghavi R, Chinmaya B, et al. (2017). Aggression among Annamalai university students. Global Journal of Intellectual & Development Disabilities. 1(3):001-004.

10. Pratama DA, Pali M, Nurcahyo FA. (2012). Pengaruh kepribadian berdasarkan the big five Personality terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan hotel.

11. Palestinian Center for Human Rights. (2009). Targeted civilians: A PCHR report on the Israeli military offensive against the Gaza strip (27 December 2008 – 12 January 2009). Available at: http://www.pchrgaza.org/files/Reports/English/pdf_spec/gaza%20war%20report.Pdf

12. Pervin LA, Cervone D, John OP. (2005). Persönlichkeitstheorien. Reinhardt München.

13. Landy FJ, Conte JM. (2004). Psicología industrial: Introducción a la psicología industrial y organizacional. McGraw-Hill.

14. John OP, Srivastava S. (1999). The Big-Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives.

15. Malik G, Singh D. (2022). Personality matters: does an individual's personality affect adoption and continued use of green banking channels? International Journal of Bank Marketing. 40(4):746-772.

16. Dollard J, Miller NE, Doob LW, Mowrer OH, Sears RR, et al. (1939). Frustration and aggression. New Haven, Connecticut, USA: Conn Yale University Press.

17. Clements K, Holtzworth-Munroe A. (2008). Aggressive cognitions of violent versus nonviolent spouses. Cognitive Therapy and Research. 32(3):351-369.

18. Holley SR, Ewing ST, Stiver JT, Bloch L. (2017). The Relationship Between Emotion Regulation, Executive Functioning, and Aggressive Behaviors. J Interpers Violence. 32(11):1692-1707.

19. Karneli Y, Neviyarni N, Yulidar I. (2018). Pengembangan modul konseling kreatif dalam bingkai kognitif perilaku untuk menurunkan perilaku agresif siswa.

20. Keikha M, Qorbani M, Kazemi Tabaee MS, Djalalinia S, Kelishadi R. (2020). Screen Time Activities and Aggressive Behaviors Among Children and Adolescents: A Systematic Review. Int J Prev Med. 11:59.

21. Sibarani R. (2022). Overview Of Aggressive Behavior In School-Age Children At SD Negeri 064990 Medan. Journal of Mid-wifery and Nursing. 4(1):26-31.

22. Bevilacqua L, Carli V, Sarchiapone M, George DK, Goldman D, Roy A, et al. (2012). Interaction between FKBP5 and childhood trauma and risk of aggressive behavior. Arch Gen Psychiatry. 69(1):62-70.

23. Ohsako T. (1997). Violence at School: Global Issues and Interventions. Studies in Comparative Education. ERIC.

24. Dayakisni T, Hudaniah PS. (2009). Malang. UMM Press.

25. Costa Jr PT, McCrae RR. (1992). The five-factor model of personality and its relevance to personality disorders. Journal of personality disorders. 6(4):343-359.

26. Al-Ansari BM. (1997). The Efficiency of the Big Five Factor List of personality in Kuwaiti society. Psychological studies. 7:2.310-277.

27. Kokkinos CM, Karagianni K, Voulgaridou I. (2017). Relational aggression, big five and hostile attribution bias in adolescents. Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology. 52:101-113.

28. Cavalcanti JG, Pimentel CE. (2016). Personalidade e agressão: uma contribuição do Modelo Geral da Agressão. Estudos de Psicologia (Campinas). 33:443-451.

29. Gitonga CM, Chege E, Karuku S. (2021). Personality types and socio-demographic determinants of girls aggressive behaviors in rehabilitation programs in Kenya. International Journal of Psychology and Counselling. 13(2):25-33.

30. Barlett CP, Anderson CA. (2012). Direct and indirect relations between the Big 5 personality traits and aggressive and vio-lent behavior. Personality and individual differences. 52(8):870-875.

31. Antoñanzas JL. (2020). The Relationship of Personality, Emotional Intelligence, and Aggressiveness in Students: A Study Us-ing the Big Five Personality Questionnaire for Children and Adults (BFQ-NA). Eur J Investig Health Psychol Educ. 11(1):1-11.

32. Bakhshi A, Sharma V. (2019). Big five personality traits and social skills of school bullies and victims. International Journal of Health Sciences and Research. 9(1):223-227.

33. Komasi S, Saeidi M, Soroush A, Zakiei A. (2016). The relationship between brain behavioral systems and the characteristics of the five factor model of personality with aggression among Iranian students. J Inj Violence Res. 8(2):67-74.

34. Bettencourt BA, Talley A, Benjamin AJ, Valentine J. (2006). Personality and aggressive behavior under provoking and neutral conditions: a meta-analytic review. Psychol Bull. 132(5):751-777.

35. Dam VH, Hjordt LV, da Cunha-Bang S, Sestoft D, Knudsen GM, Stenbaek DS. (2021). Trait aggression is associated with five-factor personality traits in males. Brain Behav. 11(7):e02175.

36. Al-Damour M. The relationship between personality patterns and aggressive behaviour for primary school students in Jor-dan, in Faculty of Educational and Psychological Sciences. 2011, Al-Ahliyya Amman University. Jordan: Almanthoma.

37. Barthelemy JJ. (2005). Aggression and the big five personality factors of grades and attendance. USA: The University of Tennessee.

38. Gonzálvez C, Martín M, Vicent M, Sanmartín R. (2021). School Refusal Behavior and Aggression in Spanish Adolescents. Front Psychol. 12:669438.

39. Dam VH, Hjordt LV, da Cunha-Bang S, Sestoft D, Knudsen GM, Stenbaek DS. Trait aggression is associated with five-factor personality traits in males. Brain Behav. 2021 Jul;11(7):e02175.

40. Zhang H, Wang X, Li Y, Sun Y, Li T. (2022). Psychoceutical interventions for emotional dysregulation and aggression in youth: A review of recent evidence. Frontiers in Psychiatry. 13:1065572.

41. Alsadi F, Ayyoub A, Abualkibash S. (2023). Big Five Personality Factors and Aggression Among School Students. Re-searchGate Preprint: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/372290425