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Abstract

Background: School bullying and victimization are major social problems affecting students in all world. Aim Determine factors influence bullying among secondary school students in sohag city. Subjects and methods: A descriptive cross-sectional research design was used in the study. It was conducted in 4 randomly selected secondary schools. Sample was 1073 students. Three tools were used: Tool(1)Self - administered questionnaire included two parts; Part 1: Socioeconomic scale. Part 2: included questions to assess students’ knowledge about bullying and factors influence it in secondary school. Tool(2) Aggression scale, Tool(3) Multidimensional peer – victimization scale. Results: common factors influenced and significantly associated with bullying occurrence in sohag secondary schools such as: age 18 years or above ,female gender, technical education , living with one parent , low socio-economic class. Verbal victimization was the higher prevalent victimization type ,anger and physical aggression were the most common aggression types among students. Boy’s mechanical school found to be the most common school exposed to high level of victimization. Conclusion: Bullying was more common among female students, age equal or more than 18 years, technical education, came from low social class and lived with one parents. Recommendations: Establishing health education program about the bullying.

Keywords: Bullying, Secondary Students, Victims & Bully-Aggressor.

Introduction

Bullying exists in all communities, either in developed or developing societies from long years, it is considered the most common form of aggression and violence in schools. Multiple studies indicated that bullying makes schools to be unsafe places for students (Okoth 2014, Al-Raqqad et al., 2017). Bullying is defined as repetitive violent behavior that occurs over time in relationships characterized by an imbalance in power and that can be manifested in many different ways. It is the systematic abuse among peers or a process of intentional and repetitive aggression, characterized by aggressive behavior that involves direct or indirect intimidation, insults, harassment, exclusion and/or discrimination (Oliveira et al., 2017).

School bullying divided into two categories. The first category refers to traditional or direct bullying. This type of bullying is conducted face-to-face and includes physical and verbal aggression. The second category refers to non-traditional knowing as indirect bullying. This type is not easily seen and includes: indirect (done via a third party), and relational aggression (conducted to damage someone’s peer relationship, social status and self-esteem) (UNICEF, 2016).

Factors influence bullying including the individual characteristics of the bully and the victim, gender, age, socioeconomic status, Peer influence factor, familial factors, school factors and community/cultural factors (Pečjak & Pirc, 2017, Juan et al., 2018).

There are also other factors like literacy level of parents, parenting styles race, religion, ethnicity, disability or sexual orientation, Chronic illness, Obesity, Underweight, Immigrant, Poverty, Foster care, Lack of close relationships, Exposure to trauma, Child maltreatment that also impact bullying (McCloy to et al., 2017, Hornor, 2018).

Any type of bullying can result in negative consequences for all participants in bullying e.g. victims, bullies and bully/victims. It can result in mental and physical health consequences of children and adolescents. In addition to causing poorer academic achievement and can have long-lasting effects on their future psychosocial adjustment as adults (McCloy to et al., 2017) Cross-sectional studies have found that bullying perpetration and victimization experiences are associated with worrying mental health outcomes, such as increased suicidal ideation (Holt et al., 2015, Gaffney et al., 2019) In addition, adolescent victims of school bullying have been found to report higher levels of social anxiety and depression in comparison to their non-victimized peers. Bullies, on the other hand, are more likely to carry weapons or use drugs (Ttofi et al., 2016, Valdebenito et al., 2017).

School nurses (SNs) may be in a particularly privileged position to recognize incidents of bullying among students, as they have the potential to build close relationships with them, thus potentially being
the first responders in addressing this potentially damaging behavior (Pigozi & Bartoli, 2016) The school nurse’s role is to promote health, prevent illness, and support children with social, emotional, or physical problems at school. The school nurse is in an ideal position to conceptualize steps toward a safe school environment and to address bullying. School nurse is not in a disciplinary or academic role thus, children are more likely to confide in her. School nurses are involved with anti-bullying programs; they collaborate with other disciplines such as teachers, guidance counselors and psychologists to support school children who report being bullied. (Blakeslee et al., 2016).

Significance of the study
Bullying has risen to become one of the most important forms of interpersonal violence among adolescents worldwide. It’s rate was reported in Egypt in 2013 (60.3%) it was considerably higher than the rates reported from nearly all other studies of bullying prevalence from around the world. However, concerns about school-based violence in Egypt have been raised by Egypt’s National Center for Social and Criminal Research, which in a recent study of students in primary and secondary school found that 69% of students reported being bullied or experiencing aggression from other students(Abdrahman, et al., 2013).

The Aim of Study
Aim of the study was determine the factors influence bullying through the following objectives:
1- Aware about factors influence bullying in secondary school in sohag city.
2- Assess different types and levels of bullying in secondary schools in sohag city.
3- Determine the types and levels of aggression in Sohag secondary schools.

Research question
1- What are the factors influence bullying in secondary schools in sohag city?
2- What types and levels of bullying are experienced in Sohag secondary schools?
3- What types and levels of aggression are experienced in Sohag secondary schools?

Subject & Methods
Research design
Descriptive cross sectional research design was used in this study.

Setting: The study was conducted in 4 randomly selected secondary schools at sohag city which include (girls' secondary school, Boys' military School, Girls' technical school, Boys mechanical School).

Sample: Multistage random sample was used in this study. Sohag city includes (15) secondary schools, (4) schools were selected randomly from the rest of schools. All grades (first, second and third grade) were included. only students who available and accept to participate in the study included. The total number of students in selected randomly schools are (9708) students. With the software EPI/Info, version 3, with 99.9% confidence interval (CI). The estimated sample size found to be (975) students. To compensate the dropouts, 10% was added to the sample size; the final sample size was 1073 students. It included about 10% from each selected schools. The number of students were selected randomly in every school. The following table cleared the number of students in each school:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Actual number of students</th>
<th>Sample size (10% from total sample size of each school)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys' mechanical School</td>
<td>3553</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls' technical School</td>
<td>2855</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys' military School</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls' military School</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9708</td>
<td>1073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tools of the study
After reviewing related literature three proper tools were used for data collection: it included:

Tool (1) Self-administered questionnaire developed by researcher to collect information from the students, it include two parts;

Part 1: Socioeconomic scale: which developed by (Abd El-Twab, 2012), it was include personal characteristics of the students such as; name, age, sex, residence educational level, occupation of parents and family income.

Scoring system
Scale included 4 items: (Education, occupation, income and life style)
Each item were divided into following categories:
1-Education : (1-8)
2-Occupation: (1-9)
3-Income : (1-6)
4-Life style : (1-3)
Total scores of socioeconomic scale calculated through:
X=7.33X1 + 6.91X2 + 4.86X3 + 5.11X4

Classification of socioeconomic scale:
1-Low socioeconomic class =Mean − 1SD
2-Middle socioeconomic class = Mean + 1SD
3-High socioeconomic class = Mean + > 1SD

Part 2 It included questions to assess students' knowledge about bullying and factors influence it.
included (11) questions such as (meaning of bullying, most common types of bullying, causes of bullying in schools, Methods that can be used to minimize bullying in schools, Is bullying experienced among students in secondary school, Who does bullying in schools, Do bullies use any weapons, Weapons commonly used, Is the school administration notified when bullying occurs, Are there specific rules used to reduce bullying in your school, What are these rules )

**Scoring system**
The total grades of knowledge equal (41); a grade one was given for each correct answer and zero was given for an incorrect answer. The grades for each item were summed up and then converted into a percent score as: Poor = score <50 %, Fair =50-70% and Good = score >70%. (Abd El-Rhman, 2014).

**Tool (II)**
Aggression scale developed by Orpinas & Frankowski (2001) to measure aggressive behavior for adolescents. This scale used for assessing physical aggression, verbal aggression and anger among students. It includes 11 questions, which included (fought back when someone hit me first, pushed or shoved other students, slapped or kicked someone and got into a physical fight because I was angry, tended students to make them angry, said things about other kids to make other students laugh, encouraged other students to fight, called other students bad names and threatened to hurt or to hit someone, got angry very easily with someone, was angry most of the day).

**Scoring system**
Scores of each item ranged from 0 to 6 (0 time - 6 or more times) respectively. severe aggression scored (>60%), moderate aggression scored (50-60%), mild aggression scored (<50%), No aggression scored (0%).

This scale used for assessing physical and verbal victimization, social manipulation, and property attacks for students. It includes 16 questions.

**Scoring system**
Multidimensional peer victimization scale questions designed to be answered by Not at all, once and More than once. The scores of each item ranged from 0 to 2 (Not at all=0, Once=1, More than once=2). High multidimensional peer victimization scored (>60%), low multidimensional peer victimization scored (<60%) & No multidimensional peer victimization scored (0%).

**Validity of tools**: Tools tested for its content validity by five experts in family and community health nursing. According to the opinions of experts the modification were done.

**Reliability**: A reliability analysis was carried out in order to examine the internal consistency of its questions. The value of Cronbach's alpha was 0.731 for knowledge, 0.820 for multidimensional peer victimization and 0.854 for aggression implying that the instrument was consistent and reliable in achieving the study objectives.

**Methodology**

**I- Administrative phase**
An official letter approval was obtained from Dean of the faculty of nursing at Sohag University to Sohag Directorate of Education and then sent to central agency for public mobilization and statistics after that to centralized management of security; finally to directors of the schools. The letter included a brief explanation of the objectives of the study and permission to carry out it.

**Pilot study**
It aimed to test the clarity of the tools and estimate the required time to fill the questionnaires. It was carried out before starting of data collection on 10% (107) of secondary school students; who included in the sample. There is no modification in the sheet.

**Data collection phase**

**II- Ethical consideration**
The researcher followed all ethical issues in conducting the research. Consent was secured orally from the participants. The participants were informed that participation in this study is voluntary; they can withdraw at any time during the study without giving reasons. The researcher have explained the aim of the study to all schools students in the study sample. They assured that any obtained information would be strictly confidential.

**Field work**
Data was collected in the period from (20/3-20/4/2018) and from(25/9-18/11/2018). The researcher took two days each week, 50-60 students who agreed to participate in the study per day. The two technical secondary schools had morning &afternoon shifts while the general secondary schools had morning shifts only. Before meeting the students the researcher met the directors of selected schools, introduced herself and explained aim of the study, then introduced the agreement letters of Sohag Directorate of Education and asking for their permission for data collection in the schools. As well as, selected the appropriated time to meet with the students according to schools schedules. The researcher was as taken oral permission from the teachers who were responsible for the desired students lessons and then the researcher asked them about preferred time for data collection. Researcher introduced herself to the students and explained the purpose and the nature of the study. After that, the questionnaire was distributed to...
students by the researcher. Students were asked to complete the questionnaire and were asked about any difficulty that might face them during answering the questionnaire. Filling of questionnaire took from 20-30 minutes by students. After the students completed the questionnaire, the researcher collected it with careful attention to incomplete answers to ask students to complete them. Finally, the researcher thanked the students and teachers for their cooperation.

**Statistical analysis**

Data entry and data analysis were done using SPSS version 19 (Statistical Package for Social Science). Data were presented as number, percentage, mean, standard deviation. Chi-square test was used to compare between qualitative variables. P-value considered statistically significant when P < 0.05.

**Results**

**Table (1): Distribution of the studied students by their general personal characteristics in secondary schools in Sohag city ,2018.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. (1073)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age: (years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 18</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 18</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean ± SD (Range)</strong></td>
<td>17.03 ± 0.99 (16.0 – 21.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military secondary school</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls secondary school</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls technical school</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys mechanical school</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residence:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who do you live with?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both parents</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of the parents or others</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social class:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table (2): Distribution of the studied students according to types and levels of Aggression they experienced in secondary schools of Sohag city, 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggression type</th>
<th>No. (1073)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verbal aggression:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No aggression</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mild aggression</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate aggression</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe aggression</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical aggression:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No aggression</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mild aggression</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate aggression</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe aggression</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anger:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No anger</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mild anger</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate anger</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe anger</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (3): Relation between the aggression level and personal characteristics of students in secondary school in Sohag city, 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal characteristics</th>
<th>Aggression level</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Mild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age:</strong> (years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;18</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥18</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military secondary school</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls secondary school</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls technical school</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys mechanical school</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residence:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who do you live with?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both parents</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of the parents or others</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social class:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Multidimensional peer-victimization scale</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age: (years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 18</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥18</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys military school</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls secondary school</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls technical school</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys mechanical school</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residence:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who do you live with?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both parents</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of the parents or others</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social class:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure (1): Levels and types of bullying victimization in Sohag secondary schools, 2018.
Figure (2): Distribution of studied students according to their total score of knowledge regarding bullying in secondary schools in Sohag city, 2018.

Table (1): Showed distribution of studied students regarding to their personal characteristics it was found that about two thirds (69.2%) of students aged below 18 years & one –third(30.8%) of them aged equal to or above 18 years with the mean age ± SD 17.03 ± 0.99 (16.0 – 21.0) As regards sex the results of the current study revealed that more than half (54.6%) of the studied students were males. Concerning school types, It was observed that more than three- fifth (64.3%) of the sample were from technical secondary schools. Regarding living of students, it was cleared that majority of the sample (86.4%) lived with both parents. According to social class, this study showed that nearly half of the students (48.7%) had middle class.

Table (2): This table cleared that more than half (52.3%) of students experienced physical aggression. As regards aggression level, it was cleared that 36.5% ,9.5 % of students experienced mild and moderate physical aggression respectively while 36.3%,6.3% of them were experienced mild and moderate verbal aggression respectively.

Table (3): Presented that about 14% of boys military school students experienced severe aggression. With regard to students ‘aggression level and their social class’, this table cleared that, about more than half (51.9%) of low social class students experienced mild aggression level. Also,(14.8%) of high social class students experienced severe aggression.

Table(4): This table revealed present of statistical significant relation between the age, students’ sex, type of school, student lived with parents and their social class and level of multidimensional peer victimization at P= 0.001.

Figure (1): This figure showed that verbal victimization was the most widely performed type of victimization reported by about three-fifth (59.2%) of students and physical victimization was the least common type of victimization(32.8%). As regards Multidimensional peer victimization the present results showed that majority (78.7%) of the sample were victims of bullying and 7.5% of students exposed to high victimization.

Figure (2): It cleared that nearly half (48%) of students had poor knowledge about bullying, more than one-third (36.5%) of them had Fair knowledge and 15.3% had good knowledge about bullying.

Discussion
Bullying is a behavioral phenomenon that has attracted the attention of educators, parents, students and policy makers in many parts of the world in recent years. (Oliveira et al, 2017). The results of the present study showed that majority (69.2%) of students had age below 18 years. This showed that all the students were adolescents and therefore are prone to peer pressure, drug abuse, and other indiscipline behaviors which lead to bullying, in addition to bullying may complicated by normal physiological and psychological changes that occur in puberty. This is similar to findings of the study about factors contributing to bullying among students in public secondary schools in kiambu district in kinya done by Kahunga in (2014), reported that majority (87.5%) of involved students in his study had age below 18 years while 12.5% had age above 18 years.

Concerning the sex in the same table, the results revealed that more than half (54.6%) of students were males. This may be attribute to boys school
more students than girls school. This findings are supported by Elmasry et al., (2016) study was conducted in Zagazig Center, Sharkia Governorate, Egypt, "with 574 participants of adolescent students" who found that more than half (54.4%) of his sample were males and more than two-thirds (45.6%) were females, nearly similar to the result of Seo et al., (2017) in korea the sample included 2936 adolescents participants", reported 57.5% were males and 42.5% were females of their studied sample. In addition to the results of study on "The experience of bullying among secondary school students in Greek schools" done by Athanasiades &Kouimtzis (2016) showed that more than half of the sample were boys. Moreover, The findings of the present study disagreed with Kijakovic & Hunt (2015) conducted study about Incidence of bullying and victimization among adolescents in New Zealand ,reported that female students were 52% and 48% were males in their study sample .In addition to Eskisu (2014) conducted study on "The relationship between bullying .family function and perceived social support among high school students, involved 683 participants from secondary schools in Ankara ,Turkey ,stated that female were more than half ( 52% ) of sample while males were 48%, also found that the middle grade was the largest in size and this finding is agree with the present study .According to type of school the present study included four secondary schools two of them were general and two were technical secondary schools involved males and females ,this findings are supported by Piskin & Cheraghi (2011) Study was conducted in Iran and Turkey "with 1733 participants " included in their study two general secondary schools and two technical secondary schools. Regarding with whom students lived the present results showed that majority (86.4%) of students lived with both parents , this may be attributed to our cultures, norms and customs of eastern community and related to decreasing divorce rate in Sohag city.

This results are nearly similar to Han et al., (2017) done a study on School bullying in urban china: Prevalence and correlation with school climate included 3777 students in China, found that most of the students lived with their parents (73.28%) while more than quarter (26.78%) of them lived with one parent or others. Regarding the place of residence the present study showed that about two-fifth(39.1%) of included students were living in rural area while more than three-fifth (60.9%) of them were living in urban area. This may be related to the study was conducted in Sohag city schools and not included rural schools. This finding is nearly similar to the result of O’Donnell (2015) conducted a study on The impact of bullying and act variables on meaning in life for adolescents in Colorado, the sample included" 186 participants, reported that two-fifth(40.0 %) of his studied sample lived in rural area while three-fifth(60.0%) of them lived in urban area. The findings of the present study disagreed with Saini & Balada (2019) who assessed Bullying ,victimization and fighting in secondary schools conducted in Hisar district of Haryana state, India included 1070 students in sample ,reported that more than half of their study’s participants were from rural area.

With regard to socioeconomic level, the present study illustrated that most of the studied students(48.7%) were in middle class and the lowest(22%) were in high class, this may be attributed to the family income level and living conditions with in average in Sohag city. These findings agreed with the findings of Garmaroudi, et al., (2014) who conducted a study about Prevalence of bullying among Iranian middle school students in Tehran ,Iran included 1960 students, found that most of participants(39.9%) were in middle social class while 27.6% of them were in high social class. As regards level of aggression the present study revealed that;36.5%,9.5 % of students experienced mild and moderate physical aggression respectively while 36.3%,6.3% of them experienced mild and moderate verbal aggression respectively.

The results of the current study are in line with the results of El masry et al., (2016) study was conducted in Zagazig Center, Sharkia Governorate, Egypt, "with 574 participants of adolescent students" found that nearly two-fifth (39.2%) of his sample were mild physically aggression and 8.5% of them were moderate physically aggression, also found that verbal aggression was mild and moderate in 40.5% and 8.0% of students respectively. According to the Relation between the aggression level and personal characteristics. The present study showed that there was no significant difference between aggression and age of the students at p-value =0.193.This finding is similar to the finding of Marcolino et al., (2015) who conducted a study in Campina Grande, Paraiba , Brazil about Bullying :prevalence and factors associated with victimization and aggression in the school quotidain "with 678 participants of adolescent students" , found that there was no significant difference between aggression and age of the students. Regarding the relationship between aggression and both sex and residence of students, the present study showed that there was no significant difference between them at p-value (0.105,0.331) respectively. The results of this study.
As regard the relationship between the victimization and the students' sex the present study observed that there was significant association between the victimization and the students' sex at p-value=0.001. These findings supported by Yahya et al., (2015) conducted a study on Bullying victimization among school-going adolescents in Iraq included 302 students reported that there was a significant association between sex and bullying victimization was observed (p = 0.001).

Also the results of the present study were similar to the results of Alavi et al., (2015) indicated that there was a statistically significant association between sex and being bullied (P < 0.001).

Also the present study showed that female students were significantly more victimized compared with male students. These findings are in contrast with the findings of Piskin & Cheraghi (2011), El-Masry et al., (2016) found that, male students were significantly more victimized compared with female students.

Regarding the relationship between victimization and residence, the present study found that there was no statistically significant association between them at p-value=0.114. This finding disagree with the result of O'Donnells (2015) stated that students' residence has significant relation with victimization. The present study revealed that there was significant relation between victimization and with whom students were living at p-value=0.006, that the students who were living with both parents were exposed to bullying less than those who were living with one parent or others. It may be explained by absence of one parent leaves a gap in his or her role, which affects the child's development (his or her thinking and personality).

The extra sadness and thinking about the absent parent makes them characterized by introversion and isolation. This affects their psychological and mental development, making them more prone to be victims of bullying. These results disagree with Han et al., (2017) found that there was no significant relation between victimization and with whom students were living.

Concerning the relationship between victimization and the social class of involved students, the current study cleared that victimization was higher in students who had low social class and there was a statistically significant association between them at p-value=0.000. The findings of the present study agreed with Garmaroudi et al., (2014) found that the Prevalence of bullying was greater among students, who were from families with low socioeconomic status. Moreover the results of the present study are in line with UNICEF (2016) done a study on "Experiences of peer bullying among adolescents and associated effects on young adult outcomes: longitudinal evidence from Ethiopia, India, Peru and Viet Nam", stated that poor students more likely to be bullied than the least poor students in India and Viet Nam.

As regards victimization types; the present study revealed that verbal victimization was the most widely performed type of victimization reported by about three-fifth (59.2%) of students and physical victimization was the least common type of victimization(32.8%) . It may be interpreted by the fact that many reasons can make verbal bullying occurs more than other types. It is easy to launch, move and invent words and insults on others. This is considered easy and does not require physical strength as other type, this make it to spread easier than other types. These results agree with Garmaroudi et al., (2014) found that verbal victimization was the most common type reported
by more than three-fifth (61.3%) of students and physical victimization was(47.6%). Also the results of current study are in agreement with Turkmen et al., (2013) conducted a study on Bullying among high school students in Turkey "sample 6127 participants" reported that verbal victimization was occurred more than physical victimization in schools (47.3 % and 41.2 % respectively).

Moreover the findings of the present study disagree with the results of Owuamanam (2015) conducted a study on Prevalence of Bullying among Secondary School Students in Ondo State, Nigeria "with sample of 600 students", indicated that the emotional type of victimization was the most common type(58.3%) among secondary school students in Ondo state.Nigeria. The current study found that majority (78.7%) of the sample were victims of bullying. This finding supported by Saini & Balada (2019) reported that majority (81.31%) of students participated in their study were victims of bullying. Moreover the findings of the present study disagreed with the results of Alavi et al., (2015) found that bullying victimization was 48.53% among students. Regarding the level of victimization the present study showed that 7.5% of the sample were exposed to high victimization level. This finding is in line with Daniels et al., (2010) conducted a study about “My Best Friend Always Did and Still Does Betray Me Constantly”: Examining Relational and Physical Victimization Within a Dyadic Friendship Context in suburban city in Canada sample 499 participants, found that 10% of students were highly victimized by their peers.

Concerning level of student's knowledge about bullying in schools, the study cleared that nearly half (48.2%) of students had poor knowledge. This finding may be attributed to lack of information source about bullying such as teachers, parents, lessons in their curriculums…etc.

Conclusion
The study revealed that there was a statistically significant difference between victimization level and personal characteristics of studied students. Common factors influenced bullying and were significantly associated with the occurrence of bullying in sohag secondary school such as: age 18 years or above ,female gender, technical education, living with one parent and low socio-economic class. Verbal victimization was the most prevalent type of victimization among students. Anger and physical aggression were the most common types of aggression among students. Boy's mechanical school found to be the most common school exposed to high level of victimization. The most common two schools experienced sever aggression were boy's military school and boy's mechanical school. Nearly half of students had poor knowledge about bullying.

Recommendation
The study recommended that
1- Establishing health education program about the bullying and it's prevention by School health nurse.
2- Future research for this study in other schools with different students to raise the ability to generalize the results.
3- Increase awareness of public about factors influence bullying in schools.
4- Provid counseling by school health nurse and social workers for students who exposed to bullying.
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