

AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOUR IN EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS: THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES AND IMPLICATIONS FOR SCHOOL AND UNIVERSITY MANAGERS IN UGANDA

BY

**Dr. Kaziba .A. Mpaata
Lecturer, Nkumba University
2008**

Abstract

In this article, an analysis on the contribution of tested theory to the understanding of aggressive behavior among students in Secondary and higher Education Institutions is made. It is emphasized that if antisocial behavior such as fire setting and other forms of violence is to be discouraged, parents, teachers and policy managers have significant role to play. An assessment is made and the article is concluded by pointing out the practical implications of the different theories to educators Uganda and beyond.

INTRODUCTION

There is overwhelming evidence in most secondary schools and even universities in Uganda today of student aggression and even violence when demanding for attention from the authorities in these institutions. This aggression has been increasing steadily over the years. Secondary schools such as Nabumali High School and universities such as Makerere, Kyambogo and Ndejje have witnessed some of the worst student strikes and aggressive behaviour in the recent times. Put another way, these institutions have registered student aggressive behaviours on a number of occasions. Students continue to adopt violent strikes as a means of inducing management to act. Moreover, following the Budo tragedy of 14th April, 2008, allegations of student involvement in fire setting have also been continuously reported. The Daily Monitor Newspaper of 1st July, 2008 quoted the police and reported that “the motive for the suspected arson incidents is indiscipline and revenge by students against fellow students and school administration”. In addition, Magara in the New Vision Newspaper of 3rd July 2008 and Muhereza in the Daily Monitor Newspaper of 4 July 2008 reported the closure of Kabale Secondary School following a violent student strike. Students were protesting the decision by the school administration preventing them from possessing mobile phones while at school. In the violence the students damaged school property including vehicles that had their wind screens vandalized. Moreover, Ssempogo, in the New Vision Newspaper of 9th July, 2008 reported an attempt to burn a school in Nakaseke district that was only saved by the guards. Meanwhile, Ssali in the Daily Monitor Newspaper of 9th July 2008 also reported that police in Masaka had arrested five students of Wava Secondary School for attempting to put their school buildings on fire. All these reports and many others not reported here demonstrate that student aggression and violence is increasing and hence the urgent need for educators to examine the route cause and find solutions to it. The

purpose of this article, therefore, is to document the theoretical perspectives on human aggression and examine its implications to secondary and university managers in Uganda.

Definition of aggressive behaviour

Social psychologists define aggression as the intent and attempt to harm another individual, physically or socially, or in some cases, to destroy an object.

In an effort to conceptualize the many varieties of human aggression, Buss (1971) tried to classify them based on the apparent motivation of the aggressor as indicated in Table I.

Table 1 Varieties of Human Aggression

	Active Direct	Indirect	Passive Direct	Indirect
<i>Physical</i>	Punching the victim	Practical joke, booby trap	Obstructing passage, sit-in	Refusing to perform a necessary task
<i>Verbal</i>	Insulting the victim	Malicious gossip	Refusing to speak	Refusing consent, vocal or written

Source: A.H. Buss “Aggression Pays” in J.L. Singer (ed). The Control of Aggression and Violence. New York: Academic Press.

When examining the present school environment in Uganda, it is be useful to recognize two types, **hostile** (or expressive), and **instrumental** aggression, a distinction first made by (Feshbach 1964, Shapiro, 2002). They are distinguished by their goals, or the rewards they offer the perpetrator. Hostile (or expressive) aggression, which we are most concerned with in academic institutions, occurs in response to anger-inducing conditions, such as insults, physical attacks, or personal failures. The aggressor’s goal is to make a victim suffer. Most student strikes are directed at harming the school administration and are precipitated by hostile aggression. The behavior is characterized by the intense and disorganizing emotion of anger, with anger is defined as an arousal state elicited by certain stimuli, particularly those evoking attack or frustration.

On the other hand, instrumental aggression begins with competition or the desire for some object or status possessed by another person such as jewelry, money, territory. The perpetrator tries to obtain the desired object regardless of the cost. Instrumental aggression is usually a factor in robbery, burglary, larceny, and various white collar crimes. The thief’s obvious goal in robbery is to obtain cash-value items. Usually, there is no intent to harm anyone. However, if someone interferes with the thief’s objective, he or she may feel forced to harm that person or risk losing the desired goal. Instrumental aggression is usually also a feature of calculated murder committed by a hired, impersonal killer.

(Bandura 1973a, Shapiro, 2002) notes that most definitions of aggression imply that it is solely concerned with behaviours and intentions residing within the perpetrator (or performer). Going a step further, he suggests that the adequate definition of aggression must consider both the “**injurious behaviour**” of the perpetrator and the “**social judgment**” of the victim. Given the school or university setting therefore, aggression is behaviour perpetrated or attempted with the

intention of harming another individual physically or psychologically and socially or to destroy an object. This definition encompasses all the behaviours described in Buss's typology. Violence in education institutions may be methodical or random, sustained or fleeting, intensive or uncontrolled. It always harms or destroys the recipient or is intended to do so (Daniels & Gilula, 1970, Shapiro 2002).

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ON AGGRESSION

Behavioral and social scientists have debated for over a half century whether humans are born aggressive and naturally violent, or born relatively free of aggressive tendencies. This debate, part of a wider controversy about the respective merits of nature and nurture, touches every school of thought in human behaviour. According to the first perspective, humans are programmed aggressive to defend themselves, family, and territory from intruders. According to the second, humans become violent by acquiring aggressive models and actions from society.

Psychoanalytic Viewpoints

Sigmund Freud, the father of psychoanalysis and a physician by training, was convinced that human beings are susceptible from birth to a build-up of aggressive energy, which must be dissipated or drained off before it reaches dangerous levels. This is known as the psychodynamic or hydraulic model since it bears a close resemblance to pressure build-up in a container. If excessive pressure accumulates in the container-the human psyche-an explosion is likely to occur, as demonstrated by tirades that may involve violence. According to the traditional Freudian perspective, people who have tirades are blowing off the excess steam of aggressive energy.

Freud suggested that violence in all of its forms is a manifestation of this aggressive energy discharged. Internal energy accumulates to dangerous levels when people have not discharged it appropriately through a process called catharsis, one of the most important concepts in psychoanalytic psychotherapy. Catharsis may be accomplished by actual behaviour (playing football, for example) or may occur vicariously (e.g. watching football). The Freudian-psychodynamic position predicts that children who participate in or avidly watch school sports will ultimately be less aggressive than children who do not. Freudian psychodynamic followers also maintain that people who engage in violent crime (hostile aggression) have not had sufficient opportunity to "blow off steam" and keep the various aggression energies at manageable levels. Most schools in Uganda, however have neglected aspects of sports that can help blow off this steam.

Psychodynamic theorists assume that humans, by their very nature, will always be prone to aggressive impulses. Therefore, if violent crime is to be controlled, the human animal must be provided with multiple but appropriate channels for catharsis (e.g., adequate recreational facilities). In this way, children and adults presumably learn to dissipate aggression in socially approved, appropriate ways. Psychotherapy is one such channel, encouraging catharsis under the guidance of a therapist.

Frustration-Aggression Hypothesis

Around the time of Freud's death in 1939, a group of psychologists at Yale University proposed that aggression is a direct result of frustration (Dollard, Doob, Miller, Mowrer, & Sears, 1939). According to Dollard and his colleagues, people who are frustrated, thwarted, annoyed, or threatened will behave aggressively, since aggression is a natural, almost automatic response to frustrating circumstances. Moreover, people who exhibit aggressive behaviour are frustrated, thwarted, annoyed, or threatened. "Aggressive is always a consequence of frustration" (Dollard et al., 1939, p.1).

Because of its simplicity and important implications, the frustration-aggression hypothesis drew much research, along with much criticism. Psychologists found it difficult not only to decide what frustration was, but also to determine how it could be measured accurately. Researchers also learned that aggression was a much more complex phenomenon than Dollard and his associates had postulated. Frustration does not always lead to aggression, and aggressive behaviour does not always signify "frustration." Experiments indicated that people respond to frustration and anger differently. Some do indeed respond with aggression, but others display a wide variety of responses.

Led by Berkowitz (1962, 1969, 1973), researchers began to propose a revised, contemporary version of the frustration-aggression hypothesis. According to Berkowitz, frustration increases the probability that an individual will become angry and soon act aggressively (aggression being defined as a behavior in which the goal is to inflict damage or injury on some object or person). In short, education managers should note that frustration facilitates the performance of aggressive behaviour. The behaviour may be overt (physical or verbal) or implicit (wishing someone dead). Anger, however, is not the only potentially aggressive emotion. Aversive conditions, such as pain; or pleasant states, such as sexual arousal, may also lead to aggressive behavior (Berkowitz, 1973).

An important component of the revised frustration-aggression hypothesis is the concept of anticipated goals or expectations. When a behaviour directed at a specific goal is thwarted, frustration is likely to result. Thus, the person must have been expecting or anticipating the attainment of a goal or achievement. Mere deprivation of goods will not necessarily lead to frustration. People who are living under deprived conditions may not be frustrated unless they actually expect something better. "Poverty-stricken groups who have never dreamed of having automobiles, washing machines, or new homes are **not** frustrated because they have been deprived of these things; they are frustrated only after they have begun to hope" (Berkowitz, 1969, p.15).

Aggression, Berkowitz observed, is only one possible response to frustration. The individual may learn others, like withdrawal, doing nothing, or trying to alter the situation by compromise. With this approach, Berkowitz not only emphasizes the importance of learning but also stresses the role head teachers and other institutional leaders have in the understanding of individual differences in response to frustrating circumstances.

The revised frustration-aggression hypothesis, therefore, suggests the following steps: (1) The person is blocked from obtaining an expected goal; (2) frustration results, generating anger, and (3) anger predisposes or readies the person to behave aggressively. Whether the person actually engages in aggressive actions will depend in part on his or her learning history, interpretation of the event, and individual way of responding to frustration. It will also depend, however, on the presence of aggression-eliciting stimuli in the environment.

Berkowitz notes that the presence of aggressive stimuli in the external environment (or internal environment represented by thoughts) increases the probability of aggressive responses. A weapon is a good example of such a stimulus. Most people in our society associate firearms with aggression. Berkowitz (1983) likens the firearm to a conditioned stimulus in that the weapon conjures aggressive associations, facilitating overt aggression. A gun, even when not used, is more likely to generate aggressive action than is a neutral object. The mere sight of the weapon might elicit ideas, images, and expressive reactions that had been linked with aggression in the past....” (Berkowitz, 1983, p.124). This is what exactly happens to university students in Uganda.

In one experiment designed to test this hypothesis (Berkowitz & LePage, 1967), angry male subjects were more likely to engage in aggressive action in the presence of a gun than a comparable group of angry subjects in the presence of a badminton racket. This suggests that a visible weapon (such as a law enforcement officer might carry) may actually facilitate, rather than inhibit, a violent response from students.

In addition, Berkowitz (1989) emphasized two important components to the frustration-aggression equation that are important for education managers. Berkowitz (1989) observed that aggressive behavior will be generated (1) to the extent that a person perceives the mistreatment as intentional; and (2) to the degree that the frustration experienced is aversive. According to Berkowitz, people become angry and aggressive at being kept from reaching a desired goal, if they think someone had intentionally blocked them from achieving that goal or deliberately and wrongly tried to hurt them.

“They are much more likely to become openly aggressive at someone blocking their goal attainment if they believe their frustrater had deliberately and unjustifiably attempted to keep them from reaching their goal than if they think the thwarting had not been intentional or had not been directed at them personally” (Berkowitz, 1989, p.68).

Thus, self restraint comes into play when students think they have not been deliberately mistreated or that the blocking of the goal was legitimate. On the other hand, students become angry and aggressive when they perceive they have been treated unfairly or were personally attacked.

Berkowitz also postulates that thwarting or frustrations generate a negative effect, which refers to an emotional state people typically seek to lessen or eliminate. Furthermore, an unexpected interference is more apt to provoke an aggressive reaction than is an anticipated barrier to goal attainment, because the former is usually much more unpleasant. That is, it has more negative affect.

In yet another reformulation of the frustration-aggression hypothesis, Berkowitz (1989) has emphasized the importance of cognitive factors. Currently, it is called the cognitive-neoassociation model. It operates in the following manner. During the earlier stages, an aversive event produces a negative affect. This negative affect may be due to physical pain or psychological discomfort. Physical pain as aversive circumstances is clear, but psychological discomfort needs further elaboration. Being verbally insulted is good example. While there is no physical pain, personal insults or demeaning comments engender anger, depression, or sadness in just about everyone – all negative affects. Unpleasant feelings or negative affects presumably then give rise, almost automatically, to a variety of feelings, thoughts, and memories that are associated with flight (fear) and fight (anger) tendencies. During this early stage, mediating cognitive processes have little influence beyond the immediate appraisal that the situation is aversive. Some students may act quickly on the basis of these initial emotions without further deliberation or forethought, sometimes engaging in violence. During the later stages, however, cognitive appraisal may go into operation and substantially influence the subsequent emotional reactions and experiences after the initial, automatic responses. These cognitions mediate and evaluate a proper course of action. Aroused people make causal attributions about the unpleasant experience, think about the nature of their feelings, and perhaps try to control their feelings and actions.

Berkowitz emphasizes that any unpleasant feeling or arousal can evoke aggressive, even violent responses. A depressed person can murder his or her family, or a thwarted student may violently lash out at authority.

Excitation Transfer Theory

Zillman (1988) proposed a theory to explain how physiological arousal can generalize from one situation to another. This is called the excitation transfer theory, it is based on the assumption that physiological arousal, however produced, dissipates slowly over time. For example, people who receive some anger-producing criticism at work, are likely to still have some residual arousal from that criticism when they arrive home later that evening. When they encounter some annoying event at home, they are apt to “**fly off the handle**” and overreact to the minor home incident. Consequently, the combination of preexisting arousal, plus anger generated by the irritation at home, may increase the likelihood of aggression. The transfer of arousal from one situation to another is most likely to occur if the person is unaware that he or she is still carrying some arousal from a previous situation to a new, unrelated one.

Social Learning theory and the Role of Parents

Why do some students behave aggressively when intensely frustrated, while others change their tactics, withdraw, or seem not to be affected? One major factor may be past learning experiences. The human being is very adept at learning and maintaining behavior patterns that have worked in the past, even if they only worked occasionally. This learning process begins in early childhood. Children develop many behaviors merely by watching their parents and significant others in their environment, a process called modeling or observational learning. A child’s behavior pattern, therefore, is often acquired through the modeling or imitation of other people, real and imagined, in the child’s environment (Bandura, 1973a). In fact, available research reveals that the conditions most conducive to the learning of aggression are those in

which the child (1) has many opportunities to observe aggression, (2) is reinforced for his or her own aggression, or (3) is often the object of aggression (Huesmann, 1988).

When a child’s imitative behaviour is reinforced or rewarded by praise and encouragement from significant models, the probability that the behaviour will occur in the future is increased.

Bandura (1983) identifies three major types of models: **family members, members of one’s subculture**, and symbolic models provided by the **mass media**. Family members, particularly parents, can be very powerful models up until early adolescence. Beginning in early adolescence, peer models are likely to dominate. Not surprisingly, the highest incidence of aggression is found in communities and groups in which aggressive models abound and fighting prowess is regarded as a valued attribute (Bandura, 1983; Short, 1968; Wolfgang & Ferracuti, 1967).

The mass media, including television, movies, magazines, newspapers, and books, provide abundant symbolic models. Television pervades the life of the growing child, even the very young one, and offers hundreds of potentially powerful aggressive and violent models in a variety of formats, ranging from Saturday morning cartoon film festivals to **triple-X-rated** cable movies. The effects these models have on children is high. This is also linked to the summarized profile of abusive or neglectful parents in table 2.

Table 2 Profile of Abusive or Neglectful Parents

Abused or neglectful parents are likely to share several of the following characteristics:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They are isolated from family supports, such as friends, relatives, neighbours and community groups. 2. They consistently fail to keep appointments, discourage social contact, rarely or never participate in school activities. 3. They seem to trust no one. 4. They are reluctant to give information about the child’s injuries or condition. They are unable to explain the injuries or they give far-fetched explanations. 5. They respond inappropriately to the child’s condition, either by overreacting or seeming hostile and antagonistic when questioned, or they underreact showing little concern or awareness and seem more occupied with their own problems than those of the child. 6. They refuse to consent to diagnostic studies of the child. <p style="text-align: right;">Table 2 cont....</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. They delay or fail to take the child for medical care – for routine checkups or for treatment of injury or illness. Or they may choose a different doctor or hospital each time. 8. They are overcritical of the child and seldom discuss the child in positive terms. 9. They have unrealistic expectations of the child, expecting or demanding behaviour that is beyond the child’s years of ability. 10. They believe in harsh punishment. 11. They seldom touch or look at the child.

12. They ignore the child's crying or react with impatience.
13. They keep the child confined – perhaps in a crib or playpen – for very long periods of time.
14. They seem to lack understanding of the child's physical and emotional needs.
15. They are hard to locate.
16. They may be misusing alcohol or drugs.
17. They appear to lack control or fear that they may lose control.

Their behavior may generally be irrational, they may seem incapable of childrearing and may seem to be cruel and sadistic.

Source: Crime Prevention Unit (no date). *Offer Friendly Training Manual*. Tallahassee, FL. Tallahassee Police Department

Since parents are powerful models, we would expect aggressive or antisocial parents to have aggressive or antisocial children. In an old but classic study, Sears, Maccoby, and Levin (1957) interviewed four hundred mothers of kindergarten children about their disciplinary techniques, their attitudes about children's aggressiveness, and the children's expression of aggression toward peers, siblings, and parents. One of the major findings was that physical punishment by parents was related to aggressiveness in the children. This was especially true when physical discipline was supplemented by high permissiveness toward aggression. In support of this finding, some researchers found that preschoolers played more aggressively when they were watched by a permissive adult than when no adult was visible (Seigel & Kohn, 1959).

Bandura (1973a) argues persuasively that aggressive behaviour can be most productively understood and modified if we give attention to the learning principles like those alluded to earlier. As psychologists learn more about human behaviour, many are beginning to agree with him.

Social learning theory hypothesizes that the rudiments of aggressive behavior are initially acquired through observing aggressive models or on the basis of direct experience. Then, aggression is gradually refined and maintained by reinforcement. Therefore, students may have an aggressive behavioural pattern, but may rarely express it if it has no functional value or is not condoned by significant others in their social environment. The documented characteristics of the neglected children has been summarized as in Table 3.

Table 3: The Profile of Abused or Neglected Children

Abused or neglected children are likely to share several of the following characteristics:

1. They appear to be different from other children in physical and emotional make up or their parents describe them as being different or bad.
2. They seem afraid of their parents.
3. They may bear bruises, welts, sores, or other skin injuries, which seem to be untreated.
4. They are given inappropriate food, drink or medication.
5. They are left alone or with inadequate supervision.
6. They are chronically unclean.

7. They exhibit extremes in behaviour, cry often or cry very little and show no real expectation of being comforted; they are excessively fearful or seem fearless of adult authority; they are usually aggressive or extremely passive or withdrawn.
8. They are wary of physical contact, especially with an adult. They may be hungry for affection yet have difficulty relating to children and adults. Based on their experiences, they feel they cannot risk getting close to others.
9. They exhibit a sudden change in behaviour, exhibit regressive behavior, such as wetting their pants or bed, thumb-sucking, whining, or becoming uncommonly shy or passive.
10. They have learning problems that cannot be diagnosed. Their attention wanders and they easily become self-absorbed.
11. They are habitually truant or late to school. Frequent or prolonged absences from school may result from the parent's keeping an injured child at home until the evidence of abuse disappears. Or they may arrive at school early and remain after classes instead of going home.
12. They are tired and often sleep in class.
13. They are not dressed appropriately or they may be dressed inadequately.

Source: Crime Prevention Unit (no date). *Offer Friendly Training Manual*. Tallahassee, FL. Tallahassee Police Department

The social learning system acknowledges that biological structures can set limits on the types of aggressive responses that can be learned, and that genetic endowment influences the rate at which learning progresses (Bandura, 1973a). However, educators, should realize that biology does not program the individual to specific aggressive behaviour. These behaviours are learned by observation, either deliberately or inadvertently; they become refined through reinforced practice.

In addition, mere exposure to aggressive models does not guarantee that the observer will try to engage in similar aggressive action at a later date. First, a variety of conditions may prevent observational learning from even taking place. Individuals differ widely in their ability to learn from observation. Some people may fail to notice the essential features of the model's behaviour or may have a poor symbolic or visual memory. Alternatively, they may not wish to imitate the model, Bandura suggests also that one important component of observational learning may be the motivation to rehearse what has been observed. He notes that a mass murderer, for example, may get an idea from descriptive accounts of another mass killing. The incident remains prominent in his mind long after it has been forgotten by others. He continues to think about the crime and to rehearse the brutal scenario mentally until, under appropriate conditions, it serves as a script for his own murderous actions.

Another restriction on observational learning that need be noted by educators in Uganda is what happens to the observed model. If the model is reprimanded or punished either during or immediately after an aggressive episode, this will probably inhibit the observer's behavior. The "bad guy" should not get away with violence, **if we are to discourage antisocial behaviour.**

Aggressive behaviour is maintained by periodic reinforcement. According to social learning theory, aggression is maintained by instrumental learning. Educators should note that in the *initial* stage, reinforcement is essential. The reinforcement may be positive, as when the individual gains material or social rewards, or it may be negative, if it allows the individual to alter or avoid aversive conditions. If aggressive behaviour brings rewards in either of these

ways, the person is likely to continue it. A youngster subjected to unmerciful harassment because of his unusual name may be able to stop the teasing with his fists. The reinforcement he gets from his newly found aggressive behavior is negative, but it is still rewarding. Aggression can also allow the individual to feel in control of a situation if things are not going his or her way. The psychological reinforcement offered by feeling in control is an extremely powerful component in any human behaviour.

Cognitive Models of Aggression

Recent cognitive models for learning aggression have hypothesized that, while observational learning is important in the process, the individual's cognitive capacities and information processing strategies are equally important. Two major cognitive models have emerged in recent years. One has been proposed by Huesmann and his colleagues (1997), a hypothesis called the cognitive scripts model. The other model has been developed by Dodge and his colleagues (Dodge, 1986; Dodge & Coie, 1987), and is called the hostile attribution model. According to Huesmann (1988), social behaviour in general and aggressive behaviour in particular, is controlled largely by cognitive scripts learned and memorized through daily experiences. "A script suggests what events are to happen in the environment, how the person should behave in response to these events, and what the likely outcome of those behaviour would be" (Huesmann, 1988, p.15). Each script is different and unique to each person, but once established they become resistant to change and may persist into adulthood. For a script to become established, it must be rehearsed from time to time. With practice, the script will not only become encoded and maintained in memory, but it will be more easily retrieved and utilized when the individual faces a problem. Furthermore, the individual's "evaluativ6a

conscience (as proposed by Eysenck) or self-control (as proposed by Hirschi), frequent criminal behaviour may represent an ongoing attempt to control and dominate others in the social environment. According to Blackburn, chronic criminality can be understood as **“an attempt to maintain status or mastery of a social environment from which they feel alienated”** (1998, p. 174). The well-rehearsed cognitive script of persistent, life-long offenders, therefore, is to dominate – often in a hostile manner – social environment they perceive as hostile.

Most students in Uganda believe that aggression is a simple, direct way of solving immediate conflicts. If something is not going your way, approaching the social environment in a threatening, hostile manner is the most direct way (not necessarily the most effective in the long run) of confronting your tormentors. On the other hand, prosocial solutions and alternative nonaggressive scripts are less direct and more complex than aggressive solutions. In essence, they are more difficult to apply. Theoretically, the more cognitively “simple” individual would be more inclined to pursue simplistic and direct solutions to problems. In addition, because prosocial solutions are more complicated and more difficult to apply, they also require effective social skills. However, the development of effective social skills takes time, and those skills will have a spotty reinforcement history until perfected. Aggressive behaviour, on the other hand, often receives immediate reinforcement for the aggressor, and therefore is more likely to be retained in one’s arsenal of strategies for immediate solutions of conflictual situations. After a twenty-two-year longitudinal study, Eron and Huesmann (1984) concluded that diminished intellectual competence and poor social skills have an early effect in increasing the likelihood that a child will adopt characteristically more aggressive styles of behaviour to conflict resolution. Further, the evidence indicates that this aggressive style will persist across situations and time and become a preferred style throughout adulthood. But the relationship is simply not one-way, with limited intellectual competence and inadequate skills causing aggressive behaviour. Rather, it appears to be interactive. Aggressive behaviour may interfere with positive social interactions with teachers and peers for intellectual and social advancement, perpetuating a chain of mutually influencing events: aggressive behaviour influencing the social environment, and the social environment, in turn, influencing aggressive behaviour.

Zillman (1988) proposes a similar idea to the cognitive script theory, but, like Berkowitz, emphasizes the importance of physiological arousal and its interaction with cognitions. Zillman agrees with Hebb (1955, p.249) that arousal **“is an energizer, but not a guide, an engine but not a steering gear.”** Cognition provides the steering and direction to the energizing effects of anger, fear, or frustration. A long-standing observation in the study of animal and human aggression is that when the organism recognizes or perceives a threat to its welfare and well-being, it can either fight or flee. Following this “recognition of endangerment,” physiological arousal quickly sets in, preparing the organism for fight or flight.

OVERT AND COVERT ACTS OF AGGRESSION

Loeber and Stouthamer-Loeber (1998) recommended that researchers on aggression and violence be mindful of two types of aggressive actions: *overt* and *covert*. According to Loeber and Stouthamer-Loeber, the two forms of aggression are different in: (1) behavior patterns; (2) emotions; (3) cognitions; and (4) development. Behaviorally, overt aggression usually involves

direct confrontation with victims and the administration of physical harm or threats of physical harm. Covert aggression, on the other hand, does not involve direct confrontation but relies on **concealment, dishonesty, or sneaky behavior**. In many instances, overt aggression decreases with age, while covert aggression increases with age (Loeber, Lahey, & Thomas, 1991; Stanger, Achenbach, & Verhust, 1997). However, children who exhibit serious forms of overt aggression (violence) tend to increase their violence as they get older, and often commit both violent and property crimes as adults (Loeber & Stouthamer-Loeber, 1998).

Emotionally, anger is usually an important ingredient in most overt acts of aggression, while more neutral emotions are characteristic of covert actions. Violent actions are usually accompanied by high levels of arousal brought on by anger. Covert actions, on the other hand, tend to be less emotional acts, such as fraud, theft, embezzlement, and a variety of occupational crimes. Cognitions are also different between the covert and overt aggression. It is noted that, aggressive and violent students tend to have cognitive deficiencies that make it difficult for them to come up with nonaggressive solutions to interpersonal conflicts and disputes. Covert aggressors also have hostile attributional biases that contribute to violence-prone cognitive processing. People who use covert aggression as a preferred strategy do not demonstrate the degree of cognitive deficiencies in solving their interpersonal problems, nor do they manifest a hostile attributional bias. “Instead, it is postulated that most covert acts are facilitated by specific cognitive capabilities, such as planfulness (i.e., casing situations prior to theft), preoccupations with consumables and property, and lying to escape detection” (Loeber & Stouthamer-Loeber, 1998, p.250). Occupational crimes, for instance, such as theft of company property, the misuse of information, or software piracy, are often committed with planning and forethought. Crime committed through the use of computers, called cybercrime, is also a good example of covert actions of aggression.

In terms of development, overt aggression generally begins early, especially in boys, as seen, for example, in the case of life-course-persistent offenders. However, Loeber and Stouthamer-Loeber suggest that development of overt aggressive behaviour does not necessarily parallel the development of covert actions. Instead, “some children have never been socialized by their parents to be honest and to respect the property of others. This is common among neglectful parents or parents who hold an indistinct or a weak moral stance in these respects” (Loeber & Stouthamer-Loeber, 1998, p.251). The formation of honesty and respect for the property of others is instilled by parents’ teaching and the prosocial models they offer their children. Some covert actions, especially lying, can also evolve as a well-learned strategy that serves to minimize the chances of detection and punishment by adults.

It should be emphasized that not all overt aggressors who engage in violence start early. As Loeber and Stouthamer-Loeber note, **“it is necessary to account for the emergence of violence in individuals during adulthood who do not have a history of aggression earlier in their lives”** (p.246). These late-onset types represent a minority of adulthood violent offenders, but the hypothesis does suggest that not all highly aggressive and violent individuals manifest aggression in childhood.

Gender Differences in Aggression

While boys engage in more overt aggression and direct confrontation as they grow up, it is not clear if boys are generally more aggressive than girls. The current work of cognitive psychologists suggests that there may be socialized differences in the way girls and boys construct their worlds. Social learning theorists have long held that girls are “socialized” differently than boys, or taught not to be overtly aggressive. Campbell (1993, p.19) argues that “boys are not simply more aggressive than girls; they are aggressive in a different way.” According to Campbell, boys and girls are born with the potential to be equally aggressive, but girls are socialized not to be overtly aggressive, whereas boys are encouraged to be overtly aggressive “to defend” themselves. Loeber and Stouthamer-Loeber (1998, p.253) conclude from their review of the research that: “In general, gender differences in aggression, as expressed by frustration and rage, are not documented in infancy.” They note that only in the preschool period (three to five years of age) do observable gender differences emerge, with boys displaying more overt aggression than girls. Overt aggression in boys becomes especially prominent in boys from elementary school age onward. However, researchers (e.g., Bjorkqvist, Lagerspetz, & Kaukianinen, 1992; Cairns et al, 1989; also found that girls and women tend to use more covert, indirect, and verbal forms of aggression, such as character defamation and ostracism. Other researchers found that females employ relational aggression, such as exclusion of peers, malicious gossip, and collusion directed at the relational bonds between friendships (Crick, 1995; Crick & Grotpeter, 1995; Loeber & Stauthamer-Loeber, 1998).

In essence, there is growing recognition that gender differences in aggression are not simply due to biology, but are primarily due to cultural and socialization processes that promote different kinds of aggression. Environmental cues are also important in cognitive scripts and aggressive strategies individuals employ for various situations. Which script or strategy an individual employs is dependent on which environment cues are present.

ENVIRONMENT FACTORS

Population Density

Some investigators have exposed people to crowded conditions combined with various room temperatures (Griffith & Veitch, 1971). In general, as population density and temperature increased, so did subjects’ negative feelings towards one another. Other investigations (Freedman, Levy, Buchanan, & Price, 1972) found gender differences in response to overcrowding. Males in same-gender, overcrowded groups were more aggressive and hostile than males in same gender, uncrowded groups. The reverse was true for females. In mixed groups, the gender differences did not occur. This evidence could suggest that men are uncomfortable and hostile in crowded same-gender conditions, while women tend to become more affable and friendly. However, the data also lend themselves to other interpretations. Mueller (1983), for instance, finds that the Freedman data indicate that men in the low-density condition were actually less competitive and aggressive, and only slightly more punitive than women. The issue of gender differences in aggressive behaviour as a function of crowding or density is far from resolved.

Freedman (1975) conducted a number of correlational studies in various geographical areas throughout the United States and found no relationship between population density and crimes of

violence like murder, rape, and aggravated assault. When populations were matched for socioeconomic class and other relevant variables, crimes of violence actually decreased in proportion to the population as density increased. Freedman attributed this finding to the large number of potential witnesses in high density areas.

Population density studies, therefore, do not clearly support a relationship between overcrowding and aggression (Mueller, 1983; Harries, 1980; Kirmeyer, 1978). While density may play a significant role in engendering aggressive behaviour in animals, in the human population the situation is far more complicated. Overall, the available evidence at this point does not support the view that student population has a significant influence on crime.

Aggression and Ambient Temperature

According to Baron (1977), extremely low and high temperatures tend to inhibit aggression, while intermediate levels tend to be associated with it. Baron suggests that when the temperature becomes very unpleasant (too hot or too cold), the person's major concern is to do something self-protective, such as getting a cold drink or donning thermal clothing. In other words, the individual is attempting as Berkowitz (1989) suggests, to escape aversive circumstances (negative reinforcement)

Baron's proposal suggests that collective or individual violence may be prominent at uncomfortable intermediate temperatures, rather than at extremely hot or bitterly cold ones. He hypothesized a similar curvilinear or inverted U-shape relationship between noise levels and aggression (Baron, 1977). It is noted, however, these studies do not consider adequately the possible influence of other environmental or situational factors that might be associated with hot weather, such as seasonal unemployment. Research by Anderson and Anderson (1984) failed to yield the predicted curvilinear relationship. They found that the number of daily violent crimes increased directly as a function of temperature in two different cities. As temperature increased, violent crime increased in a *linear* fashion. In another study, Anderson (1987) discovered that overall violent crime in the United States was more prevalent in the hotter summer months as well as in the hotter years. The study also revealed that hotter cities have higher violet crime rates than the cooler cities. These relationships also exhibited a linear function rather than a curvilinear one.

Other investigations have found that a combination of high temperature and air pollution is highly related to family disturbance and violent behavior (Rotton & Frey, 1985).

Other Environmental Factors

The relationships between aggression and other environmental factors, such as noise, air pollution, and even erotica, are relatively new areas of inquiry. With reference to air pollution, for example, some studies indicate that individuals exposed to cigarette smoke are more aggressive than individuals in clean-air conditions (Jones & Bogat, 1978). Some people are even more aggressive when someone is simply smoking (inappropriately) around them (Zillman, Baron, & Tamborini, 1981), even if the air is not heavily infiltrated with smoke. There is also some evidence to suggest that loud, unpredictable, or complex noises may influence aggressive tendencies. For example, Konecni (1975) found that angry subjects exposed to loud or complex noise became more aggressive than angry subjects exposed to soft and simple noise. Apparently,

the additional arousal instigated by the noise adds to the arousal effects of anger already felt by the subject. This increase in arousal level presumably facilitates aggressive behavior.

Effects of Mass Media

By the age of sixteen, the average child in Uganda has spent more time watching television than sitting in a classroom and has probably witnessed a number of killings. This is true especially for students who are in towns.

There are four scenes of violence portrayed on network television to every scene expressing affection. A three-year study (1994-1997) by four universities on violence on American television revealed that 90 percent of movies shown on television include violence (National Cable Television Association, 1998). Violence was found most frequently on subscription television (85 percent on premium cable, and 59 percent on basic cable). Across three years of the study, nearly 40 percent of the violent incidents on television were initiated by “good” characters who are likely perceived as attractive role models. Sixty-seven percent of the program portrayed violence within a humorous context. In general, the study found that most media violence is glamorized and that the long-term negative consequences of violent behaviour are rarely depicted. Nearly three-quarters of violent scenes contain no **remorse, criticism, punishment, or emotional reactions** from the perpetrators. Overall, the survey found that the percentage of programs on television that contain some violence remained unchanged over the three-year period of study. One estimate suggests that the average American child sees more than one hundred thousand violent episodes and some twenty thousand murders on television before reaching adolescence (Myers, 1996).

Other surveys found that news coverage of violence against women and children was not used to educate the public but rather to fascinate and entertain (National Media Archive, 1990). In reference to video game preferences, the most popular game category is fantasy violence and other human violence games (Funk & Buchman, 1996). In that same study, the number of girls who listed violent games was equal to the number of boys who listed violent games. Girls favorite games were more likely to fall into the fantasy violent category, whereas boys preferred the human violent games.

It is not therefore surprising that many people are disturbed by media violence and that social science researchers are intrigued by its possible relationship with the violence in our society. Whether exposure to violent media increases violence has been the focus of several public commissions and reports designed to influence social policy (Wood, Wong, & Chachere, 1991). In general, the bulk of the experimental studies reveal that television violence in particular has a significant effect on the frequency and type of aggressive behavior expressed by some adults and some children, especially children of an impressionable age. The relationship between violent television and aggression appears to be particularly strong for young boys who closely identify with the **violent characters they see on television**, and for children who have difficulty in their interpersonal relationships with their peers (Eron & Huesmann, 1986). In addition, there appears to be a correlation between violence portrayed in the print media, including pornographic literature, and the occurrence of violent crime. However, researchers to date have not established a causal link. Freedman (1988), p.158), for example, warns that “the available

empirical evidence does not support the idea that viewing television violence causes aggression.” Let us look at some of this research in more detail.

In a classic study by Bandura (1965), sixty-six nursery school children were divided into three groups and shown one of three five-minute films. All three films depicted an adult verbally and physically assaulting a “BoBo,” a large inflatable doll with a sand base. One group saw the adult model being rewarded with candy and a soft drink after displaying aggressive behavior. A second group observed the model being spanked and reprimanded verbally. The third group witnessed a situation in which the model received neither punishment nor reward.

After the children saw the film, they were permitted to free play for ten minutes in a playroom of toys, including a Bobo doll. The group that had witnessed the adult model being rewarded for the aggressive behavior exhibited more aggression than the other two groups. In addition, boys were more aggressive than girls. The group that saw the adult model being punished exhibited the lowest amount of aggression in the playroom.

Bandura’s research, which included variations on the aforementioned basic design, consistently demonstrated this modeling effect. Furthermore, numerous follow-up studies not only replicated his findings, but also suggested that media violence may have a strong influence on real-life violence in many situations (Baron, 1977). There has also been some suggestion that even news reports of violence may have a **contagion effect** or **copycat effect**, a tendency in some people to model or copy an activity portrayed in the entertainment or news media. Contagion effect is said to occur when action depicted in the media is assessed by certain individuals as a good idea and then mimicked. For example, an ingenious bank robbery, dramatized on television, might be imitated.

Researchers have also found that **aggressive children watch more media violence, identify more with violent characters, and believe more that the violence they observe reflects real life than nonaggressive children** (Lefkowitz, Eron, Walder, & Huesmann, 1977; Huesmann, 1988; Huesmann & Eron, 1986). Does this mean that they learned their aggressive styles from the media? The answer is not that clear. Berkowitz (1970) suggests that people who rely heavily on aggression for meeting their needs are more influenced by media violence than are people who do not usually seek violent solutions. Studies have also shown that extremely aggressive adolescents are most strongly attracted to violence portrayed in media entertainment (Berkowitz, 1970).

Repeated exposure to violence on television may habituate heavy viewers to violence. It may also distort one’s perception of the world. Heavy television viewers respond to violence with less physiological arousal than do light viewers, suggesting that repeated exposure has desensitized them to violent events (Thomas, 1982).

Black and Bevan (1992) found that adults (both men and women) who viewed a violent movie (*Missing in Action*) were more aggressive than those who saw a nonviolent film (*Passage to India*), although the aggression probably dissipated rapidly after leaving the theater.

In an extensive review of the research literature, Wood and

Our results demonstrate that media violence enhances children’s and adolescence’ aggression in interactions with strangers, classmates, and friends. Our findings cannot be dismissed as representing artificial experimental constructions because the studies included in our review evaluated media exposure on aggression as it naturally emerged in unconstrained social interaction.

However, Wood and colleagues admonish that the studies they reviewed focused on short-term media effects since researchers measured aggressive behavior almost immediately after the film presentation. Long-term effects of media violence remain largely unknown. However, after over three thousand studies on the effects of violent media and aggression, the overwhelming conclusion is that violent television and movie do increase aggressive tendencies in both children and adults.

Victim-Precipitated Aggression

It has been observed that aggression is principally a learned behavior. However, it may be influenced by a number of variable-temperature, frustration, and situation cues. For example, it may occur because an individual has learned that aggression works. Social learning theory postulates that most aggressive behaviour is acquired through modeling and maintained through various forms of reinforcement, especially social reinforcement. Besides, there is need to give attention to another parameter, *the victim of the aggression*. Often, a specific aggressive act is either provoked or facilitated by the behavior of the person who eventually becomes the victim. Specifically, what begins as heated argument develops into a physical, violent brawl – a process called **ascaltion**.

Research reviewed by Baron (1977) indicates that most people respond to provocation in kind. Furthermore, the reciprocated response approximates in intensity the provocation received. The first person then reacts by increasing the provocation. In this way, verbal attacks often lead to physical retaliation and violence. The implication is that in some crimes, the behaviour of the victim plays a role in escalating the offender’s actions.

The concept of escalation is consistent with social learning theory. That is, we influence our social environment and the social environment influences us in turn.

IMPLICATIONS FOR SCHOOL AND UNIVERSITY EDUCATION MANAGERS IN UGANDA

The different theories perspectives presented have got serious implication for educators and policy formulators in Uganda. Some of these are outlined in table 4:

Table4 Practical Implication for Education Manager

No.	Suggestion	Required activity
1.	There is need to always blow off the students’ excessive energy.	Develop sports in schools and engage students, and staff, in them.

No.	Suggestion	Required activity
2.	Avoid threats and excessive punishment	Develop counseling facilities and recruit qualified counselors for the job.
3.	Deal with student and teacher frustration.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Always Identify student problems and solve them. • Pay teachers promptly • Organise regular and participative meetings • Emphasize the need for counseling services. • Detect wrong characters, among students and other employees.
4.	Do not take student and others for granted.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deal with students and teacher professionally. • Demonstrate professional competence. • Make efforts to learn more about student background. • Respect and stick to agreed decision.
5.	Top management and teachers should avoid excessive personal insults and demeaning comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Show respect for students and other employees. • Don't be arrogant. • Don't exceed your professional boundaries. • Use sound methods, procedures and protocol. • Use facts and data to reprimand. • Understand context before action is taken.
6.	Suggest relevant best practices for the social home environment and counsel parent.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invite professionals counselors and organize parent workshops, periodically. • Sensitize parents on child neglect - consequences. • Train student prefects on school best practices and on how to lead others.
7.	Engage students and parents in best practices for socialization.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasize moral issues. • Integrate moral values in the management system. • Invite religious leaders for interaction with students and others.
8.	Develop a school intelligence system (SIS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use cooperative students and staff to monitor activities. • Have teamwork and reward such performing teams. • Show team leadership • Act trust worthy • Interact and communicate regularly. • Link academic achievement to good behaviour.
9.	Solve problems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Show teamwork in solving problems • Analyze problems professionally • Show good judgement • Recommend options • Implement resolutions • Follow up agreed positions consistently.

No.	Suggestion	Required activity
10.	Reward good work habits.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Let self motivated dependable students lead others as prefects. • Appreciate high quality work. • Reward candid effective and thorough students.
11.	Avoid teaching hungry students.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Endeavour to follow the agreed on school menu. • Communicate change in menu if any is made.
12.	Control the copy cat effect from the news media.	Educate or inform parents of the best programmes for students on holiday at each level.
13.	Discourage anti social behavior.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage students to join meaningful academic oriented groups. • Link good behaviour to annual scholarships, prizes, etc.
14.	Leave no activity to student prefects alone.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Behind any activity such as preps, there must be responsible teachers. • Prefects should not be allowed to provide their own reprimands as they wish to other fellow students. • Get interested in prefect behaviour as well, they are still students .
15.	Provide specific feedback.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide this feed back on creativity, effectiveness, quality work, meeting deadlines, good behaviour, religious devotion and link all to academic achievement.

From table 4 we can note that the following are urgently needed in our institutions.

The Need for Social Identification

One of the roles of an institutional leader is to define reality for the team: **“this is the problem, we’ll tackle it in this way”**. In essence the head teacher seeks to reduce the complexity of the situation into a test of loyalty and trust on the part of subordinates who, if they trust the leader, they are willing to get fully involved. The present violence in schools calls for high social identification that translates into collectivistic orientation. That is, a school or university where members are willing to place the needs of the school above individual needs and make self-sacrifices for the sake of the school continuity. Moreover, social identification results in strengthening of shared values, beliefs and behaviour norms among members of the school.

Social identification may be strengthened by skillful use of school slogans, symbols (e.g. flags, emblems, uniforms), rituals, (singing the school’s song or anthem, saluting the flag, reciting the creed), and ceremonies (e.g. initiation of new members). School leaders with a strong social identification usually make reference to past history of the school by telling stories about past successes, heroic deeds by members, and symbolic actions by the founder or former leaders. The

student should look at learning and education thereafter as meaningful, noble, heroic and morally correct.

Collective Self efficacy

This refers to the perception of the school members or community that together they can accomplish exceptional feats. When collective self efficacy is high, students are more willing to cooperate with members of staff in a joint effort to carry out their collective mission. The role of institutional leaders is to increase the expectation of students and others that their individual and collective efforts are likely to be successful.

Improve monitoring of the Environment

The heads of these institutions should develop better external and internal networks that include people who can provide an objective evaluation of the school's strength and weaknesses and act accordingly especially in terms of student behaviour and in connection with wrong elements who can smuggle in dangerous equipment and chemicals, such as fuel.

In doing so, there is need to keep actions and decisions consistent with the ideology. When the behaviour and decisions of top management reflect the core ideology, it will be strengthened; when they are inconsistent, the ideology will be undermined. For example, drastic changes in the school menu can breed aggression and violence from students.

Emphasize continuity in socialization practices

Formal orientation programs are useful for this purpose such as training programs for school prefects on relevant skills by use of formal mentors or subject matter experts. These experts who are selected because they are able to model and teach key values that are required.

Manage the Politics of Subcultures

Some cultural diversity among the students is inevitable and even desirable, but it is essential to ensure that it does not become so great that it seriously threatens the primary culture of the institution. Managing these differences requires considerable political sensitivity and skill in conflict management by top level leaders.

Build Cohesiveness and Group Think

Cohesiveness is the degree of mutual affection among members and their attraction to the group. This can be by use of various uniting characteristics. Its helps in that it becomes difficult for individual students to isolate them and plan negatively for school or university destruction.

Always Communicate and Clarify

To reduce confusion or clear up a misunderstanding, it is important for school managers to communicate clearly and check for consensus – that is check on the amount of agreement among the students with respect to interpretation of information.

Smooth over conflict

This can be done by suggesting compromises in order to reduce tension. The leader can do it by first asking students to reconcile their differences in a constructive manner so as, to discourage personal attacks, insults and threats among themselves.

Render student suspension and expulsion a last resort

Top management should not be tempted to think that immediate expulsion or suspension is the main solution. It might be the reverse as a punishment. This is because there is a proliferation of secondary schools in Uganda who are willing to take on these students without asking for any recommendation. It is important therefore to involve even police if such decisions are reached. The Ministry of Education and the board of the governing council, must be part of the decision.

Build and use power carefully

Education managers need build and use power in the most appropriate way that can convince the students and others that they are serving the school's interest. A summary of process can be summarized as in Table 5.

Table 5 Some ways of how to use power in Education Institutions

- | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Explain rules and requirements, and ensure that students understand the serious consequences of violations.2. Respond to any infractions promptly and consistently without showing any favoritism to ensure that students understand what is expected and to avoid the appearance of being arbitrary and impulsive.3. Investigate to get the facts before using reprimands or punishment, and avoid jumping to conclusions or making hasty reprimands.4. Except for the most serious infractions, provide sufficient oral and written warnings before resorting to punishment.5. Administer warnings and reprimands clearly to avoid embarrassment and the possibility that a student will act defiant to show others that he or she is not intimidated by the leader.6. Stay calm and avoid the appearance of hostility or personal rejection of the student in question.7. Express a sincere desire to help the person comply with the expectations and thereby avoid punishment.8. Invite the student leaders to participate in suggesting ways to deal with the problem colleagues, and seek agreement on a concrete plan to deal with the problem student.9. Maintain credibility by administering punishment if noncompliance continues after threats and warnings have been made.10. Use punishments that are legitimate, fair, and commensurate with the seriousness of the infraction. |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Consequently, a summary of the behavioral skills needed of institutional leaders in the management of education can be summarized as in table 6

Table 6 Some Behavioral Skills required of Education Leaders

1. Gain more formal authority in all departments	35. Initially make polite and clear requests.
2. Use symbols of authority to influence others	36. Explain the reasons for a request.
3. Get people to acknowledge authority	37. Don't exceed your scope of authority
4. Exercise authority regularly	38. Be sensitive to target persons' concerns.
5. Follow proper channels in giving orders	39. Follow up to verify compliance.
6. Back up authority with reward of different types	40. Insist on compliance if appropriate.
7. Discover what people need and want.	41. Offer desirable rewards.
8. Gain more control over rewards.	42. Offer fair and ethical rewards
9. Ensure people know you control rewards.	43. Explain criteria for giving rewards.
10. Don't promise more than you can deliver.	44. Provide rewards as promised.
11. Don't use rewards in a manipulative way.	45. Use rewards symbolically to reinforce desirable behaviour.
12. Avoid complex, mechanical incentives.	46. Listen seriously to target persons' concerns.
13. Don't use rewards for personal benefit.	47. Show respect for target (don't be arrogant).
14. Gain more relevant knowledge.	48. Act confident and decisive in a crisis.
15. Keep informed about technical matters.	49. Use personal appeals when necessary.
16. Develop exclusive sources of information.	50. Don't ask for a personal favour that is excessive given the relationship.
17. Use symbols to verify expertise.	51. Provide an example of proper behaviour (role modeling).
18. Demonstrate competency by solving difficult problems.	52. Inform target persons of rules and penalties.
19. Don't make rash, careless statements.	53. Give ample prior warnings.
20. Don't lie or misrepresent the facts.	54. Understand situation before punishing.
21. Don't keep changing positions.	55. Remain calm and helpful, not hostile.
22. Show acceptance and positive regard.	56. Encourage improvement to avoid the need for punishment.
23. Act supportive and helpful.	57. Ask target persons to suggest ways to improve.
24. Defend someone's interests and back them up when appropriate.	58. Administer discipline continuously.
25. Keep promises.	59. Keep student records up to date.
26. Make self-sacrifices to show concern.	60. Interact with students and others as often as possible.
27. Use sincere forms of ingratiation.	
28. Identify credible penalties to deter unacceptable behaviour.	
29. Gain authority to use punishments	
30. Don't make rash threats.	
31. Don't use coercion in a manipulative way.	
32. Use only punishments that are legitimate.	
33. Fit punishments to the infraction.	
34. Don't use coercion for personal benefit	

From table 6 it is important that in dealing with aggressive behaviour, coercive power is invoked by a threat or warning that the target person will suffer undesirable consequences for noncompliance with a request, rule or policy. The threatened punishment may take many different forms, such as dismissal, suspension, and/or withholding of resources or assistance that the person needs. The likelihood of compliance is greatest when the threat is perceived to be credible, and the target person strongly desires to avoid the threatened punishment. Sometimes it is necessary to establish credibility by showing that you actually have the power. Credibility will be undermined by rash threats that are not carried out despite noncompliance.

CONCLUSION

This article has demonstrated that there are important theories that have been documented by different researchers in the field of aggressive behaviour and violence that education leaders and policy managers can internalize for the proper day to day running of our institutions. By use of these theories, educators can demonstrate competence in dealing with the present rampant antisocial behaviour that has been on the increase in Uganda. And for this to be realized there are important behavioural skills that institutional leaders must quickly adopt as discussed.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, C.A. (1987). Temperature and aggression: Effect of quarterly, yearly, and city rates of violent and nonviolent crime. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 1167-1173.
- Anderson, C.A., & Anderson, D.C. (1984). Ambient temperature and violent crime: Tests of the linear and curvilinear hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46, 91-97.
- Bandura, A. (1965). Influence of models' reinforcement contingencies on the acquisition of imitative responses. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1, 589-595.
- Bandura, A (1973a). *Aggression: A social learning analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A (1973b). Social learning theory of aggression. In J.F. Knutson (Ed.), *The control of aggression*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.
- Bandura, A. (1983). Psychological mechanisms of aggression. In R.G. Geen & E.I. Donnerstein (Eds.), *Aggression: Theoretical and empirical reviews (Vol.1)*. New York: Academic Press.
- Baron, R.A. (1977). *Human aggression*. New York: Plenum.
- Berkowitz L. (1962). *Aggression: A social-psychological analysis*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Berkowitz L. (1969). The frustration-aggression hypothesis revisited. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Roots of aggression*. New York: Atherton Press.
- Berkowitz L. (1970). The contagion of violence: An S-R mediational analysis of some effects of observed aggression. In W.J. Arnold & M.M. Page (Eds.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Berkowitz L. (1973). Words and symbols as stimuli to aggressive response. In J. F. Knutson (Ed.), *The control of aggression*, Chicago, IL: Aldine.
- Berkowitz L. (1983). The experience of anger as a parallel process in the display of impulsive, "angry" aggression. In R.G. Geen & E.L. Donnerstein (Eds.), *Aggression: Theoretical and empirical reviews (Vol. 1)*. New York: Academic Press.
- Berkowitz L. (1989). Frustration-aggression hypothesis: Examination and reformulation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 106, 59-73
- Berkowitz L., & LePage, A. (1967). Weapons as aggression-eliciting stimuli. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 7, 202-207.

- Bjorkqvist, K., Lagerspetz, M.J. & Kaukianinen, A. (1992). Do girls manipulate and boys fight? Developmental trends in regard to direct and indirect aggression. *Aggressive Behavior*, 18, 117-127.
- Black, S.L., & Bevan, S. (1992). At the movies with Buss and Durkkee. A natural experiment on film violence. *Aggressive Behaviour*, 18, 37-45.
- Blackburn, R. (1998). Criminality and the interpersonal circle in mentally deisordered offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 25, 155-176.
- Cairns, R.B., Cairns, B.D., Neckerman, H.J., Ferguson, L.L., & Gariepy, J.L. (1989). Growth and aggression: I. Childhood to early adolescence. *Developmental Psychology*, 25, 320-330.
- Campbell, A. (1993). *Men, women, and aggression*. New York: Basic Books.
- Campbell, A., Muncer, S., & Coyle, E. (1992). Social representation of aggression as an explanation of gender differences: A preliminary study. *Aggressive Behavior*, 18, 95-108.
- Crick, N.R. (1995). Relational aggression: The role of intent attributions, feelings of distress, and provocation type. *Development and Psychopathology*, 7, 313-322.
- Crick, N.R. & Grotpeter, J.K. (1995). Relational aggression, gender, and social-psychological adjustment. *Child Development*, 66, 710-722.
- Daniels, D.N., & Giluba, M. F. (1970). Violence and the struggle for existence. In D. Daniels, M. Gilula, & F. Ochberg (Eds.), *Violence and the struggle for existence*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.
- Dodge, K. A. (1986). A social information processing model of social competence in children. In M. Perlmutter (Ed.), *The Minnesota symposium on child psycghology*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Dodge, K. A. (1993a). The future of research on the treatment of conduct disorder. *Development and Psychopathology*, 5, 311-319.
- Dodge, K. A. (1993b). Social-cognitive mechanisms in the development of conduct disorder and depression. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 44, 559-584.
- Dodge, K. A., & Cole, J.D. (1987). Social information processing factors in reactive and proactive aggression in children's peer groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 1146-1158.
- Dollard, J., Doob, L.W., Miller, N.E. Mowrer, O.H., & Sears, R.R. (1939). *Frustrating and aggression*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Eron, L.D., & Huesmann, L.P. (1984). The relation of prosocial behaviour to the development of aggression and psychopathology. *Aggressive Behaviour*, 10, 201-211.
- Eron, L.D., & Slaby, R.G (1994). Introduction. In L.D. Eron, J.H. Gentry, & P. Schlegel (Eds.), *Reason to hope: A Psychosocial perspective on violence and youth*. Washington, DC: America Psychological Association.
- Eysenck, H.J. (1996). Personality and crime: Where do we stand? *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 2, 143-152.
- Fenichel, O. (1945). *The psychoanalytic theory of neurosis*. New York: W.W. Norton.

- Fenichel, O. (1964). The function of aggression and the regulation of aggressive drive. *Psychological Review*, 71, 257-272.
- Freedman, J. L. (1975). *Crowding and behaviour*. San Francisco, CA: W.H. Freeman.
- Freedman, J. L. (1988). Television violence and aggression. What the evidence shows. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Applied social psychology annual: Television as a social issue* (Vol. 8). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Freedman, J. L., Levy, A., Buchanan, R.W., & Price, J. (1972). Crowding and human aggressiveness. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 8, 528-548.
- Funk, J.B., & Buchman, D.D. (1996). Playing violent video and computer games and adolescent self-concept. *Journal of Communication*, Spring, 84-89.
- Griffith, W., & Veitch, R. (1971). Hot and crowded: Influences of population density and temperature on interpersonal affective behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 17, 92-98.
- Halleck, S. L., (1967). *Psychiatry and the dilemmas of crime*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Harries, K.D. (1980). *Crime and the environment*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Hebb, D.O. (1955). Drives and the C.N.S. (Conceptual Nervous System). *Psychological Review*, 62, 243-254.
- Huesmann, L. R. (1988). An information processing model for the development of aggression. *Aggressive Behavior*, 14, 13-24.
- Huesmann, L. R. (1997). Observational learning of violent behavior: Social and biosocial processes. In A. Raine, P.A. Brennan, D.P. Farrington, & S.A. Mednick (Eds.), *Biosocial bases of violence*. New York: Plenum.
- Kirmeyer, S.L. (1978). Urban density and pathology – a review of research. *Environment and Behavior*, 10, 247-269.
- Konecni, V. J. (1975). The mediation of aggressive behavior: Arousal levels vs. anger and cognitive labeling. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 32, 706-712.
- Lefkowitz, M., Eron, L., Walder, L., & Huesmann, L., (1977). *Growing up to be violent: A longitudinal study of the development of aggression*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Levin, B. (1976). Psychological characteristics of firesetters. *Fire Journal*, 70, 36-41
- Loeber, R., Lahey, B.B., & Thomas, C. (1991). The diagnostic conundrum of oppositional defiant disorder and conduct disorder. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 100, 379-390.
- Loeber, R., & Stouthamer-Loeber, M (1998). Development of juvenile aggression and violence: Some common misconceptions and controversies. *American Psychologist*, 53, 242-259.
- MacDonald, J.M. (1977). *Bombers and firesetters*. Springfield, IL: C.C. Thomas.
- Mueller, C.W. (1983). Environment stressors and aggressive behavior. In R.G. Geen & E.I. Donnerstein (Eds.), *Aggression: Theoretical and empirical reviews* (Vol. 2). New York: Academic Press.
- Myers, D.G. (1996). *Social psychology* (5th edition). New York: McGraw-Hill.

- National Media Archive. (1990 September). Stories emphasized violence against women and children. *On Balance*, 3, No.8.
- Rotton, J., & Frey, J. (1985). Air pollution, weather, and violent crimes: Concomitant time-series analysis of archival data. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49, 1207-1220.
- Sears, R., Maccoby, E., & Levin, H. (1957). Patterns of child rearing. Evanston, IL: curvilinear trend over recent decades. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 48, 5-13.
- Siegel, A., & Kohn, (1959). Permissiveness, permission, and aggression: The effect of adult presence or absence on aggression in children's play. *Child Development*, 30, 131-141.
- Shapiro Daniel (2002). Negotiating Emotions in Conflict Resolutions. *Quartely*.
- Stanger, C., Achenbach, T.M., & Verhulst, F.C.