This violence. the author says that in contrast



This paper is titled Urban Boys' Social Networks and SchoolViolence and it is written by Minden Joel in 2000.

The primary goal for thisstudy is to identify the characteristics that distinguish adolescents that are involved in school violence from those involved in community violence. The author says that in contrast to aggressive schoolbehaviors, which have gained a lot of consideration in the literature, harmfulacts like attacking students or teachers in academic settings with weapons have received little scientific study, even if such acts are not as frequent. But the situation of such acts is actually realized when you look at the rates of weapon carrying used and use by school-going adolescents. A survey in 1998 of 10, 909 seventh, ninth, and eleventh grade students in a Virginia suburban school district shows that 5. 6% had carried a gun to school during the previous 30 days, 7. 7% carried a knife for protection, and 9. 9% carried some other weaponfor protection. Overall, this estimate revealed that approximately 13% of students had brought a weapon to school for protection in past 30 days.

To try to develop a theory on school violence, we first needto look at the extent to which risk factors for general violent behaviorexplain the display of violence in the school. There are a number of knowncharacteristics that have been consistently identified in violent adolescents. These include: an early onset of delinquency or violence, involvement infrequent, varied, and serious delinquent acts, social-cognitive deficits, poorfamily relations and a lack of parental discipline and monitoring, peerrejection during childhood, association with delinquent peers duringadolescence, and exposure to violence and other major stressors. Considerable research has proven that

most violentadolescents are frequently involved in a pattern of serious offending thatother adolescents aren't.

The occurrence of school violent could be accountedfor by the concurrent presence of other deviant activity but the display ofschool violence may not be limited to the serious offender and also, priorinvolvement in serious violence and delinquency is not a prerequisite forschool violence. School violence occurs as an extension of involvement incommunity violence with individuals living in areas where the violence is, tosome extent, normative. Conversely, in areas in which violent activity is lessfrequent, the display of school violence may in part be related to isolationfrom peers. Although there appear to be variations factors involved inthe display of school violence, the common elements are lack of positive adultsupervision and infrequent or no involvement in conventional behaviors andgroups. A detachment from convention and adult influence may suitably describeboth the isolated or rejected individual who "snaps" without priorindications and the gang member who may possess a large deviant social networkwhile remaining removed from groups and institutions with appropriate social norms(i. e.

, opposed to the use of violence). In this article, this disconnection from normative social structures is described as network unconventionality and examined for its role in the display of school violence. A research was conducted to find the connection betweennetwork unconventionality (being detached from convention) and school violence. Data analyzed for the research was based on responses given by 285 boys. The results of this study suggest that school violence among inner-city boys is related to unconventional social network characteristics, independent of the effects

https://assignbuster.com/this-violence-the-author-says-that-in-contrast/

ofindividual deviance. Network comparisons revealed that boys involved in schoolviolence were over four times more likely than boys engaged in communityviolence to be gang members with a high proportion of deviant peers rather thangang members with a low proportion of deviant peers.

The boys who were violentat school were also less involved in positive activities and had lower networkboundary density between adults and peers than did boys displaying communityviolence but not school violence.