Ethiopian Journal of Behavioral Studies, 2023, 6(1), 1-29

Disruptive Behaviors and Family Conflict among School Adolescents in Harari Regional State

Galata Sitota [1]and Belay Tefera[2]

Abstract

Disruptive behavior in adolescents is a commonly reported challenge across Ethiopian adolescents in general and the Harari regional state in particular. However, studies examining how family factors (family conflict) contribute to disruptive behavior is rarely found. Hence, the present study aimed to examine the effects of family conflict on adolescents' disruptive behaviors. Data were collected from 491 adolescent students (262 males, 229 females) using 'the Problem Behavior Frequency Questionnaire,' and 'Family Conflict Scale. Correlational analysis and ANOVA were conducted to examine relationships and differences. The findings indicated that although the majority of participants reported modest levels of disruptive behavior, a considerable number of respondents, 189 (38.4%), reported a relatively high level of disruptive behavior. Likewise, out of the total 491 participants, 215 (43.7%) of them endorsed their particular family environments as highly conflicting. A statistically significant relationship was reported between family conflict and disruptive behavior in adolescents in that family conflict is a cultivating ground for disruptive behaviors in adolescents. Adolescents from the non-intact family structures were found to engage more in disruptive behaviors than adolescents from intact family structures. Statistically significant sex difference in adolescents' disruptive behaviors was reported in such a way that male adolescents engage more in more disruptive behaviors than female adolescents. A statistically significant interaction effect between family structure and sex on adolescents' disruptive behavior was reported, suggesting that male adolescents from non-intact family structures were found to be more prone to engage in disruptive behaviors than male adolescents from intact family structures. Likewise, female adolescents from non-intact family structures were more prone to disruptive behaviors than those from intact family structures.

Key Terms*: Adolescents, Family conflict, Disruptive behaviors*

[1] Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, College of Education and Behavioral Sciences, Haramaya University, galatasitota@yahoo.com

[2] Professor of Psychology, School of Psychology, CEBS, AAU, Email- belaytefera@yahoo.com

Introduction

Adolescence is a development period characterized by complex developmental challenges and a transitional growth phase from childhood to adulthood (Santrock, 2007). It is also a time of significant developmental changes in the social, emotional, physical, and cognitive realms (Darling &Steinberg, 1993). Accompanied with these rapid developmental changes, it is typical for adolescents to experiment with different things, including both negative and positive behaviors. However,, these negative behaviors could evolve, unless managed effectively, into more harmful, disruptive behaviors.

Disruptive behaviors in adolescents are described by various researchers as maladaptive behaviors, problem behaviors, aggression, inappropriate behaviors, behavioral disorders, conduct disorders, and delinquent behaviors, to name a few.For example, Carolyn et al. (2017) characterize disruptive behavior in adolescents as a wide range of behaviors that include disobedience, defiance, aggressive acts against self or others, drug use and abuse, stealing, lying, property destruction, and delinquency. Karimyet al. (2018) define disruptive behaviors in adolescents as defiance of authority figures, furious outbursts, and other anti-social activities such as lying and stealing. Among others, family conflict is one of the factors that contribute to disruptive behaviors in adolescents. Indeed, a certain level of family conflict is unavoidable in human life. However, ongoing disputes, on the other hand, can be unpleasant and detrimental to family relationships (Aye et al., 2016).

According to Moos and Moos (1994), family conflict refers to openly expressed anger, and disagreement among family members. Similarly,Xu and his colleagues (2017) define family conflict as a wide range of disputes among family members, including marital, parent-child, and sibling conflicts. In connection to this notion, Family system theory asserted that because family members are linked and interdependent systems, every dispute or problem that arises between or among family members impacts all of the family's members. Though conflict is an inevitable part of family life, it has a wide range of negative consequences for each family member (Repettiet al., 2002), and it has a significant impact on joint family activities, which are one of the most important markers of family functioning (Mackovaet al., 2019). Among family members, adolescents are the most vulnerable to family conflict where high levels of parent–adolescents and marital conflict are related to both internalizing and externalizing problem behaviors in children and adolescents (Repettiet al., 2002; Timmons &Margolin, 2015; Gazendam-Donofrio et al., 2007). Similarly, Reimer (2005) stressed that among others, familial conflict is one of the most important factors contributing to disruptive behavior in adolescents.

Likewise, Corville-Smith et al. (1998) discovered that adolescents' disruptive behavior is linked to negative family variables such as excessive family conflict, lack of parental acceptance, and poor discipline. Furthermore, Córdovaet al. (2016) found that adolescents from conflicting families were at relatively greater risk of sexual risk behavior and other problem behaviors. Consistent with this idea, Morattoet al. (2017) stated that aggressive behavior in adolescents was related to family functioning characterized by conflict among family members. In the same way, Mackova and his

associate (2019) asserted that not only has poor family functioning characterized by conflict been linked to family crises, but it has also been linked to a variety of negative developmental outcomes in adolescents. In support of this notion, Shek (1997) stated that poor family functioning (conflicting) is related to elevated levels of substance abuse in adolescents. Moreover, David et al. (1996) discovered that family conflict had a stronger predictive power than marital happiness or dissatisfaction for subsequent internalizing and externalizing difficulties in adolescents. In their cross-sectional study, Loon et al. (2014) discovered that family conflict is linked to adolescent externalizing and internalizing behaviors. In the same vein, Loukas et al. (2003) found a link between family conflict and increased disruptive behaviors in adolescents who remained disruptive throughout their lives. From the review of empirical research findings presented in the preceding paragraphs about the relationship between family conflict and disruptive behaviors in adolescents, unequivocal research findings where family conflict is associated with different problem behaviors have been consistently reported. However, whether or not the research findings obtained overseas would hold in the Ethiopian context is yet to be tested by the present research. Among the factors contributing to disruptive behaviors in adolescents' family structure, particularly single and step-parent family environment is significantly affected by adolescents' disruptive behavior. For example, according to Rydell (2010), living in single and step-parent families strongly predicts disruptive behavior in adolescents. Likewise, divorced families and family conflict are strong predictor of disruptive behavior in adolescents. Reinforcing this idea, Ginther and Pollak (2004) revealed that children with divorced parents have greater behavioral difficulties than children in intact households and that children

living in stepparent and blended families also have higher behavioral problems. Some recent studies also demonstrated that adolescents from single-parent families are more involved in different disruptive behavior problems than adolescents from intact families (e.g., Park &Lee, 2020; Mason, 2012; Ginther & Pollak, 2013; Bruffaertset al.,2016). These studies portrayed how single and stepparent families contribute to different problem behaviors in adolescents. These researchers, in their explanations, have stated that single parents' lack of time to spend and supervise their children, as well as a scarcity of resources for raising children, are the major causes of reported disruptive behavior among adolescents from single parents compared to adolescents from intact families.

Disruptive behavior in adolescents can be reported by both sexes, although common in adolescent boys (Webster, 1996). Both sexes can report this problem behavior, albeit the manner in which they do so appears to be different. For example, while adolescent boys engage in aggressive behavior such as physical assault, female adolescents engage in relational aggression such as threatening to withdraw acceptance or friendship, ostracizing, or using social exclusion or rumor spreading (Crick et al., 1999); lying/cheating, stealing, running away from home, swearing, truancy, alcohol or drug use (Bongerset al., 2004).Although there are a few inconsistencies, studies conducted on adolescents demonstrated that adolescents' sex has a considerable effect on their disruptive behaviors. For example, a study conducted in Ethiopia revealed the prevalence of disruptive behaviors in both sexes, though the way disruptive behaviors manifested in both sexes differed, with boys engaging in more physical aggression and girls engaging in more verbal aggression or relational aggression (Kinde&Mekonnen,2006; Henok et al., 2019; Mulgeta etal.,

2019; Zeray , 2019). Other researcher, for example, Beza(2020) reported the absence of sex differences in adolescents' engagement in disruptive behaviors. In the same vein, Zeray (2019) asserted thatphysical fights between boys are widespread, including striking and boxing; nevertheless, verbal conflict is common among girls.Nowadays, in Ethiopia context, owing to different factors, disruptive behaviors in adolescents is the commonly reported challenges (Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (FDRE) Ministry of Health, 2016).Adolescents ofHarari regional state are not exempted from this blame. For example, since the researcher has been living in the Harari Regional State, he has got a chance to frequently visit the secondary schools in the region. It was this time that the researcher comes to witness the grave disruptive behaviors in adolescents attending their high school education in the region. Disturbing in the classes while the teacher is teaching, coming late and jumping into the class without getting permission to let into the class from the teachers, customary late coming to the schools, fighting each other while the teacher is teaching, to mention a few are the common witnessed disruptive behaviors among adolescent students of Harari regional state. However, previous research on adolescent problems in Ethiopia has been focused on tangential factors that contribute to adolescents' disruptive behavior, with many of them placing a high value on contributing elements such as individual-level factors, societal factors and family educational status (Mulgeta et al., 2019;Kinde&Mekonnen,2006;Zeray, 2019; Beza, 2020; Fayso, 2019).To the best of the researchers' knowledge, no study, however, has looked at how family characteristics (family conflict and family structure) affect adolescents' disruptive behavior in Ethiopian contexts generally and in Harari regional state specifically. Hence, given the scarcity of research in this area

of interest, the present study is worth investigating. Thus, the present research is conceived to address this gap by asking the following guiding questions:

1. What is the level of adolescents' disruptive behaviors and perceived family conflict in the study area?
2. Is there a statistically significant and negative relationship between disruptive behaviors in adolescents and family conflict?
3. Do disruptive behaviors in adolescents vary as a function of their sex and family structure?

Method

Research Design

A correlational research design was employed to address the objectives of the study. A correlational research design was selected for its appropriateness to examine the associations among predictor and criterion variables. This design helps to describe and measure the degree of relationship between two or more variables or sets of scores and explain the relationship among variables of interest. Given the fact that the present study is targeted to examine relationships and predictions among variables of interest, the correlational research design is an appropriate design to use for the intended purpose.

Study Area

The current research took place in Harari regional state, which is located 522 kilometers east of Ethiopia's capital, Addis Ababa. It is situated at an elevation of 1,885m above sea level. Currently, a total of 183,344 people live in the region. The Islamic faith is practiced in the city by the majority of the population (69%), followed

by Orthodox Christianity, which is practiced by roughly 27% of the entire population. According to the FDRE Central Statistical Agency ([CSA], 2007), 12.5% of children under 18 live either with one parent or alone because of parental loss. Furthermore, 10.15% of marriage ends in divorce. Unemployment and illiteracy are also the commonly reported challenges in the region (CSA, 2007).

Participants of the Study

There are 18 high schools in Harari regional state. Of these, 10 are public schools, and 8 are private schools. Six senior secondary schools in the Harari Regional State were randomly chosen to participate in the current study. Six schools, three from each type, were chosen randomly. Maltez, Hi-Tech, and Al Habasha Academy were from private schools, while Harar, Abadir, and Aboker Secondary Schools were government schools. During data collection, a total of 7471(Male= 4083 and Female =3388) adolescent students were enrolled and attending their education in the selected schools. The sample size of the study was determined using Drapper and Smith's formula for the non-single population (cited in Belay & Abdinasir, 2015). According to Drapper and Smith, sample size (n) is a function of the factors (Xi) and categories (Ck) involved in research such that a minimum of 10 observations is required for each category of a factor n= (Cfn_1 x Cfn_2 x Cf_3x…….Cf_n).

Where: n = sample

Cf_1 = number of categories of factor 1

Cf_2 = number of categories of factor 2

Cf_3 = number of categories of factor 3

Cf_n = number of categories of factor n

There were four variables in the present research (i.e., sex, family structure, school type, and grade level). There are two categories in the first variable (male and female), two categories in the school type variable (private and government school), two categories in the second factor (Intact and Non-intact), and four categories in the third factor (grade 9, 10, 11 and 12). Hence, the minimum sample size the researcher drew was 2 x 2 x 2 x 4 x 10 = 320. However, anticipating non-response or missing data might hinder achieving the desired precision, and to increase the representativeness of the study, the researchers increased the sample size by 45%, which brought the total sample size to 464. However, due to the less number of students attending private high schools compared to those attending government high schools, samples of adolescent students from private schools were oversampled by two weights to see if school type had an impact on adolescents' disruptive behaviors. Accordingly, the total sample size for the study was 525 (Male = 281 and Female = 244). After fixing on the total sample size (n) to be drawn from the population (N) using the above formula, then samples of participants were drawn from each selected schools. However, of the 525 students, 34 students did not return the questionnaire or they wrongly and inappropriately responded to the items. Hence, data analysis was made based on the responses obtained from 491 respondents, of which 262 were male and 229 were female.

Instruments of Data Collection

A self-report instrument was used to collect data on three important issues: participants' demographic information like sex, age, grade level, and family structure (Part I), Problem Behavior Frequency Scale (PBFS) used to measure disruptive behavior in adolescents (Part II), and the Family Conflict Scale (Part III) used to measure family conflict.

Disruptive Behaviors in Adolescents: To measure disruptive behavior in adolescents, an adolescent self-report version of Problem Behavior Frequency Scale (PBFS) developed by Farrell et al. (1992) and later modified by the same authors in 2000 was used. The scale contains 26 items that cover four general areas of problem behaviors in adolescents: (1) physical aggression, (2) nonphysical/relational aggression, (3) delinquent behavior, and (4) drug use. Responses were based on a 6-point scale: 1 (never), 2 (1–2 times), 3 (3–5 times), 4 (6–9 times), 5 (10–19 times), and 6 (20 times or more). Higher scores indicate more involvement in disruptive problem behaviors. Sample items of the scale are threatening a teacher, spreading a rumor, being suspended from school for bad behavior, damaging school or other property that did not belong to you, and smoking cigarettes. Pertaining to the scale's internal consistency, adequate and reasonably high Cronbach's α coefficients have been reported for all dimensions of the scale. The number of items and alpha coefficients for the (PBFS-26) subscales are as follows: The scale's alpha coefficient for the six items measuring drug use was 87. For the physical aggression dimension, an alpha coefficient was = .85. The non-physical/relational aggressiveness dimension has an alpha value of .85. For the six-item delinquent behavior dimension, Cronbach alpha value .79 was reported on the original scale. Further, in reasonably establishing the scale's factor structure, model fit results were reported to be Comparative Fit Index (CFI) =0.93 was reported.

Family Conflict Scale: This scale was adapted from the Family Environment Scale. The scale has nine items designed to measure family conflict. The Scale is scored using a 4-point Likert scale (1 to 4): Definitely true, Mostly true, mostly false, and

definitely false. Regarding the meanings of the scale, a high score represents a high conflict among family members and vice versa. Sample items of the scale are: we fight a lot; we get so angry that we throw things. With reference to the psychometric properties of the scale, reasonably high results have been reported. The scale has an acceptable goodness-of-fit index (GFI) = 0.93, Comparative Fit Index (CFI) = 0.95, and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) = 0.05. Internal consistency was acceptable for Cohesion ($\alpha = 0.86$).

Pilot Study

Validation of the present instrument went through different stages, beginning with checking the face and content validity of the scale using six experts in the field of psychology. Concerning the face and content validity of the scale, two associate professors and one professor, including three doctoral students, have forwarded their comments after looking into the instruments' relevance, appropriateness, clarity, and conceptual scope, where they endorsed the two scales along with these criteria.

Once the scales were modified per expert comments, the scales were then translated to the native languages (Amharic and Afan Oromo) by the language experts and made ready for data collection. A randomly selected sample of 304 adolescents from two schools (one private school and one government school) was used to test the instruments before using them for the final data collection. To check the internal consistency of the scale, Cronbach alpha internal consistency reliability was utilized. Exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis was run to test the underlying structure of the scale, as well.

Following exploratory factor analysis made for the problem behavior frequency scale, seven items which had low loading and cross-loading on more than

one factor were removed such that for Physical aggression dimension= 5 items (α=.807); for relational aggression= 4 items (α=.803); for delinquency dimension = 4 items (α=.724); and for drug use dimension =6 items (α=.77) were obtained respectively. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was also used to examine the fitness of the model obtained through exploratory factor analysis such that the obtained result fitted the data with CMIN = 431.03, CMIN/DF = 2.95, CFI = .901, and RMSEA = 0. 080.Family Conflict scale was also subjected to exploratory factor analysis, where the scale has maintained its original dimension (i.e., uni-dimensionality).Following factor analysis of the scale, Cronbach alpha result of (α=.74) was reported for an entire scale. The CFA model was also found to fit the data with CFI = .992 and RMSEA = .032.

Procedures

For secondary students, English is a foreign language, so students may have considerable difficulty in English. Therefore, before using the questionnaires for data collection, the questionnaires were translated into Amharic and Afan Oromo languages by language experts. This is due to the fact that in the Harari region, the commonly used languages are Amharic and Afan Oromo. After all the participants were in their respective classrooms, the researchers introduced themselves to the participants. Then, to get the students' permission to participate in the study the purpose of the study was clearly communicated to them. Then, after obtaining students' permission to participate in the study, a convenient time for the students to fill in the survey questionnaire was set in agreement with the students. Then, a conducive physical and psychological environment was created. To avoid confusion during data collection, they were given appropriate instructions for completing the

questionnaires in their respective classrooms. Accordingly, the questionnaire was distributed and collected. The whole data collection and administration process was undertaken in the presence of the researchers to avoid some inconveniences that could arise during data collection.

Data Analysis

After the data were collected, coded, and encoded into (SPSS) software, version 24, data cleaning was performed so that missing and incomplete responses were discarded and ready for further analysis. Descriptive statistics was employed to summarize the data. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to measure the association among the variables of the study. Two-way ANOVA was employed to examine whether disruptive behaviors in adolescents can vary as a function of their sex and family structure.

Ethical Considerations

This study involved a host of ethical issues. To begin, approval to conduct the study was obtained from the respective secondary schools where the data were collected. In addition, the participants were notified that their participation was voluntary and that they could withdraw from the study at any moment. Furthermore, all participants were instructed not to write their names on the questionnaires to keep the information confidential. Moreover, the participants were guaranteed that the information collected from them would be used solely for this study and that the information they submit would not be shared with anybody.

Results

In this section, the demographic characteristics of the participants and the results of the study are presented respectively in accordance with the specific objectives.

Socio-Demographics

Table 1Demographic characteristics of the study participants

Variables		Frequency	Percent	Variables		Frequency	Percent
Sex	Male	262	53.3	Family Structure	Intact	365	74.4
	Female	229	46.7		Non- intact	126	25. 6
	Total	491	100		Total	491	100
Grade level	9th	126	25.6	School type	Government	379	77.2
	10th	109	22.1		Private	112	22.8
	11th	160	32.5	Age of respondents	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
	12th	96	19.5		14	20	17.5
	Total	491	100				

Table 1 shows the demographic information of the participants. Nearly half of the participants in the current study were female students, with male adolescents 262(53.3%) and female adolescents 229(46.7%), respectively. About 74.4 percent of the respondents came from an intact family structure, whereas 25.6% were from non-intact families (i.e., living with single parents, step-parent, relatives or others). The study participants' grade levels ranged from ninth to twelfth grade. As regards their age, they were between 14 and 20 years.

Levels of Disruptive Behaviors in Adolescents and Perceived Family Conflict

To identify the level of disruptive behaviors in adolescents and perceived family conflict, the mean is used to classify the sample and identify the number of cases scored above the mean.

Table 2

Levels of Disruptive Behaviors and Perceived Family Conflict Among Adolescents

Variables	No	No of cases	No of items	Min	Maxi	Mean	SD	Percent
Disruptive behavior	491	189	19	19	59	29.2	8.1	38.4%
Family conflict	491	215	9	9	32	17.1	5.0	43.7%

Note: The number of cases implies the total number of respondents who scored above the mean. Percentage implies the proportion of the sample that scores above the mean on the variables

As shown in Table 2, although the majority of the participants reported modest levels of disruptive behavior, 189 (38.4%) reported relatively high levels of disruptive behavior. The table also shows that out of the total 491 students, 215 (43.7%) of them reported that their particular family environments was highly conflicting.

Descriptive Summary of the Study Variables

The mean and standard deviation of the major study variables are summarized in Table 3 below.

Table 3
Descriptive Summary of the Study Variables

Variables	Categories	No	Disruptive behavior	Family conflict
Sex	Male	No	262	262
		Mean	30.56	17.16
		SD	9.1	5.1
	Female	No	229	229
		Mean	27.27	16.93
		SD	6.5	5.0
Family structure	Intact	No	365	365
		Mean	27.51	16.35
		SD	7.1	5.01
	Non intact	No	126	126
		Mean	33.42	19.2
		SD	9.1	4.4
School type	Govt	No	379	
		Mean	29.21	
		SD	8.1	
	Private	No	112	
		Mean	28.1	
		SD	8.0	

As shown in Table 3, male adolescents (M= 30.56 and SD= 9.1) are more involved in disruptive behaviors than their female counterparts (M= 27.27 and SD=6.5). The Table also depicts that adolescents from non-intact family structures reported that they were involved in disruptive behaviors than adolescents from intact family structure (Non-intact; M=33.42 & SD=9.1; and Intact; M= 27.51 & SD=7.1), respectively.

Furthermore, adolescents from non-intact family structures indicated that their family environment was more conflicting than those from intact family structures

(Non-intact; M= 19.2 and SD=4.4; Intact; M= 16.35 and SD= 5), respectively. Moreover, no visible mean difference was reported between adolescents from Government schools (Mean =29.21 and SD= 8.1) and Private schools (Mean = 28.1 and SD =8) in their engagement in different disruptive behaviors.

Correlation Among the Variables of Interest

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was run to test the relationship among the variables of interest.

Table 4
Zero Order Correlation Coefficients among Variables of the Study (N=491)

	1	2	3	4	5
Sex(1)	1				
Age(2)	.169**				
Grade level(3)	-.029	.442**			
Family structure (4)	-.012	.123**	.009		
Disruptive behavior(5)	.201**	.214**	.178**	.317**	
Family Conflict(6)	.023	-.098*	-.215**	.236**	.113**

As depicted in Table 4, a statistically significant relationship was reported between sex and disruptive behavior in adolescents (r= .201, p<.001). This implies that male adolescents are more likely to involve in disruptive behaviors than their female adolescent counterparts. The table also shows that there is a significant relationship between family conflict and family structure (r= .236, p< 001). That is, unlike adolescents from intact family structure, adolescents from non-intact family structure perceived their family environment as conflicting. In addition, disruptive behavior in adolescents also positively related to the age (r= .214, P<.001) and grade

level (r=.178, P<.001) of the respondents. This implies that disruptive behavior in adolescents increases from early adolescents to late adolescents.

A statistically significant and positive relationship was obtained between family conflict and disruptive behaviors in adolescents (r=.113, p<.001), indicating that family conflict increases disruptive behaviors in adolescents. Moreover, a statistically significant relationship was reported between family structure and disruptive behaviors in adolescents (r=.317, P<.001). This implies that adolescents from non-intact family structure are more prone to engage in disruptive behaviors than adolescents from intact family structure.

Disruptive Behaviors in Adolescents as a Function of their Sex and Family Structure

A two-way ANOVA was employed to examine if disruptive behaviors in adolescents differed depending on sex and family structure. To make it easier for the reader to understand the interaction effect of independent variables on dependent variables, a descriptive overview of the variables is presented in Table 5.

Table 5
Mean and Standard Deviation of Disruptive Behaviors in Adolescents by Sex and Family Structure

Family structure	Sex	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Intact	Female	26.39	6.358	169
	Male	28.47	7.735	196
	Total	27.51	7.196	365
Non intact	Female	29.75	6.596	60
	Male	36.76	9.934	66
	Total	33.42	9.176	126
Total	Female	27.27	6.575	229
	Male	30.56	9.070	262
	Total	29.02	8.163	491

There is a visible and significant mean difference between male adolescents from intact and non-intact family structures in their engagement in disruptive behavior

when compared to female adolescents from both family structures (see Table 5). On the other hand, male adolescents from both family structures (Male from Intact; Mean= 28.47 and Male from Non-intact; Mean = 36.76) were reported to be more involved in disruptive behaviors than female adolescents from both family structures with mean (Female from intact =26.39 and female from Non-intact = 29.75).

Table 6
ANOVA Summary of Disruptive Behaviors in Adolescents by Sex and Family Structure

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	5211.294[a]	3	1737.098	30.831	.000
Intercept	343860.159	1	343860.159	6103.119	.000
Family structure	3167.044	1	3167.044	56.211	.000
Sex	1927.364	1	1927.364	34.208	.000
Family structure * Sex	567.081	1	567.081	10.065	.002

a. R Squared = .160 (Adjusted R Squared = .154)

As shown in Table 6, family structure significantly contributed to adolescents' disruptive behaviors (F= 56.2,p<.001). That is, adolescents from non-intact family structures are more prone to be involved in disruptive behaviors than adolescents from intact family structure, with Mean of Intact= 27.5 and non-intact= 33.4. In the same Table, sex is found to have a significant effect on adolescents' disruptive behaviors (F= 34.2, p<.001) in that male adolescents are reported to be more involved in disruptive behaviors than their female adolescent counterparts.

Similarly, as can be seen in Table 5, statistically significant interaction effect was reported between family structure and sex on adolescents' disruptive behavior. This shows that there was a significant difference in disruptive behaviors among male

adolescents from various family structures. Likewise, there was a significant difference among female adolescents from various family structures.

Discussion

The present study revealed that though most adolescents who took part in the study have reported a modest level of disruptive behavior, a considerable number of respondents, 189 (38.4%) reported relatively high levels of disruptive behavior. In connection to this notion, in the present study**,** out of the total 491 students, 215 (43.7%) of them endorsed their respective family environments as highly conflicting. Therefore, given a large number of adolescents perceived their family environment as unhealthy (conflicting), it is not surprising that adolescents of this proportion, 189 (38.4%), reported engaging in different disruptive behaviors at a high level. In fact, disruptive behavior in adolescents is not unique to Ethiopian adolescents; rather, it is a global phenomenon. For example, according to Kaltialaet al.(2000), the prevalence of disruptive behaviors varies from elementary to high school children, with rates as high as 27 percent for elementary school children (Whitney &Smith, 1993) and 51 percent for adolescents (Bond et al.,2001).Similarly, a few scattered research studies conducted in various parts of Ethiopia demonstrated the prevalence of disruptive behaviors among adolescents. For example, a study conducted by the FDRE Ministry of Health (2016) reported the extensive use of different substances such as Khat, cigarettes, and alcohol among adolescents and youth in Ethiopia, where nearly half of them (45.6%) consume alcohol more than six times in a month. In support of this study, Anteneet al. (2014) revealed that 312 (47.9%) of the 651 school adolescents reported current usage of various substances such as alcohol, cigarettes, and khat.

A statistically significant and negative relationship between family conflict and disruptive behaviors in adolescents was reported. This implies that conflicting family climate could serve as a cultivating environment for adolescents to engage in different disruptive behaviors. In support of this notion, Family system theory asserts that because family members are linked and interdependent systems, every dispute or problem that arises between or among family members impacts all of the family's members. In the same vein, (Repettiet al., 2002; Timmons &Margolin, 2015; Gazendam-Donofrio et al., 2007) asserted that family conflict is related to both internalizing and externalizing problem behaviors in children and adolescents. Similarly, Reimer (2005) stressed that, among others, familial conflict is one of the most important factors contributing to disruptive behavior in adolescents. Furthermore, Corville-Smith et al. (1998) discovered that adolescents' disruptive behavior is linked to negative family variables such as excessive family conflict, lack of parental acceptance, and poor discipline. Furthermore, Moratto et al.(2017) stated that aggressive behavior in adolescents was found to be related to family functioning characterized by more conflict. In the same way, Mackova and his associate (2019)revealed that family conflict has been linked to a variety of negative developmental outcomes in adolescents. In support of this notion, Shek (1997) stated that poor family functioning (conflicting) is related to elevated levels of substance abuse in adolescents.

With regard to family structure and disruptive behavior in adolescents, a statistically significant effect of family structure on adolescents' disruptive behavior was reported such that adolescents from non-intact family structure are more likely to engage in disruptive problem behaviors than adolescents living with their both

biological parents (fathers and mothers). In support of this notion, Rydell (2010) asserted that living in single and step-parent families strongly predicts disruptive behavior in adolescents. Reinforcing this idea, Ginther and Pollak (2004) revealed that children with divorced parents have greater behavior difficulties than children in intact households. In the same vein, some recent studies also demonstrated that adolescents from single-parent families are more involved in different disruptive behavior problems than adolescents from intact families (e.g., Mason, 2012;Ginther&Pollak, 2013; Bruffaertset al.,2016; Park &Lee, 2020).

The gender of the respondents has a significant effect on disruptive behaviors in adolescents, as male adolescents are more likely than female adolescents to engage in disruptive behaviors. In support of this notion, Steffensmeier and Allan (2000) stated that males are more prone to offending at every age than females. In a similar vein, Laheyetal.*(*2000) revealed that boys participate in more overtly aggressive behavior than girls of their age. Moreover, Baldry and Farrington (2000) uncovered that more boys than girls are involved in bullying.

Furthermore, Loukas et al.(2003) stated that beginning in childhood and continuing into adulthood, adolescent boys exhibit more antisocial behaviors than their female counterparts. Like what has been reported in the Western context, a study conducted in Ethiopia revealed the prevalence of disruptive behaviors in both sexes, though the way disruptive behaviors manifested in both sexes differed, with boys engaging in more physical aggression and girls engaging in more verbal aggression or relational aggression (Kinde &Mekonnen, 2006; Henok et al., 2019; Mulgeta et al., 2019; Zeray, 2019). Other researchers (e.g., Beza, 2020) have reported the absence of sex differences in adolescents' engagement in disruptive behaviors.

Moreover, a statistically significant interaction effect between family structure and sex on adolescents' disruptive behavior was reported. This tells us that there was a significant difference in disruptive behaviors among male adolescents from various family structures in that male adolescents from non-intact family structure were found to be more prone to engage in disruptive behaviors than male adolescents from non-intact family structure. Likewise, there was a significant difference among female adolescents from various family structures in that female adolescents from non- intact family structure are more prone to engage in disruptive behaviors than female adolescents from intact family structures. In a nutshell, it is possible to infer that the family environment of non- intact family structure has a cultivating ground for disruptive behaviors in adolescents.

The present study also revealed a significant and positive relationship between grade level and age with disruptive behaviors in adolescents in that the age of adolescents increases from early adolescence to late adolescence. Their engagement in different disruptive behavior increases, too.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The findings of this research generally suggest the following major conclusions:

- Despite the fact that the majority of participants reported modest levels of disruptive behavior, a considerable number of the respondents, 189 (38.4%) have reported a relatively high level of disruptive behavior. Likewise, out of the total 491 adolescent students, 215 (43.7%) of them endorsed their particular family environments as highly conflicting.
- A statistically significant relationship was reported between family conflict and disruptive behavior in adolescents.

- Adolescents from non-intact family structure were found to engage in disruptive behaviors than adolescents from intact family structures.
- Statistically significant sex difference in adolescents' disruptive behaviors was reported in that male adolescents were reported to be more involved in disruptive behaviors than female adolescents of their counterparts.
- A statistically significant and positive relationship was reported between age, grade level, and adolescent disruptive behaviors. As adolescent age and grade level increases adolescents' engagement in different disruptive behaviors increases too.
- A statistically significant interaction effect between family structure and sex on adolescents' disruptive behavior was reported. This tells us that there was a significant difference in disruptive behaviors among male adolescents from various family structures in that male adolescents from non-intact family structure were found to be more prone to engage in disruptive behaviors than male adolescents from non-intact family structure. Likewise, there was a significant difference among female adolescents from various family structures in that female adolescents from non-intact family structures are more prone to engage in disruptive behaviors than female adolescents from intact family structures.

The following suggestions would help address the gaps noted:

- Because the family environment significantly impacts each family member's behavior and personality, training and orientations involving adolescents and their parents should be arranged by the concerned bodies so that problem

behavior free, well-mannered, responsible, and disciplined adolescents will be achieved.

- Male adolescents are among the commonly vulnerable age group to different disruptive behaviors. Hence, the concerned bodies, including social workers, psychologists, and area experts, should organize orientation and training to help boost adolescents 'self-control skills that could thereby serve them to disengage in different problem behaviors.
- Parents of adolescent students, particularly single and stepparent families should be given orientation and training on allocating time for discussion and the importance of sharing ideas among family members so that their adolescents learn to avoid engaging in various disruptive behaviors.
- Further research needs to be conducted on the role of sex and family structure in the disruptive behaviors in adolescents to clear possible inconsistencies noted in this and many other researches.

References

Antene, B., Telake, A.,&Solomon, M. (2014). High prevalence of substance use and associated factors among high school adolescents in Woreta Town, Northwest Ethiopia: Multi-domain factor analysis. *BMC Public Health*, *14*(1): 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-14-1186.

Aye, E. N., Akaneme, I. N., Adimora, E. D., Offorka, T. O., Robinson, A., Nwosu, P. O., & Ngozi, F. (2016). Family conflict and managing strategies: Implication for understanding emotion and power struggles. *Global Journal of Psychology Research: New Trends and Issues*, *6*(3): 148-159.

Baldry, A. C. & Farrington, D. P. (2000). Bullies and delinquents: Personal characteristics and parental styles. *Journal of Community &Applied Social Psychology*, *10*(1): 17-31.

Belay, T.,& Abdinasir, A. (2015). *Research methods*. Addis Ababa: Mega Printing Press.

Beza, B .(2020). The relationship between perceived parenting style and aggression behavior of adolescents: in the case of Tanahaike grade 9th school adolescents: Ameans for intervention, BahirDar, Ethiopia. *Indian Journal of Health and Wellbeing*, *11*(01): 5356. https://doi.org/10.15614/ijhw.v11i01.4.

Bond, L., Carlin, J. B., Thomas, L., Rubin, K., & Patton, G. (2001). Does bullying cause emotional problems? A prospective study of young teenagers. *Bmj*, *323*(7311), 480-484.

Bongers, I. L., Koot, J. M., van der Ende, J., & Verhulst, F. C. (2004). Developmental trajectories of externalizing behaviors in childhood and adolescence. *ChildDevelopment*, 75, 1523–1537.

Bruffaerts, R., Mortier, Ph., Kiekens, G., Auerbach, R. P., Cuijpers, P., Demyttenaere, K., Green, J. G., Nock, M. K., &Kessler, R. C. (2016). Single mother parenting and adolescent psychopathology. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, *44*(7): 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-016-0128-x.Single.

Carolyn, S., Julianne, M. &Smith,B. (2017).*Assessment and treatment of childhood problems,: A Clinician's Guide.* (3rdedi.). The Guilford Press.

Córdova, D., Heinze, J. E., Mistry, R., Salas-Wright, C. P., & Zimmerman, M. A. (2016). Eco developmental trajectories of family functioning: Links with HIV/STI risk behaviors and STI among Black adolescents. *Developmental Psychology*, 52(7).

Corville-Smith, J., Ryan, B., Adams, G., & Dalicandro, T. (1998). Distinguishing absentee students from regular attenders: The combined influence of personal, family, and school factors. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, (27): 629-640.

Crick, N. R., Casas, J. F. and Ku, H. C. (1999). Relational and physical forms of peer victimization in preschool. *Developmental Psychology*, *35*(2), 376.

Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). *Parenting syle as context:* An integrative model. *Psychological Bulletin*,*113* (3): 487-496.

David, C., Steele, R., Forehand, R., & Armistead, L. (1996). The role of family conflict and marital conflict in adolescent functioning. *Journal of Family Violence*, *11*(1): 81-91.

Farrell, A. D., Danish, S. J., & Howard, C. W. (1992). Relationship between drug use and other problem behaviors in urban adolescents. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 60(5), 705–712.

Farrell, Albert D., Kung, Eva M., White, Kamila S. and Valois, Robert F. (2000).'The Structure of Self-Reported Aggression, Drug Use, and Delinquent Behaviors during Early Adolescence', Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology, 29(2), 282 — 292

Fayso,T. (2019). Aggressive behaviour in secondary schools of Mesken *Woreda*: types, magnitude and associated factors. *Psychology and Behavioral Science International Journal*, *10*(5): 1–8. https://doi.org/10.19080/pbsij.2019.10.555800.

Gazendam-Donofrio, S. M., Hoekstra, H. J., van der Graaf, W. T. A., van de wiel, H. B. M., Visser, A., Huizinga, G. A., & Hoekstra-Weebers, J. E. H. M. (2007). Family functioning and adolescents' emotional and behavioral problems: *Annals of Oncology*, *18*(12): 1951–1956. https://doi.org/10.1093/annonc/mdm373.

Ginther, D. D. K. &Pollak, R. (2013). Family structure and children's educational outcomes. *Focus, 30*(2): 11–14. http://link.springer.com/article/10.1353/dem.2004.0031

Ginther, D.K. &Pollak, R.A.(2004). Family structure and children's educational outcomes: Blended families, stylized facts, and descriptive regressions. *Demography*, *41*(4):671-696.

Gresham, F. M. (2015). *Disruptive behavior disorders: Evidence-based practice for assessment and intervention*. Guilford Publications.

Henok, G., Aregash, H.,& Desalegn, G.(2019). Adolescents antisocial behavior and their academic performance: The case of high schools in Jimma Town. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, *6*(1): 110.

Kaltiala-Heino, R., Rimpelä, M., Rantanen, P. &Rimpelä, A. (2000). Bullying at school—an indicator of adolescents at risk for mental disorders. *Journal of Adolescence*, *23*(6): 661-674.

Karimy, M., Fakhri, A., Vali, E., Vali, F., Veiga, F. H., Stein, L. A. &Araban, M. (2018). Disruptive behavior scale for adolescents (DISBA): Development and psychometric properties. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Mental Health*, *12*(1): 1-7.

Kinde, G., & Mekonnen, S. (2006). Types, magnitude, predictors and controlling mechanisms of aggression in secondary schools of Jimma Zone. *Ethiopian Journal of Education and Science 2(2): 52-61*.

Lahay, B., Schwab-Stone, M., Goodman, S., Waldman, I., Canino, G. , Rathouz, P., Miler, T., Dennis, K. , Bird, H. &Jensen, P. (2000). Age and gender differences in oppositional behavior and conduct problems: A cross-sectional household study of middle childhood and adolescence. *Joumal of Abnomzal Psychology*, *109*(3): 488-503.

Loon, L. M. A., Ven, M. O. M., Doesum, K. T. M., Witteman, C. L. M., & Hosman, C. M. H. (2014). The relation between parental mental illness and adolescent mental health: The role of family factors. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, (*23): 1201–1214.

doi:10.1007/s10826-013-9781-7.

Loukas, A., Fitzgerald, H. E., Zucker, R. A. &Krull, J. L. (2003). Developmental trajectories of disruptive behavior problems among sons of alcoholics: Effects of parent psychopathology, family conflict, and child undercontrol. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *112*(1): 119–131. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.112.1.119.

Mackova, J., Veselska, Z. D., Bobakova, D. F., Geckova, A. M., Van Dijk, J. P., & Reijneveld, S. A. (2019). Crisis in the family and positive youth development: The role of family functioning. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *16*(10). https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16101678.

Mason, E. (2012). Family Systems on Adolescent Internalizing and externalizing behaviors. *Dissertation*.

Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia Central Statistical Agency. (2007). *Populationand housing Censuses*. Addis Ababa: Author

Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia Ministry of Health. (2016). National Adolescent and Youth Health Strategy (2016-2020). Addis Ababa: Author.

Moos, R.H., Moos, B.S.(1994).*Family environment scale manual: Development, applications, research* (3rd ed). Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologist Press.

Moratto Vásquez, N. S., Cárdenas Zuluaga, N., & Berbesí Fernández, D. Y. (2017). School climate and family functionality as associated factors to bullying in students of Antioquia, Colombia. *Pensamiento Psicológico*, *15*(1): 63-72.

Mulgeta, M.,Teka, G., Adamu,B.,& Adamu, M.(2019). Assessment of substance abuse and associated factors among secondary school students in Ambo town, Ethiopia, 2018. *Journal of Addiction Research & Therapy, 10 (3), 1-14.*

Park, H.,&Lee, K. S. (2020). The association of family structure with health behavior, mental health, and perceived academic achievement among adolescents: A 2018 Korean nationally representative survey. *BMC Public Health*, *20*(1): 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-08655-z.

Reimer, M. &Smink, J. (2005). Information about the school dropout issue. *Clemson, SC: National Dropout Prevention Center/Network at Clemson University*.

Repetti, R. L., Taylor, S. E., & Seeman, T. E. (2002). Risky families: Family social environments and the mental and physical health of offspring. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128, 330–366. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.128.2.330.

Rydell, A. M. (2010). Family factors and children's disruptive behaviour: An investigation of links between demographic characteristics, negative life events and symptoms of ODD and ADHD. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, *45*(2): 233-244.

Santrock, J.W. (2007).*Child development*(11th Ed.), Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Shek, D. T. L. (1997). Family environment and adolescent psychological well-being, school adjustment, and problem behavior: A pioneer study in a Chinese context. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, *158*(1): 113–128. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221329709596656

Steffensmeier, D.,&Allan, E. (2000). Looking for patterns: Gender, age, and crime. In J.

Sheley (Ed.), *Criminology: The ContemporaryH* (pp. 85–127). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Timmons, A. C., & Margolin, G. (2015). Family conflict, mood, and adolescents' daily school problems: moderating roles of internalizing and externalizing symptoms. *Child Development*, *86*(1): 241–258. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12300.

Webster-Stratton, C. (1996). Early-onset conduct problems: Does gender make a difference?. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *64*(3): 540.

Whitney, I.,&Smith, P. K. (1993). A survey of the nature and extent of bullying in junior/middle and secondary schools. *Educational Research*, *35*(1): 3-25.

Xu, Y., Boyd, R. C., Butler, L., Moore, T. M., & Benton, T. D. (2017). Associations of parent-adolescent discrepancies in family cohesion and conflict with adolescent impairment. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, *26*(12): 3360–3369. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-017-0825-2.

Zeray, T. (2019). Aggressive behavior among addis ketema preparatory school students: magnitude and contributing factors. (Unpublished Masters Thesis*),* Addis Ababa University.