Effectiveness of Moral Motivation and Reasoning Training on Violent Behaviors of Male Students

Sonita. Jahanbini[1] , Shahram. Vahedi[2]* , Parviz. Karimi Sani[3]

[1] Ph.D. Student, Department of Psychology, Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran
[2] Professor, Department of Psychology, Tabriz University, Tabriz, Iran
[3] Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Shabester Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shabester, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: vahedi117@gmail.com

Article Info

Article type:
Original Research

ABSTRACT

Objective: The emergence of violent and deviant behaviors among students, educators, and officials is a fundamental problem in society. These behaviors, besides causing economic and familial problems, also lead to numerous ethical, social, cultural, and political damages. Therefore, this study aimed to determine the effectiveness of moral motivation and reasoning training on violent behaviors in male middle school students.

Methods and Materials: The research method was quasi-experimental with one experimental group and one control group, including pre-test and post-test assessments. The study population consisted of all middle school students with violent behaviors in Tabriz during the academic year 2020-2021. For selecting the research sample, multi-stage cluster random sampling and screening methods were used. Thirty students who scored above the cut-off point on the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS, 1972) were selected as the sample of students with violent behaviors and were randomly divided into experimental and control groups. The experimental group received twelve two-hour sessions of moral motivation and reasoning training, while the control group received regular school education. Both groups completed the Conflict Tactics Scale questionnaire as pre-test and post-test. Multivariate covariance analysis was used for data analysis.

Findings: The results of multivariate covariance analysis showed that the effectiveness of moral motivation and reasoning training was significant for all three subscales, including verbal violence (F=7.30, α=0.004), mild physical violence (F=3.47, α=0.48), and severe physical violence (F=3.58, α=0.04) (α>0.05).

Conclusion: The results of this study indicate that among the subscales of violent behaviors, verbal violence received the most significant impact from the provision of moral motivation and reasoning training.

Keywords: Moral reasoning, Moral motivation, Violence.

1. Introduction

Violence, in general terms, is a global issue and challenge. School violence, particularly bullying, is a prominent concern within the educational system. Bullying is defined as a specific type of violence characterized by a power imbalance between the bully and the victim and its repetitive nature over time (Teng et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2016). Aggression and violent behaviors are forms of violence against others that can cause harm or injury to others. Aggression and violence have been present in individuals from early childhood, persist over time, and continue into adolescence and adulthood (Asadi Majreh & Akbari, 2019). However, the highest prevalence and manifestation of aggression can be attributed to adolescence and youth. Violence is an aggressive behavior exhibited with the intent to harm individuals or objects and can manifest physically, verbally, or through the destruction of objects and violation of rules and regulations in the living environment (DeWall et al., 2007). Aggression and violence are recognized as global problems with detrimental physical and psychological effects on both social and individual levels (Lee & DiGiuseppe, 2018). The emergence of violent and deviant behaviors among students, educators, and officials is a fundamental problem in society, leading to various ethical, social, cultural, and political damages, besides economic and familial issues (Gini et al., 2014; Lee & DiGiuseppe, 2018; Saidi et al., 2020). Statistical evidence indicates that violence is increasingly prevalent among adolescents in schools, with 30 to 50 percent of schools experiencing rising violence (Asadi Majreh & Akbari, 2019). Addressing maladaptive student behaviors, including school violence, is a significant concern of the educational system (Sullivan et al., 2021).

The International Council of Nurses defines "violence" similarly to the World Health Organization, as acts involving the intentional use of power or physical force against oneself, another person, group, or community, resulting in harm (Fatma et al., 2017). Studies have shown that violence can have long-term harmful effects on individuals' social and moral development and stability (Huang et al., 2017) and may lead to direct physical harm or psychological and behavioral problems (Saidi et al., 2020). Aggression can manifest as overt reactions involving physical or verbal altercations or as covert actions with hidden symptoms, forming internally within individuals (Babaei et al., 2020; Visconti et al., 2015; von Grundherr et al., 2017).

Recent research in Iran also indicates that the spread of violence and aggression is one of the most severe social issues, particularly since a large portion of this age group attends school. Statistics and evidence show that violence is increasingly prevalent among adolescents in schools, where students carry weapons like knives for self-defense (Babaei et al., 2020). This issue contradicts the primary role and function of schools as educational and safe environments. Despite schools being perceived as safer than streets or homes, especially for children and adolescents, the increasing occurrence of violence suggests otherwise. School violence is particularly sensitive, as allowing it can result in a more violent society in the future. Recent studies in Kurdistan Province's schools indicate high levels of violent behaviors among both male and female students compared to the national average, with 11.3 percent of students being victims of peer violence several times a month or week and 28.9 percent perpetrating violence against others. Types of verbal violence include swearing (75.3 percent), mocking and insulting individuals (70.2 percent), and name-calling (59 percent). Physical violence includes hitting (42.1 percent), pushing and shoving (56.2 percent), slapping, punching, and kicking (43.9 percent), and neck-pushing or slapping (42.2 percent). Psychological-social violence involves forcing victims to do tasks or assignments against their will (43.9 percent). Additionally, a significant percentage of students experience various verbal and physical violence from teachers (Babaei et al., 2020).

Brugman et al. (2023) investigated whether and how components of moral judgment (moral reasoning and moral value evaluation) and self-serving cognitive distortions are associated with peer bullying roles among adolescents. Bullies and victims displayed the lowest levels of moral judgment and the highest levels of self-serving cognitive distortions. Conversely, defenders and bystanders had the highest levels of moral judgment and the lowest cognitive distortions. Self-serving cognitive distortions fully mediated the relationship between moral reasoning and bullying and partially mediated the relationship between moral evaluation and bullying. Multi-group analyses revealed that the strength of relationships between moral judgment components and self-serving cognitive distortions varied by adolescent roles. Anti-bullying intervention programs should include facilitating moral reasoning and valuation and reducing self-serving cognitive distortions (Brugman et al., 2023).

Teng et al. (2020) aimed to use ecological-social theory and social-cognitive theory, adopting a multi-level approach to examine the longitudinal relationship between

mechanisms of moral disengagement and violent behavior and the moderating effects of school climate perception over 18 months. The study examined the main effects of moral disengagement and school climate perception and their interaction effects on violent behavior at the interpersonal, intrapersonal, and interaction levels. The study involved 2997 fifteen-year-old adolescents from six secondary schools. Results showed that, at the interpersonal level, students with higher moral disengagement and negative perceptions of school climate were more likely to engage in bullying compared to those with lower moral disengagement and positive school climate perceptions. At the intrapersonal level, students with higher moral disengagement and negative school climate perceptions engaged in more bullying and violence over time. Finally, cross-sectional interactions indicated that the relationship between moral disengagement and violent behavior was not significant for students with more positive school climate perceptions (Teng et al., 2020).

Recently, interventions focusing on ethics have gained importance in reducing aggressive behaviors. Over the past few decades, a growing number of studies have integrated findings from cognitive-social, moral, and emotional development research and their relationship with violence (Kokkinos et al., 2016). In this context, aggression is viewed as unethical behavior (Gini et al., 2014), and moral reasoning mechanisms are strong predictors of aggression (Gini et al., 2014). This perspective that children and adolescents view violence as morally problematic is well-supported.

Rest et al. (1999) proposed a four-component model of moral behavior, including moral sensitivity, moral judgment, moral motivation, and moral character. The third component, moral motivation, differentiates between knowing the right action and prioritizing it. Moral motivation involves the importance given to competing choices. A deficiency in moral motivation occurs when personal values compete with the concern for doing the right thing. Thus, moral motivation encompasses the commitment to ethical courses of action, the preference for moral values over other values, and personal accountability for moral outcomes (Rest et al., 1999).

To better understand the role of moral components in bullying incidents and support interventions for insensitive adolescents, a deeper understanding of moral reasoning regarding bullying is needed. Among all studies examining the relationship between moral behavior and other variables, moral reasoning holds a special place. Moral reasoning is the process of making conscious judgments about the goodness or badness of actions (Berkowitz et al., 1986; Murray-Close et al., 2006; Ryan, 2001; Swanson & Hill, 1993). It also refers to the ability to understand and recognize moral and social issues using individual values and standards (which vary in different perspectives) to take appropriate action and behave ethically (Ryan, 2001). Ethical behavior is the ability to conform to or deviate from societal standards, appearing in repeated and consistent behavior patterns. In Kohlberg and Piaget's views on ethics, moral reasoning is central to morality. Kohlberg assumes that moral reasoning is a crucial factor unifying moral judgment and the decision to act morally, playing a primary role (Cheng, 2014). Social-cognitive theory also posits that moral and immoral behaviors result from moral reasoning and self-regulatory mechanisms (Wang et al., 2016). Studies examining the relationship between moral behavior and reasoning show a significant positive relationship (Rest et al., 1999; Ryan, 2001; Swanson & Hill, 1993). Over 40 studies have investigated the relationship between moral reasoning and delinquency, with several meta-analyses, generally supporting the negative relationship between moral reasoning and delinquent behavior (Cheng, 2014). Studies indicate that moral reasoning is the most critical predictor of antisocial behaviors like aggression and bullying (Wang et al., 2016). In the past decade, many psychologists and education experts have focused on ethics, which may stem from societal problems such as assault, theft, aggression, violence, bullying, and delinquency, often attributed to declining ethics (Judy & Nelson, 2000).

Based on extensive searches, very few studies have reported the impact of moral reasoning and motivation on reducing violence globally, and no reports have been found at the national level. Therefore, this study aims to examine the effectiveness of moral reasoning and motivation training in reducing violent behaviors in adolescents. The primary research question is whether moral reasoning and motivation training can reduce student violence.

2.   Methods and Materials

2.1.   Study Design and Participants

The research method was quasi-experimental, including one experimental group and one control group, with pre-test and post-test assessments. The study population consisted of all middle school students with violent behaviors in Tabriz during the academic year 2020-2021. Multi-stage cluster random sampling and screening methods were used to select the research sample. Thirty students who scored above the

cut-off point on the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) were selected as the sample of students with violent behaviors and randomly divided into experimental and control groups. The experimental group received twelve two-hour sessions of moral reasoning and motivation training, while the control group received regular school education.

2.2. Measures

2.2.1. Conflict Tactics

The CTS has been used in numerous studies since 1972, with its validity and factor structure confirmed. In this scale, violence is conceptualized in verbal, mild physical, and severe physical dimensions. The scale was translated into Persian by Zarei (2004) and validated on 600 young people in Tehran, with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.87. Respondents must mark one of the options (never, 1-2 times, 3-5 times, 6-10 times, more than 10 times) for each item based on their experiences in the past year. The total score indicates the level of violence in that dimension. Verbal violence is operationalized through indicators like swearing, shouting, and mocking others. Mild physical violence includes pushing, shoving, slapping, punching, kicking, throwing objects to cause harm, hitting, choking, grappling with others, and participating in group fights. Severe physical violence is measured through indicators like threatening others with a knife, using a knife in fights, and coercing others using force and threats (Hashemi & Mardani, 2021).

2.3. Intervention

2.3.1. Moral Reasoning and Motivation Training Package

In this study, a synthesized approach was taken, reviewing domestic and international research articles (Babaei et al., 2020; Berkowitz et al., 1986; Blasius, 2007; Cheng, 2014; Ey et al., 2019; Hao & Wu, 2019; Kim & Yi, 2014; Lee et al., 2021; Manning & Bear, 2011; Murray-Close et al., 2006; Ryan, 2001; Swanson & Hill, 1993; von Grundherr et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2016), and then designing a 12-session moral reasoning and motivation training package tailored to the specific conditions and characteristics of students with violent behaviors. To assess content validity, the training package was reviewed by several specialists, supervisors, and consultants, and any potential issues were corrected based on their feedback. The content validity of this package was evaluated using the

Lawshe content validity ratio (1986), demonstrating high validity.

Session 1: Recognizing Moral Issues

In the first session, students will be taught how to judge the credibility of sources, distinguish fact from opinion, and access accurate information. These skills are foundational for recognizing and addressing moral issues effectively.

Session 2: Analyzing Ethical Issues

The second session focuses on categorizing different types of issues and analyzing ethical problems. Students will learn to systematically break down ethical dilemmas to understand the underlying moral principles involved.

Session 3: Identifying Judgment Criteria

In the third session, students will learn to identify moral codes and standards that guide ethical judgment. This includes recognizing the principles that should inform their decisions and actions.

Session 4: Understanding the Application of Codes

During the fourth session, students will explore how to apply moral codes in various situations. They will be taught to understand the relevance and application of these codes in everyday decision-making.

Session 5: Evaluating the Credibility of Ethical Codes

The fifth session involves teaching students how to evaluate the credibility of different ethical codes. This includes assessing whether a code is reliable and valid based on its sources and principles.

Session 6: Developing General Reasoning Skills

In the sixth session, students will be trained in impartial reasoning. This involves learning to reason without bias and to consider all relevant factors objectively.

Session 7: Using Correct Reasoning

The seventh session focuses on using correct reasoning techniques. Students will practice making logical, well-founded arguments that are based on sound principles and evidence.

Session 8: Avoiding Human Reasoning Pitfalls

The eighth session aims to teach students how to avoid common pitfalls in human reasoning, such as cognitive biases and logical fallacies, ensuring their reasoning processes remain robust and reliable.

Session 9: Developing Ethical Reasoning

In the ninth session, students will learn to judge different perspectives and reason about the outcomes of various actions. This includes understanding the consequences of their actions and making morally sound decisions.

Session 10: Reflecting on Ethical Actions and Outcomes

The tenth session involves reflecting on the process and outcomes of ethical actions. Students will be taught to monitor their reasoning and to consider the meanings and goals behind their actions.

Session 11: Planning for Decision Implementation

In the eleventh session, students will focus on planning the implementation of their decisions. This includes learning to monitor their reasoning, execute their plans successfully, and identify the necessary resources.

Session 12: Developing Optimism

The final session aims to develop students' optimism by teaching positive thinking skills. Students will learn about the corrective impact of positive thinking and how to understand the reasons behind others' actions, fostering a more positive and proactive approach to moral reasoning and motivation.

2.4. Data analysis

For data analysis, indicators such as mean and standard deviation were used, and inferential statistics were analyzed using regression correlation. Data analysis was conducted using SPSS version 27.

3. Findings and Results

Table 1 presents the means and standard deviations of the research variables.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations of Research Variables

Variable	Subscale	Group	Pre-test (15 students)		Post-test (15 students)	
			M	SD	M	SD
Violent Behaviors	Verbal Violence	Control	10.93	1.70	9.66	2.16
		Experimental	9.93	1.90	5.06	1.09
	Mild Physical Violence	Control	42.66	2.31	42.86	2.79
		Experimental	43.40	2.69	40.33	13.59
	Severe Physical Violence	Control	14.20	2.14	14.86	2.41
		Experimental	15.06	1.90	8.53	1.88

In examining the subscales of violent behaviors, the mean and standard deviation for the verbal violence subscale in the pre-test were 9.93 and 1.90, respectively, and in the post-test were 5.06 and 1.09, respectively, indicating a reduction after receiving the moral motivation and reasoning training package. However, in the control group, the mean in the pre-test (10.93) and post-test (9.66) showed little change. The mean and standard deviation for the mild physical violence subscale in the experimental group in the pre-test were 43.40 and 2.69, respectively, and in the post-test were 40.33 and 13.59, respectively, indicating a reduction after receiving the moral motivation and reasoning training package. However, in the control group, the mean in the pre-test (42.66) and post-test (42.86) showed little change. For the severe physical violence subscale, the mean and standard deviation in the experimental group in the pre-test were 15.06 and 1.90, respectively, and in the post-test were 8.53 and 1.88, respectively, indicating a reduction after receiving the moral motivation and reasoning training package. However, in the control group, the mean in the pre-test (14.20) and post-test (14.86) showed little change. Among the subscales of violent behaviors, the greatest reduction in the mean was observed in the verbal violence subscale.

To test the effectiveness of the moral motivation and reasoning model in reducing students' violent behaviors, a MANOVA test was used. The results of the MANOVA test for the group effect on the subscales of violent behaviors are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Results of MANOVA for the Group Effect (Moral Motivation and Reasoning Training Package) on Subscales of Violent Behaviors

Subscale	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Eta Squared
Verbal Violence	25.074	2	12.537	7.303	.004	.388
Mild Physical Violence	787.781	2	393.890	3.475	.048	.232
Severe Physical Violence	80.190	2	40.095	3.586	.044	.238
Error						
Verbal Violence	39.483	23	1.717			
Mild Physical Violence	2607.365	23	113.364			
Severe Physical Violence	257.138	23	11.180			

Based on Table 2, considering the increased scores of the experimental group in the variable of violent behaviors and its subscales, it can be said that the moral motivation and reasoning training package has a reducing effect on students' violent behaviors. The effectiveness for all three subscales with F values and significance levels include verbal violence (F = 7.303, α = .004), mild physical violence (F = 3.475, α = .048), and severe physical violence (F = 3.586, α = .044), (α < .05) are significant. Additionally, the Eta squared values indicate the effect size, with Eta values for the three subscales being verbal violence (.388), mild physical violence (.232), and severe physical violence (.238). It can be concluded that the moral motivation and reasoning training package had a 38% impact on verbal violence, 23% on mild physical violence, and 23% on severe physical violence, with the greatest impact observed in verbal violence.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

The present study aimed to determine the effectiveness of the moral motivation and reasoning training package on the violent behaviors of middle school male students. The results showed that moral motivation and reasoning training led to a reduction in students' violent behaviors, including verbal, mild physical, and severe physical violence. Theoretically, moral reasoning is an effective factor in moral behavior, which develops when individuals can think freely and independently to accept or reject certain rules (Blasius, 2007). Moral reasoning can include initial judgment about the wrongness or harmfulness of behavior, but it can also provide reasons for the behavior and hold the individual responsible (Lee et al., 2021). Therefore, each person must

take responsibility for their actions concerning the acceptance or rejection of rules, as the responsibility for any action is morally borne by individuals, which is assumed to be a necessary part of any comprehensive ethical system (Pretzlaff, 2005). Additionally, the violence control reasoning perspective states that presenting a set of arguments about the dangers and consequences of aggression to an aggressor or victims can prevent aggression in those who have not yet shown aggression. For example, if the potential consequences of aggressive behavior by a father towards his child are highlighted, it may prevent the intensity of the behavior. Moreover, based on the moral malleability theory, although morality is somewhat innate, it is largely influenced by various factors and thus can be taught (Brugman et al., 2023). Therefore, teaching moral reasoning can affect adolescents' violent behaviors, theoretically explaining the findings of the present study, as it showed that the moral motivation and reasoning training package could reduce adolescents' violent behaviors. Adolescents who received the training could align and harmonize their moral beliefs with their views on violent behaviors. They learned that having specific goals requires choosing specific means and that one cannot talk about lofty ideals while using non-lofty means. They realized they could not have moral beliefs and reach morality while exhibiting violent behaviors; thus, their violent behaviors gradually decreased. Additionally, adolescents who received the moral motivation and reasoning training could strengthen their moral conscience because, logically, to maintain a sound moral life, a moral conscience must exist. They managed to align their moral beliefs with their ethical actions and avoid conflict. Therefore, as they came to believe that verbal or

physical violence, whether mild or severe, is wrong, and if they showed violent behavior, they would violate their conscience and be logically inconsistent with moral reasoning. Consequently, they gradually reduced their violent behaviors. Therefore, by being exposed to moral motivation and reasoning training, adolescents aligned their actions with their moral beliefs, achieving consistency and being considered individuals with a moral conscience. Based on the above explanations, moral reasoning training can reduce adolescents' violent behaviors, theoretically explaining the present study's findings.

Furthermore, the hypothesis test results showed that verbal violence had the most significant impact from the moral motivation and reasoning training package among the subscales of violent behaviors. This finding can be explained by stating that verbal or verbal violence is a form of psychological abuse, including using verbal language, body language, and written language against the victim (Teng et al., 2020; Visconti et al., 2015). It can include labeling, harassment, insult, blame, and excessive shouting at another person (Koller & Darida, 2020). Many adolescents who are victims of verbal violence do not know how to combat and treat it, accept the conditions, and continue their lives in a sick cycle of love, abuse, and violence. Accepting this type of life only ignores feelings and the experience of happiness. If adolescents are caught in such a cycle, they must learn how to live properly with mental health without being subjected to violence. The present study's findings showed that moral motivation and reasoning training could help these adolescents significantly.

The present study's findings are empirically consistent with many prior (Babaei et al., 2020; Brugman et al., 2023; Ey et al., 2019; Gini et al., 2014; Lee & DiGiuseppe, 2018; Teng et al., 2020; von Grundherr et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2016). For instance, Lee et al. (2021) in their study on moral reasoning about violent behavior concerning the type of aggression, age, and gender in South Korean students concluded that moral reasoning significantly relates to various violent behaviors, including physical group aggression, verbal aggression, and cyber aggression, consistent with the present study's findings. Lee et al. (2021) showed in their study on moral reasoning and moral behavior considering the relationship of forms and functions of violence in childhood that moral reasoning is an important factor in understanding various forms of aggression (Lee & DiGiuseppe, 2018). This research showed that moral reasoning could be developed during childhood and have significant effects on children's and adolescents' violent

behaviors, consistent with the present study's findings. Moral motivation and reasoning play an important role in individuals' potential for aggressive and bullying behaviors and their capacity for positive social interactions.

5. Limitations & Suggestions

Additionally, the present study's findings indicate that among the subscales of violent behaviors, verbal violence received the most significant impact from the moral motivation and reasoning training package. This finding can be explained by stating that verbal or verbal violence is a form of psychological abuse, including using verbal language, body language, and written language against the victim. Given the impact of the moral reasoning and motivation training package on violent behaviors, it is recommended to be taught to all students.

Authors' Contributions

All authors contributed equally.

References

Asadi Majreh, S., & Akbari, B. (2019). Structural model aggression according to emotion regulation, alexithymia, impulsivity and sensation seeking in students. *Journal of Sabzevar University of Medical Sciences*, *25*(6), 819-828. https://jsums.medsab.ac.ir/article_1144_9d08fb7fb004fa5c591cce13fbc1740b.pdf

Babaei, A., Vahedi, S., Imanzadeh, A., & Adib, Y. (2020). Effectiveness of Ethical Sensitivity Skill Training on Moral Disengagement and Bullying in Adolescent Girls. *Social Psychology Research*, *10*(37), 123-139. https://doi.org/10.22034/spr.2020.109700

Berkowitz, M. W., Mueller, C. W., Schnell, S. V., & Padberg, M. T. (1986). Moral reasoning and judgments of aggression. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *51*(4), 885-891. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.51.4.885

Blasius, T. L. (2007). *Comparison of moral reasoning and transformational leadership of public school principals using inclusive education in Michigan*. ProQuest. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/337188110_SCHOOL_PRINCIPALS_TRANSFORMATIONAL_LEADERSHIP_STYLES_AND_THEIR_EFFECTS_ON_TEACHERS_SELF-EFFICACY

Brugman, D., van der Meulen, K., & Gibbs, J. C. (2023). Moral judgment, self-serving cognitive distortions, and peer bullying among secondary school adolescents. *Journal of Moral Education*, 1-21. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057240.2023.2209289

Cheng, C. (2014). The Predictive Effects of Self-Esteem, Moral Self, and Moral Reasoning on Delinquent Behaviors of Hong Kong Young People. *International Journal of Criminology and Sociology*, *3*, 133-145. https://doi.org/10.6000/1929-4409.2014.03.12

DeWall, C. N., Baumeister, R. F., Stillman, T. F., & Gailliot, M. T. (2007). Violence restrained: Effects of self-regulation and its depletion on aggression. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *43*(1), 62-76. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022103105001551

Ey, L.-A., Walker, S., & Spears, B. (2019). Young children's thinking about bullying: Personal, social-conventional and moral reasoning perspectives. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, *44*(2), 196-210. https://doi.org/10.1177/1836939119825901

Fatma, H., Khan, T. F., & Husain, M. (2017). Psychobiology of aggression in sports. *Indian Journal of Health and Wellbeing*, *8*(7), 744-747. https://www.academia.edu/download/55492322/ContentServer_3.pdf

Gini, G., Pozzoli, T., & Hymel, S. (2014). Moral disengagement among children and youth: A meta-analytic review of links to aggressive behavior. *Aggressive Behavior*, *40*(1), 56-68. https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21502

Hao, J., & Wu, C. (2019). Deaf Children's Moral Behavior, Moral Reasoning and Emotion Attribution. *The Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, *24*(2), 95-103. https://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/eny047

Hashemi, S. Z., & Mardani, S. (2021). Meta-analysis of Common Social Deviations among Students. *Journal of Social Problems of Iran*, *12*(1), 67-101. https://doi.org/10.22059/ijsp.2021.84967

Huang, J., Tang, J., Tang, L., Chang, H. J., Ma, Y., Yan, Q., & Yu, Y. (2017). Aggression and related stressful life events among Chinese adolescents living in rural areas: A cross-sectional study. *Journal of affective disorders*, *211*, 20-26. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0165032716316330

Judy, B., & Nelson, E. S. (2000). Relationship between parents, peers, morality, and theft in an adolescent sample. *The High School Journal*, *83*(3), 31-42. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40364446

Kim, Y. M., & Yi, S. H. (2014). The Moral Judgment and Justification Reasoning in terms of Aggressive Behavior by 3, 4 and 5 Year Olds: The Relationship to Children's False Belief Understanding. *Korean Journal of Child Studies*, *35*(3), 49-69. https://koreascience.kr/article/JAKO201421154208725.page

Kokkinos, C. M., Voulgaridou, I., Mandrali, M., & Parousidou, C. (2016). INTERACTIVE LINKS BETWEEN RELATIONAL AGGRESSION, THEORY OF MIND, AND MORAL DISENGAGEMENT AMONG EARLY ADOLESCENTS. *Psychology in the Schools*, *53*(3), 253-269. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.21902

Koller, P., & Darida, P. (2020). Emotional behavior with verbal violence: Problems and solutions. *Interdisciplinary Journal Papier Human Review*, *1*(2), 1-6. http://www.igsspublication.com/index.php/ijphr/article/view/41

Lee, A. H., & DiGiuseppe, R. (2018). Anger and aggression treatments: a review of meta-analyses. *Current opinion in psychology*, *19*, 65-74. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352250X17300520

Lee, S.-H., Smith, P. K., & Monks, C. P. (2021). Moral Reasoning about Aggressive Behavior in Relation to Type of Aggression, Age and Gender in South Korean Pupils. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *18*(5).

Manning, M. A., & Bear, G. G. (2011). Moral Reasoning and Aggressive Behavior: Concurrent and Longitudinal Relations. *Journal of School Violence*, *10*(3), 258-280. https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2011.579235

Murray-Close, D., Crick, N. R., & Galotti, K. M. (2006). Children's Moral Reasoning Regarding Physical and Relational Aggression. *Social Development*, *15*(3), 345-372. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9507.2006.00346.x

Pretzlaff, R. K. (2005). Should Age be a Deciding Factor in Ethical Decision-Making? *Health Care Analysis*, *13*(2), 119-128. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10728-005-4475-y

Rest, J. R., Thoma, S. J., & Bebeau, M. J. (1999). *Postconventional moral thinking: A neo-Kohlbergian approach*. Psychology Press. https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9781410603913/postconventional-moral-thinking-james-rest-darcia-narv-ez-stephen-thoma-muriel-bebeau-muriel-bebeau

Ryan, J. J. (2001). Moral Reasoning as a Determinant of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Study in the Public Accounting Profession. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *33*(3), 233-244. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1017584021475

Saidi, S., Saffarinia, M., & Ahmadian, H. (2020). The Model Of Relationship Between Aggression and Social Perspective Taking With Pro-social Behavior through mediator Role Social Trust. *Social Psychology Research*, *9*(36), 1-20. https://www.socialpsychology.ir/article_105539.html

Sullivan, K., Zhu, Q., Wang, C., & Boyanton, D. (2021). Relations Among Peer Victimization, Aggression, and School Climate

Among Elementary School Students in China. *School Psychology Review*, 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1080/2372966X.2021.1898290

Swanson, H. L., & Hill, G. (1993). Metacognitive aspects of moral reasoning and behavior. *Adolescence*, *28*(111), 711. https://search.proquest.com/openview/444b1b9f243b9cc351d07e07ed2174a3/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=41539

Teng, Z., Bear, G. G., Yang, C., Nie, Q., & Guo, C. (2020). Moral disengagement and bullying perpetration: A longitudinal study of the moderating effect of school climate. *School Psychology*, *35*(1), 99-109. https://doi.org/10.1037/spq0000348

Visconti, K. J., Ladd, G. W., & Kochenderfer-Ladd, B. (2015). The role of moral disengagement in the associations between children's social goals and aggression. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, *61*(1), 101-123. https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.13110/merrpalmquar1982.61.1.0101

von Grundherr, M., Geisler, A., Stoiber, M., & Schäfer, M. (2017). School Bullying and Moral Reasoning Competence. *Social Development*, *26*(2), 278-294. https://doi.org/10.1111/sode.12199

Wang, X., Lei, L., Liu, D., & Hu, H. (2016). Moderating effects of moral reasoning and gender on the relation between moral disengagement and cyberbullying in adolescents. *Personality and individual differences*, *98*, 244-249. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0191886916303178