

Psychological Fragility And Its Relationship To The Family Upbringing Methods Among The Adolescent Student - A Field Study At Mohamed Boudiaf Secondary School In Aflou

Lakhdar Chellali*¹, Mohammed Safi², Cheikh Ammara¹

¹Laboratory of research and studies on human and community issues.
University Center Aflou.

²Laboratory of Psychological counseling and development of measurement tools in the school environment,
Amar Telidji University, Laghouat.

Corresponding author *: l.chellali@cu-aflou.edu.dz

Received: 12-01-2024 Accepted: 25-05-2024 Published: 07-07-2024

Abstract

The current study sought to reveal the level of psychological fragility and family upbringing methods, with their dimensions, among the adolescent student in the city of Aflou, and to identify the nature of the relationship between psychological fragility and family upbringing methods, with their dimensions, among the sample members, as well as to reveal the differences in the two variables according to gender. The study sample consisted of 103 male and female adolescents, using the Psychological Fragility Scale (prepared by Tawfik Nour Taleb, 2023), as well as the Family Upbringing Methods Scale (Alragab & Alzyood, 2008). The results of the study reached:

- 1- There is a statistically significant correlation between psychological fragility and family upbringing methods among adolescents studying in the city of Aflou.
- 2- The level of psychological fragility was high, while the family upbringing methods were low among the adolescent studying in the city of Aflou.
- 3- There are no statistically significant differences in psychological fragility in its dimensions according to gender, and the presence of differences between the sexes in the methods of family upbringing with their dimensions, among the sample members.

Keywords: psychological fragility, family upbringing methods, adolescent student.

Introduction

Study Problem:

The family represents the first nucleus of the individual's psychological and social life, as it is the pillar that builds the personality of children, develops it and works to raise them to carry the educational and social heritage of society and transmit it across generations. It is also a source of security and emotional warmth for every individual, and it seeks to provide the material and psychological needs of its members according to an interactive system, through which he learns the social system and human relations according to what is dictated by the rules and standards known and agreed upon

in every society, and through that he learns to exchange emotions, experiences, and concepts (love, hate, kindness,...) with his parents and siblings, to then develop it with members of the community surrounding him, including peers, teachers, and others...

Many psychologists emphasize the importance of the role of the family and its impact on the child's family upbringing, on the formation of his personality, and on his normal psychological and social development, especially in light of an integrated and stable family environment, in which love and good care for children are widespread, which increases his self-confidence and encourages him to assume his

responsibilities, develop his ambition and abilities to confront problems and solve them, explore and be free from restrictions, as well as expand the circle of his inclinations, interests, values and goals in life.

However, the presence of this adolescent in a turbulent family environment, dominated by deprivation, loss of support, affection and security, may contribute to the emergence of some negative psychological effects: (such as tensions, psychological conflicts, nervous emotions and anxiety, a feeling of loss of self-confidence, low self-esteem, aggressive behavior, depression, psychological fragility,...), and psychological fragility, as a new term in the arena of Arab scientific research, is a new psychological phenomenon that characterizes the personality of young people and adolescents in the current era.

Psychological fragility also represents the frequent complaint of young people in the prime of their lives, even at their young age, about suffering from feelings of exhaustion, helplessness, loss of energy, despair, and a feeling of loss and loss of value and purpose, as they begin to suffer and do not feel the joy of life, they give up easily, and they think that their simple and fleeting problems are difficult, and they describe the situations and events of their lives in exaggerated negative terms that do not match their true magnitude. (Suheir Kamel Tony Abd El-Al, 2023, p. 140)

It expresses the loss of the ability to self-actualize, the low level of endurance, the weak ability to face life's pressures and challenges, and the increasing trend towards emotional dependence, which we can attribute to negative family upbringing methods, as they were unable to acquire the skills to bear responsibility, their dependence on others to achieve their achievements and goals, and the reason may be due to the absence of moral support and family control, so we find these adolescents spoiled and defeated in the face of the simplest problems and obstacles they face.

Abeer Dunqul (2022) indicated that the fragile psychological structure of students who are fragile is characterized by cracks, defects, and disorder, including a negative self-image, low self-esteem and dissatisfaction, the emergence of a lack of satisfaction of basic emotional needs, suffering from conflicts, and a weak ego, and resorting to immature defensive mechanisms to try to adapt, and perceiving the environment as aggressive, frustrating, and unsympathetic, and the family system is characterized by tyranny, cruelty, violence, and frustration of satisfying basic needs of love, acceptance, and attention. (Abeer Ahmed Abu Al-Wafa Dunqul, 2022, p. 333)

The current generation of adolescents and young people has been called the snowflake generation, because it is a psychologically fragile generation that shatters with the first pressure it faces in life, and it also feels weak and is good at playing the victim, and a structure devoid of any solid structure that strengthens, supports, and helps them face the hardships of life. They have an overwhelming sense of uniqueness and always feel entitlement, and they also expect high-quality treatment, extra warmth toward their presence, and pure loyalty to their ideas, as if these matters belong to them alone and to the exclusion of others. (Ismail Arafa, 2020, p. 35)

Psychological fragility is also considered a relatively stable state or characteristic of an individual, which weakens his coping capabilities, reduces his resistance to risk factors, makes him more susceptible to psychological and behavioral disorders and problems, and is unable to adapt to the reality in which he lives. (Karima Ali Al-Jabjabi, 2023, p. 855)

In addition to the aforementioned study of Abeer Dunqul (2022), which concluded that there are high dimensions and personality traits for people with psychological fragility, many studies have shown the extent of psychological fragility that adolescents and young people suffer from, and the negative effects it has on their psychological, social, and academic lives,

such as a study of Aawad (2023), who concluded that there is a negative and significant correlation, which indicates that family relationships are considered one of the determinants of psychological fragility, as they are what establish the psychological structure of the individual in a good or bad way.

The study of Jamati (2021), which revealed that adolescents who do not excel academically are characterized by a level of psychological fragility, and there are differences between adolescents who excelled academically and those who did not excel academically in psychological fragility in favor of those who did not excel academically, as there is a positive correlation between the ambivalent attachment style and psychological fragility among maladjusted adolescents.

We also find a study by Maryam Charchari (2012), the results of which concluded that psychological fragility is linked to the child's weak coping capabilities in the face of risk factors or stressful events. The results showed that psychological fragility was linked to the availability of an adult around the child who compensates for the lack of parental function. In addition to the study of Abd El-Al, Suhair Kamel Tony (2023), which concluded in some of its results that the level of psychological fragility among female students of the College of Early Childhood Education increased by 71.51%, while among the results of the study by Karima Ali Al-Jababi (2023) was that there were no differences between the average grades of the sample members according to the gender variable.

Based on the above, researchers believe that the current generation of adolescents faces psychological and family problems resulting from the absence of family support and support, in facing their financial and psychological problems, in an era in which frustrations and pressures abound, which led us to crystallize the research problem on the relationship of

psychological fragility to the methods of family upbringing among adolescent students.

The main question of the study was determined as follows:

- Is there a statistically significant correlation between psychological fragility and family upbringing methods among adolescent students?

From which the following questions emerged:

- What is the level of psychological fragility of the adolescent student?
- What is the level of family upbringing methods of the adolescent student?
- Are there statistically significant differences in psychological fragility, depending on the gender variable among the sample members?
- Are there statistically significant differences in the methods of family upbringing, depending on the gender variable among the sample members?

Study hypotheses:

1. There is a statistically significant correlation between psychological fragility and family upbringing methods among adolescent students.
2. We expect a high level of psychological fragility and family upbringing methods with their dimensions among adolescent students in the city of Aflou.
3. There are statistically significant differences in both fragility and family upbringing methods, with their dimensions, among adolescent students in the city of Aflou, due to the gender variable.

Study objectives

- Identifying the relationship of psychological fragility and its relationship to the methods of family upbringing among the adolescent student.

- Identifying the level of psychological fragility among adolescent students.
- Identifying the level of family upbringing methods of the adolescent student.
- Detecting differences in psychological fragility according to the gender variable among sample members.
- Detecting differences in family upbringing methods according to the gender variable among the sample members.

Study Importance:

- This research belongs to several fields (positive psychology, family psychology, and mental health), which increases its importance.
- The importance of the age stage that the research addresses, which is adolescence, as it is a developmental stage that requires a lot of efforts to invest the energies and talents of children to the fullest extent, to achieve high psychological health and safety in them, which qualifies them to integrate easily into their society.
- Contributing to educating adolescents and their parents, consolidating positive values, reducing behavioral deviations that may stem from negative family upbringing, and clarifying psychological and social counseling tasks and services at this stage.
- It came at a time when many families are suffering from psychological problems for their children, and the inability of these families to find a way to help and guide their children and increase their ability to face the pressures and problems of life.
- Identifying adolescent students with psychological fragility and their personal characteristics helps those responsible for their affairs diagnose and understand their conditions, thus enabling them to obtain assistance before their conditions become severe, to ensure their safety and psychological and social health.

- The current research contributes to supporting the Arab Library with a theoretical heritage on the concept of psychological fragility and methods of family upbringing in the local and Arab society.

Terminology of study:

Psychological fragility:

Aawad Fatima Awwad Mohamed Assaid (2023) defines it as: “The inability to tolerate pressures and frustrations, and the feeling of losing control over the course of life in general, as a result of the lack of requirements necessary for internal self-management, which affects the psychological destiny of the individual”. (Aawad Fatima Awwad Mohamed Assaid, 2023, p. 166)

Talib Hanan (2014) defines psychological fragility as: “the lowest resistance to attacks and damage, and it changes between individuals, and means sensitivity and inability to resist environmental pressures”. (Talib Hanan, 2014, p. 81)

Family upbringing methods:

Hana Al-Felfili and Umma Al-Razzaq Al-Washli (2018) defined it as: “the process that takes place with the aim of adapting the child to his desired role in society, and through which the individual’s behavior, skills, motivations, and tendencies are shaped.” (Hanaa Al-Fifli and Ummah Al-Razzaq Al-Washli, 2018, p. 70)

Ihsan Muhammad Al-Hassan (2005) also defined family upbringing as: “a method of refining the experiences, skills and values of the individual by the family, in a field that enables him to achieve social and cultural adaptation to the environment in which he lives.” (Ihsan Mohamed Al-Hassan, 2005, p. 273)

Practical aspect:

First - Study Methodology:

In this study, we adopted the descriptive approach, through which we attempt to study the relationship between psychological fragility and family upbringing with their dimensions, because the descriptive approach depends on studying the phenomenon as it exists in reality, describing it accurately, and expressing it in quantitative and qualitative terms. The qualitative expression describes the phenomenon and explains its characteristics, while the quantitative expression gives us a numerical description and explains the amount, size, and degree of the phenomenon.

Second - Limitations of the study:

It included the following limits:

- 1- Spatial boundaries of the study:** The field study of the subject of the study was conducted at Mohamed Boudiaf Secondary School in the city of Aflou, Laghouat Province.
- 2- Time limits of the study:** The field part was carried out in January 2024.
- 3- Human limits of the study:** A basic sample of (103) students from Mohamed Boudiaf Secondary School of both genders was chosen, as they were selected randomly, and from them a exploratory sample of (30) students of both genders was selected.

Third - Study sample:

After zooming	1.2.3.4.5.6.7.8.9.10.11.12
After rumination	13.14.15.16.17.18.19.20.21.22.23.24
After disability	25.24.26.27.28.29.30.31.32.33.34.35.36

The validity and reliability of the scale in the current study were calculated within the following elements:

A - Validity: Validity was calculated in two ways:

- **Content validity:** The internal consistency validity of the

The study sample consisted of:

1 - Exploratory sample: The exploratory sample for the research consisted of (06) males (20.00%), and (24) females (80.00%), who were chosen in a simple random way, where the age range of the sample ranged between (14-18) years, with an average age of (15.97) years, and a standard deviation of (1.32) years.

2- The basic sample: The basic study sample consisted of (103) individuals, consisting of (23) males, representing (22.30)%, and (80) females, accounting for (77.70%). They were chosen randomly, and the age range of the sample ranged between (14-20) years, with an average age of (16.18) years, and a standard deviation of (01.24) years.

Fourth - Study tools:

I- The first study tool: psychological fragility:

The scale prepared by the researcher (Tawfiq, Nour Talib, 2023) was used, and it consists of (36) statements, and it was distributed into (3) areas, in a manner consistent with the nature of the sample adopted in the study, distributed by (12) statements, and the researcher identified alternatives answer as follows: Never, Rarely, Sometimes, Often, Always. The statements are composed as follows:

psychological fragility scale was calculated by calculating the correlation of the score of each item with the total score of the scale, the score of each item with the dimension to which it belongs, and the score of each dimension with the total score of the scale. Table No. (01) shows the results produced by the statistical treatment of content validity.

Table No. (01): shows the correlation coefficient of the score of each item with the total score of the psychological fragility scale with its dimensions.

Number	Correlation Coefficient	Significance Level	Number	Correlation Coefficient	Significance Level	Number	Correlation Coefficient	Significance Level
01	0,694**	0,000	13	0,697**	0,000	25	0,669**	0,000
02	0,607**	0,000	14	0,549**	0,002	26	0,614**	0,000
03	0,607**	0,000	15	0,661**	0,000	27	0,549**	0,002
04	0,428*	0,018	16	0,315	0,490	28	0,608**	0,000
05	0,557**	0,001	17	0,490**	0,006	29	0,658**	0,000
06	0,520**	0,003	18	0,423*	0,020	30	0,543**	0,000
07	0,524**	0,003	19	0,629*	0,000	31	0,520**	0,003
08	0,738**	0,000	20	0,536**	0,002	32	0,522**	0,003
09	0,617**	0,000	21	0,662*	0,000	33	0,637**	0,000
10	0,646**	0,000	22	0,433**	0,017	34	0,679**	0,000
11	0,521**	0,003	23	0,623**	0,001	35	0,609**	0,000
12	0,630**	0,000	24	0,623**	0,000	0,000	0,613**	36

**Statistically significant at 0.01 / *Statistically significant at 0.05

Table No. (02): shows the correlation coefficient of the score of each item with the total dimension score of the psychological fragility scale with its dimensions.

	After zooming				After rumination				After deficit		
	Nbr	Correl. Coeffici.	Signif. Level		Nbr	Correl. Coeffici.	Signif. Level		Nbr	Correl. Coeffici.	Signif. Level
	01	0,613**	0,000		13	0,687**	0,000		25	0,683**	0,000
	02	0,677**	0,000		14	0,546**	0,002		26	0,607**	0,000
	03	0,540**	0,002		15	0,669**	0,000		27	0,745**	0,000
	04	0,580**	0,001		16	0,489**	0,006		28	0,638**	0,000
	05	0,743**	0,000		17	0,575**	0,001		29	0,702**	0,000
	06	0,580**	0,001		18	0,386**	0,037		30	0,828**	0,000
	07	0,649**	0,000		19	0,626**	0,000		31	0,664**	0,000
	08	0,649**	0,000		20	0,556**	0,001		32	0,548**	0,002
	09	0,649**	0,000		21	0,703**	0,000		33	0,602**	0,000
	10	0,643**	0,000		22	0,489**	0,006		34	0,736**	0,000
	11	0,661**	0,000		23	0,551**	0,002		35	0,698**	0,000
	12	0,670**	0,000		24	0,692**	0,000		36	0,743**	0,000

**Statistically significant at 0.01 / *Statistically significant at 0.05

It is clear from Table No. (02) that all expressions are significant at the significance level (0.01) or (0.05), and their coefficients ranged between (0.54*-0.74**), (0.48** - 0.70**), (0.54**-. 0.74**) respectively for the

dimensions of the scale, and this gives an indication of the presence of internal consistency coefficients, and thus its items are considered valid for what they were formulated to measure.

Table No. (03): shows the correlation coefficient of the score of each item with the total score of the psychological fragility scale with its dimensions.

Dimension	Correlation coefficient	Significance level
Zoom dimension	0,913**	0,000
The rumination dimension	0,939**	0,000
The deficit dimension	0,914**	0,000

**Statistically significant at 0.01 / *Statistically significant at 0.05

It is clear from Table No. (03) that all dimensions are significant at the significance level (0.01) or (0.05), and their coefficients ranged between (0.91**-0.93**), which gives an indication of the presence of internal consistency coefficients, and therefore its items are considered valid.

▪ Terminal comparison validity (discriminant validity):

The differences between the averages of high scores and the averages of low scores were calculated using a t-test to indicate the differences between the averages. Table No. (04) shows the results resulting from the statistical treatment of the veracity of the terminal comparison.

Table No. (04): shows the differences between the average scores of high and low scores on the psychological fragility scale with its dimensions.

The Scale	Low Scores N15		High Scores N15		Degree Of Freedom	Value (V)	Significance Level
	Arithmetic Average	Stand. Deviat.	Arithmetic Average	Stand. Deviat.			
Psychological Fragility	69.46	13,74	106,80	24.85	28	5,090	0,000
Zoom Dimension	21.20	4,94	35.13	8.50	28	5,487	0.000
The Rumination Dimension	26.13	5.84	41,33	6.01	28	7,018	0.000
The Deficit Dimension	19.40	33,06	33.06	10.18	28	4,941	0.000

**Statistically significant at 0.01 / *Statistically significant at 0.05

It is clear from Table No. (04) that there are statistically significant differences at the significance level (0.01) between high and low scorers, on all dimensions of psychological fragility and its total score, as the t values reached (5.09**, 5.487**, 7.018**, 4.941. **), which means that the scale is valid and can therefore be adopted in the current study.

B - Reliability(stability): The reliability coefficient of the mental health scale was calculated using Cronbach's alpha and the Guttman equation, and the following table (05) shows the results that resulted from the statistical treatment of reliability.

Table No. (05): shows the calculation of the Cronbach's alpha coefficient and the length correction using the Gottman equation for the psychological fragility scale with its dimensions.

The Scale	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient	Guttman Coefficient	Number Of Items
-----------	------------------------------	---------------------	-----------------

Psychological Fragility	0,94	0,90	36
Zoom Dimension	0,86	0,86	12
The Rumination Dimension	0,82	0,83	12
The Deficit Dimension	0,88	0,84	12

**Statistically significant at 0.01 / *Statistically significant at 0.05

It is clear from Table No. (05) that the values of Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients for the dimensions of the psychological fragility scale ranged between (0.82-0.86), while the total score was (0.94), and after correcting for length with the Guttman equation, the values of the correlation coefficient for the dimensions ranged between (-0.83). 0.86), while the total score was (0.90), which are high values that indicate the reliability (stability) of the scale.

4-2 The second study tool: Family upbringing methods:

The researchers used the questionnaire prepared and designed by (Alragab & Alzyood, 2008) to measure family upbringing methods as a research tool. This questionnaire consisted of (41) items, divided between two main types, where the first type refers to positive family upbringing methods and consists of (21) Paragraph, includes areas (Dialogue (5) paragraphs, acceptance (6) paragraphs, assuming responsibility (5) paragraphs, and cooperation (5) paragraphs). While the second type refers to negative upbringing methods and

consists of (20) and also includes areas: (Negligence (5) paragraphs, excessive protection (5) paragraphs, discrimination (5) paragraphs, and oscillation (5) paragraphs). The answer was on a five-point verbal Likert scale (strongly agree, agree, moderately agree, disagree, strongly disagree), and the following scores were respectively given: 1-2-3-4-5 in the areas of positive styles, and the opposite in Areas of negative patterns. The validity and reliability of the scale was calculated in the current study within the following elements:

A - Validity: Validity was calculated in two ways:

- **Content validity:** The internal consistency validity of the family upbringing scale was calculated by calculating the correlation of the score of each item with the total score of the scale, the score of each item with the dimension to which it belongs, and the score of each dimension with the total score of the scale, and Table No. (06) shows the results it yielded. Statistical treatment of content validity.

Table No. (06): shows the correlation coefficient of the score of each item with the total score of the family upbringing methods scale with its dimensions.

Nbr	Signif. Level	Correlat . Coef	Nbr	Signif. Level	Correlat . Coef	Nbr	Signif. Level	Correlat . Coef
01	0,677**	0,000	15	0,195	0,301	29	0,034	0,144
02	0,579**	0,001	16	0,213	0,258	30	0,144	0,300
03	0,342	0,064	17	0,558**	0,031	31	0,308	0,098
04	0,512**	0,004	18	0,610**	0,000	32	0,380*	0,038
05	0,648**	0,000	19	0,568**	0,001	33	0,357	0,053
06	0,567**	0,000	20	**80,62	0,000	34	0,231	0,220
07	0,721**	0,000	21	0,548**	0,002	35	0,251	0,180
08	0,706**	0,000	22	0,082	0,668	36	0,122	0,520
09	0,645**	0,000	23	0,300	0,108	37	0,115	0,545
10	0,620**	0,000	24	0,659**	0,000	38	0,080	0,676

11	0,589**	0,001	25	**0.637	0,000	39	0,491**	0,006
12	0,835**	0,000	26	0.539**	0,000	40	0.012	0,951
13	0,400**	0,029	27	0.103	0,142	41	0,155	0,415
14	0,728**	0,000	28	0.142	0,034			

**Statistically significant at 0.01 / *Statistically significant at 0.05

It is clear from Table No. (06) that (19) are non-significant statements, and (24) are significant statements at the level of significance (0.01) or (0.05), and their coefficients ranged between (0.38*-0.83**), which gives an indication of the presence of Internal consistency coefficients, and therefore its items are considered valid for what they were designed to measure.

Table No. (07): shows the correlation coefficient of the score of each item with the total score of the dimension of the family upbringing methods scale with its dimensions.

Nbr	Correlatcoef	Signif Level	Nbr	Correlatcoef	Signif Level	Nbr	Correlatcoef	Signif Level	Nbr	Correlatcoef	Signif Level
01	0,653**	0,000	12	0,628**	0,000	22	0,520**	0,000	32	0,720**	0,000
02	0,649**	0,000	13	0,713**	0,000	23	0,332*	0,037	33	0,823**	0,000
03	0,522**	0,003	14	0,573**	0,000	24	0,862**	0,000	34	0,769**	0,000
04	0,744**	0,000	15	0,549**	0,001	25	0,790**	0,000	35	0,683**	0,000
05	0,770**	0,000	16	0,735**	0,000	26	0,661**	0,000	36	0,565**	0,001
06	0,680**	0,000	17	0,797**	0,000	27	0,280**	0,000	37	0,426**	0,019
07	0,685**	0,000	18	0,835**	0,000	28	0,579**	0,001	38	0,560**	0,001
08	0,810**	0,000	19	0,877**	0,000	29	0,757**	0,000	39	0,571**	0,001
09	0,793**	0,000	20	0,887**	0,000	30	0,734**	0,000	40	0,586**	0,001
10	0,807**	0,000	21	0,746**	0,000	31	0,525**	0,000	41	0,662**	0,000
11	0,729**	0,000									

**Statistically significant at 0.01 / *Statistically significant at 0.05

It is clear from Table No. (07) that all statements are significant at the significance level (0.01) or (0.05), and their coefficients ranged between (0.332*-0.80**), which gives an indication of

the presence of internal consistency coefficients, and therefore its items are considered valid.

Table No. (08): shows the correlation coefficient of the score of each field with the total score of the family upbringing methods scale with its dimensions.

Fields	Correlation coefficient	Significance level
Dialogue	0,816**	0,000
acceptance	0,823**	0,000
assuming responsibility	0,607**	0,000
cooperation	0,701**	0,000
Negligence	0,608**	0,000
excessive protection	0,081	0,670
discrimination	0,380*	0,039
oscillation	0,297	0,111

**Statistically significant at 0.01 / *Statistically significant at 0.05

It is clear from Table No. (08) that all dimensions are significant at the significance level (0.01) or (0.05), and their coefficients ranged between (0.91**-0.93**), which gives an indication of the presence of internal consistency coefficients, and therefore its items are considered valid.

- **Validity of the terminal comparison (discriminant validity):** The differences between the averages of the high scores and the averages of the low scores were calculated using the t-test to indicate the differences between the averages, and Table No. (09) shows the results produced by the statistical treatment of the veracity of the terminal comparison.

Table No. (09): shows the differences between the average scores of high and low scores for the family upbringing methods scale.

The Scale	Low Scores N15		High Scores N15		Degr Free dom	Value (V)	Signifi cance Level
	Arithma verage	Stand. Deviat	Arithmeta verage	Stand. Deviat.			
Familyupbringingmethods	143.20	14.48	173.60	8.01	28	7,11	0,000
Dialogue	16.26	3.41	22.60	1,76	28	6,38	0,000
Acceptance	20,93	5.58	29,13	0.83	28	5,62	0,000
Assuming Responsibility	14.39	2.78	22.13	2.28	28	7.59	0,000
Cooperation	18.60	4,80	24,26	0,96	28	4.47	0,000
Negligence	18,13	2,92	23,40	0,91	28	6.66	0,000
Excessive Protection	13,33	1,58	19,73	2,63	28	8.06	0,000
Discrimination	14.26	3.61	21.93	1,86	28	7.29	0,000
Oscillation	12,06	2.01	16,93	2,31	28	6.141	0.000

**Statistically significant at 0.01 / *Statistically significant at 0.05

It is clear from Table No. (09) that there are statistically significant differences at the significance level (0.01) between high and low scorers on all dimensions of family upbringing methods and the total score, where the t values reached (5.09**, 5.487**, 7.018**, 4.941 **), which means that the scale is valid and, therefore, can be adopted in the current study.

B- Reliability: The reliability coefficient of the family upbringing methods scale was calculated using Cronbach's alpha and the Gitman equation, and the following table (10) shows the results that resulted from the statistical treatment of reliability.

Table No. (10): shows the calculation of the Cronbach's alpha coefficient and the length correction using the Gottman equation for the family upbringing methods Scale with its dimensions.

The Scale	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient	Guttman Coefficient	Number Of Items
Familyupbringingmethods	0,84	0,009	41
Dialogue	0,69	0,69	5
Acceptance	0,85	0,65	6
Assuming Responsibility	0,70	0,61	5

Cooperation	0,88	0,82	5
Negligence	0,59	0,63	5
Excessive Protection	0,53	0,35	5
Discrimination	0,74	0,65	5
Oscillation	0,49	0,38	5

**Statistically significant at 0.01 / *Statistically significant at 0.05

It is clear from Table No. (10) that the values of Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients for the dimensions of the family upbringing methods scale ranged between (0.49-0.88), while the total score was (0.84), and after correcting for length with the Guttman equation, the values of the correlation coefficient for the dimensions ranged between (0.88- 0.49), while the total score was (0.009), which are high values that indicate the stability of the scale.

Fifth - Study procedures:

This study was conducted according to the following steps:

1- Shedding light on some theoretical frameworks and previous studies related to the variables of the study.

2- Choosing the appropriate measures to conduct this study, as both the psychological fragility scale (Tawfiq, 2023) and the family upbringing methods scale (Al-Shadida and Al-Majali, 2015) were chosen.

3- The exploratory study tools (the psychological fragility scale and the family upbringing methods scale) were applied to a survey sample of (30) male and female adolescent students studying in the city of Aflou, in order to ensure the validity and reliability of the two scales.

4- The basic study tools were applied to a basic sample of (103) adolescent students studying in the city of Aflou, Laghouat Province.

5- Correcting metrics and tables for data, and drawing, interpreting and discussing results.

Sixth: Statistical methods:

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, Version No. 22 (SPSS 22), was relied upon, and a number of statistical methods were relied upon, namely:

- 1- Pearson correlation coefficient.
- 2- T-test for the significance of the differences between the means (averages).
- 3- Cronbach's alpha coefficient to calculate reliability.
- 4- Gutmann's equation for semidivision.
- 5- Arithmetic and hypothetical mean, and standard deviation.

First: Presentation, discussion and interpretation of the results of the first hypothesis: This hypothesis states the following:

There is a statistically significant correlation between psychological fragility and family upbringing methods, with their dimensions, among the adolescent student in the city of Aflou.

To verify the validity of this hypothesis, the researchers calculated the Pearson correlation coefficient between the degrees of psychological fragility and the methods of family upbringing with their dimensions, and in Table No. (11) shows the results of the statistical treatment:

Table No. (11): shows the Pearson correlation coefficient between the degrees of psychological fragility and the methods of family upbringing with their dimensions.

Measured variable	Psychological fragility		
	Sample	Correlat.	Stat Signif

		Coef	
Measured variable	103	0.011	- 0.250*

*Statistically significant at 0.05

It is clear from Table No. (11) that there is a statistically significant correlation between psychological fragility and family upbringing methods with their dimensions, as the correlation coefficient reached (*-0.250) at a significance level of (0.05), and thus the hypothesis was valid.

The result can be attributed to the fact that the relationship between family upbringing and the psychological fragility of the adolescent student is a complex subject affected by multiple factors, because family upbringing is one of the main factors that affect the psychological and social development of the adolescent, and it includes the methods and behaviors that parents follow in raising their children.

Family upbringing methods include many elements such as emotional support, discipline, guidance, communication, and interaction with children, as providing a healthy and supportive family environment positively affects the psychological and mental health of children, and reduces the possibility of psychological fragility such as anxiety, depression, and behavior problems.

On the other hand, when educational methods are negative or ineffective, such as emotional separation, or physical or emotional violence, they may increase the risk of psychological

fragility in stressed people, because adolescents who are exposed to constant pressure or harmful behaviors within the family, may face psychological problems that affect their personal and social development.

Therefore, the research shows that there is a direct relationship between family upbringing methods and psychological fragility in adolescent students, as providing a supportive and loving environment in the family can reduce the possibility of psychological fragility appearing, and contribute to enhancing the psychological and emotional health of children.

Second - Presentation, discussion and interpretation of the results of the second hypothesis: This hypothesis states the following:

We expect a high level of psychological fragility and family upbringing methods with their dimensions among the teenage student in the city of Aflou.

To verify the validity of this hypothesis, the researchers calculated the hypothesized mean and the arithmetic mean of the adolescent students' scores in both psychological fragility and family upbringing methods with their dimensions, and Table No. (12) shows the results of the statistical treatment:

Table No. (12): shows the prevalence of both psychological fragility and family upbringing methods with their dimensions among the sample members.

Scales	Nbr Items	Default Average	Arithmetic Average	Standard Deviation	The Level
Psychological fragility	36	39	83.10	25.40	high
Family upbringing methods	41	123	150.50	20.58	low

It is clear from Table No. (12) that the level of prevalence of both psychological fragility and family upbringing methods with their dimensions among the sample members in the city of Aflou was high, and therefore this hypothesis was valid in the first part of psychological fragility, and it was not valid in the second part regarding family upbringing methods.

The researchers explain the result as follows:

If the level of prevalence of psychological fragility and family upbringing methods with their dimensions among the adolescent student is high, this indicates the presence of challenges in the environment surrounding him and in family interactions to which these factors are subject, which may greatly affect the adolescent's mental health and his relationship with the family.

High rates of psychological fragility may indicate the presence of psychological pressures on adolescents, such as anxiety, depression, eating disorders, and general psychological stress, as these pressures can arise from several factors such as school pressure, social relationship problems, and family challenges.

1. If family upbringing methods are ineffective or negative, such as excessive cruelty, emotional detachment, or isolation, they may

increase the possibility of psychological fragility problems appearing in adolescents, and for example, adolescents may be negatively affected if there is no emotional support or Guidance by parents.

If there is an increase in the level of psychological fragility and family upbringing methods with their dimensions, this may require intervention from the family and society to provide the necessary support and resources to affected adolescents, as by strengthening family communication and providing psychological and emotional assistance, levels of psychological fragility can be reduced and the quality of life of adolescents can be improved.

Third: Presentation, discussion and interpretation of the results of the third hypothesis:

This hypothesis states the following:

There are statistically significant differences in both fragility and family upbringing methods with their dimensions among adolescent students in the city of Aflou, attributed to the gender variable.

To verify the validity of this hypothesis, the researchers calculated the "T" test for the significance of the differences in degrees of psychological fragility and family upbringing methods with their dimensions, and Table No. (13) displays the results of the statistical treatment:

Table No. (13) shows the results of the T-test for the significance of differences between the sexes in the degrees of psychological fragility and family upbringing methods with their dimensions.

Gender Measured	Males n = 23		Females n=80		Degr freedom	value (v)	Significance level
	Arithma verage	Stand. deviat	Arithmeta verage	Stand. deviat.			
Psychological fragility	78.60	20.97	84.40	26.52	0.963	101	0.338
Methods of raising a family	142.43	20.76	152.82	20.05	2.172	101	0.032

**Statistically significant at 0.01 / *Statistically significant at 0.05

It is clear from Table No. (13) that there are no statistically significant differences between the genders in the degrees of psychological fragility in its dimensions, as the value of (t) reached

(0.338), and there are also statistically significant differences between the genders in the degrees of family upbringing methods, and the value of (t) was (0.032), at a significance

level of (0.05), and thus the hypothesis was partially valid.

The result may be explained by the fact that there may be no identifiable gender differences in rates of psychological fragility between males and females in adolescence.

However, some studies may show gender differences in some dimensions of psychological fragility, for example, some research may indicate that females display higher levels of depression, while males may display higher levels of suicidal or aggressive behaviors.

However, these differences may be statistically insignificant in some studies, or may change based on culture and social context.

It is also important to understand that psychological fragility is not just statistical estimates of symptoms, but rather an individual experience influenced by many personal, social and cultural factors. Therefore, each individual must be treated individually and their individual experiences and needs respected, regardless of their gender.

On the other hand, although there are gender differences in the methods of family upbringing among adolescents that may appear in some cases, these differences may be the result of cultural, social, and psychological factors, and may affect adolescents' experiences and personal development in different ways, for example, Family upbringing methods may differ between the genders, as parents may have different orientations towards sex education, as children may be treated in different ways based on gender, which affects their experiences and needs.

Social expectations related to gender can also affect family upbringing methods, for example, different expectations may be applied to children based on gender, leading to different parenting experiences. Culture and social values also play a major role in determining upbringing methods, as social values and orientations may differ between the genders in some cultures,

which is reflected in family upbringing methods. So, gender differences can appear in adolescents' family upbringing methods, and these differences can affect their experiences and personal development directly or indirectly.

Sixth- General conclusion:

The current study aimed to reveal the level of psychological fragility and family upbringing methods with their dimensions among the adolescent teenage student in the city of Aflou, and to know the nature of the relationship between psychological fragility and family upbringing methods with their dimensions among the sample members. After analyzing, interpreting and discussing the results of the hypotheses, the following results were reached:

- 1- There is a statistically significant correlation between psychological fragility and family upbringing methods among the adolescent student in the city of Aflou.

- 2- The level of psychological fragility was high, while the methods of family upbringing were low among the adolescent student in the city of Aflou.

- 3- There are no statistically significant differences in psychological fragility with its dimensions according to gender, and the presence of differences between the sexes in the methods of family upbringing with their dimensions among the sample members.

Conclusion:

The topic of the relationship between psychological fragility and the methods of family upbringing of the adolescent student is an important topic that deserves attention and study, as these elements interact in a complex manner and affect the adolescent's experience and his personal and psychological development. There are some elements that can help in understanding this relationship, and family upbringing and upbringing methods can affect the mental health of adolescents, such as emotional support and positive guidance from parents, which may reduce levels of depression

and anxiety in adolescents, while psychological pressure or emotional separation increases the possibility of psychological fragility problems. On the other hand, family trends and values play an important role in shaping the methods of family upbringing and upbringing, as cultural and social values may affect how parents deal with the psychological difficulties faced by adolescents, and how they direct them to deal with them, while the quality of communication in the family can be an important factor in determining levels of psychological fragility in adolescents, and if there is effective communication and open dialogue between parents and children, adolescents may feel supported and assisted, which reduces the possibility of the emergence of problems of psychological fragility. Family upbringing methods and the level of psychological fragility of the adolescent may also be affected by social and family challenges such as family separation, financial pressures, and environmental changes. Therefore, understanding this relationship can help parents and educators provide a supportive and healthy environment for adolescents, and promote healthy psychological development.

List of references:

- 1 Ihsan Mohamed Al-Hassan (2005). Family Sociology, Amman: Wael house for Publishing and Distribution.
- 2- Ismail Arafa (2020). Psychological Fragility, 2nd edition, Riyadh: Dalail Endowment Publishing House, Riyadh.
- 3- Suhair Kamel Tony Abd Al-Al (2023). Nomophobia and its relationship to psychological fragility among female students of the College of Early Childhood Education, Journal of Childhood Research and Studies, Beni Suef University, Volume 5, Number 10, Part 1, pp. 134-226.
- 4-Abeer Ahmed Abu Alwafa Denqul (2022). Psychological fragility among a sample of university students: a clinical study, Journal of Educational Sciences, South El Oued University, No. 53, pp. 333-402.
- 5-Aawad Fatima Aawad Mohamed Assaid (2023). Parental competence and its relationship to the psychological fragility of female students at Ain Shams University, Journal of Education Research and Innovation, Ain Shams University, Issue 8, Part 8, pp. 161-191.
- 6-Karima Ali Al-Jabjabi (2023). Psychological fragility and its relationship to creative thinking among students of the Faculty of Dentistry, Dhamar University, Al Bayda University Journal, Volume 5, Number 4, pp. 854-870.
- 7-Maryam Charchari (2012). Skin in a child with a mentally ill father, unpublished master's thesis, Mentouri University, Constantine, Algeria.
- 8- Nabiha Djamati (2021). Attachment patterns and psychological fragility among adolescents who are not academically successful and their relationship to their counseling needs, unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Batna, Algeria.
- 9- Hanaa Al-Felfili and the Ummah Al-Razzak Alwachli (2018). Introduction to Child Raising, Amman: Amjad Publishing and Printing House.