



Assessment of School Bullying and Contributing Factors A Case of Punjab (Pakistan)

Dr. Nargis Abbas¹, Ms. Uzma Ashiq², Ms. Farhat Abbas³

^{1,2}University of Sargodha

³Lahore College for Women University

Received: September 1, 2014

Accepted: November 13, 2014

ABSTRACT

School Bullying combined with social withdrawals and passivity has negative long-term effects on depressive tendencies and self-esteem of students that directly affect their attitude towards school and education. Teacher through school system and parents at home are the active agent in this phenomenon. A neglected behavior of teacher and inter-parental relationship can result in relational aggression in the child. To explore this phenomenon, this study is focused on assessing the school bullying and its contributing factors in the province Punjab. A quantitative survey was conducted on a sample of 300 10th grade students from 12 public and private schools of two cities of the Punjab (Lahore & Sargodha). Results showed significant association between gender and school bullying. More boys than girls were found significantly involve in school bullying (Bullied: $t=-4.064^{***}$ & Bully: $t=-4.129^{***}$). ANOVA results demonstrated mother's education as the significant factor for school bullying{bullied: $F(5, 262)=2.9^*$ & bully : $F(5, 249)=2.9^*$ respectively}. Regression analysis demonstrated father's discipline and inter-parental relation as the significant predictors of being bullied. While for bully, an additional contributing factor of mother's upbringing styles was found significant. Evolutionary perspective can be applied to reduce the incidence of bullying after exploring the facts.

KEYWORDS: School bullying, parent's education, Inter-parental relation, teacher's support

1 INTRODUCTION

School Bullying and rejection in the form of victimization in schools combined with social withdrawals and passivity is a serious problem that affects students' personality and their educational performance. Olweus (1994) defined school bullying as a repetitive aggression carried out by one person or group of persons to give harm to another person verbally, physically or psychologically. It doesn't include playful fighting, good-natured teasing between friends, joking or one time attack. Peers in school, most of the time due to imbalance of power (physically or socially), cause harassment, violence and teasing for other children in the school directly or indirectly. Such constant teasing and threats for violence for students in schools which is recognized in literature as bullying, may leads to social segregation, depressive tendencies and low self esteem that directly affect their attitude towards school and education (Elwan & Alwan, 2013; Rosen et al., 2013; Salmivalli, 2000).

For the past two decades, a number of studies (Boulton & Underwood, 1992; Hawker & Boulton, 2000; Stassen Berger, 2007; Rivers et al. 2009) done on school bullying revealed that such victimization leads to depression, isolation, social anxiety, social self-worth and sometime results in suicides. It has elongated negative effects on the children individually and produces destructive effects on school environment. Stassen Berger (2007) in a meta-analysis, conducted on the publications of last 20 years on school bullying, identified the number of variation factors (gender, age, ethnicity, culture, appearance and place) for bullying and its consequences on victims, bullies and peer group. In another meta-analysis conducted by Holt et al. (2007) indicated certain issues linked to internal and external problems due to victimization that results in school evading, squat academic achievements and lack of school amusements.

Giovazolias, (2008) reported that at International level more or less 3 children in every 10 children found to be indulged in school bullying. A scholarship of literature tried to investigate the reasons and causes for this issue, which varies from socio-economic and demographic variables to home (including parents behavior, inter-parental relationship, siblings bullying) and school factors (including teacher's behavior, peer relation and environment) (Stassen Berger, 2007; Holt, 2007; Hawker & Boulton 2009; Monks, 2009; Cécile & Daniel, 2011).

* Corresponding Author: Dr. Nargis Abbas, University of Sargodha, nargisabbas@uos.edu.pk

1.1 Gender differences

Gender differences in bullying and its various types have been reported in research. Evidence suggests that, on the one hand, usually boys engage more in violence and aggression activities than girls (Holt *et al.*, 2007; Stassen-Berger, 2007; Hong & Espelage, 2012; Strøm *et al.*, 2013). On the other hand, studies identified that boys involve significantly more in physical bullying, whereas girls experience more indirect, verbal and relational bullying (Card *et al.* 2008; Monks *et al.* 2009; Nocentini *et al.* 2013; Rueger & Jankins, 2013). While explaining the reason of such situation Gini (2006) remarked that it could be due to fact that physical bullying is more societal and acceptable to gain the social status. Such social status or social dominance is centered in the social competition of being superior (Pellegrini & Bartini, 2000). In elucidating being superior, an interpretation especially for boys (thus for men later) is being strong, powerful and able to control others (Gini, 2008). Therefore, an acceptable agonistic strategy for solving conflicts and having control is use of physical power, aggression and violence (Shetgiri *et al.*, 2012). Pinheiro (2006) stated school bullying as a relational factor of prevailing situation & culture of society depicting the rule of might is right, e.g., men controls women or powerful rules over powerless. Being the eyewitness of such power-based dominance in homes and society, child behaves accordingly.

1.2 Peer and teacher role

Bullying is a well-known incidence; it is assumed that it is always linked with internal and external school environment. Major part of research focused on the issue of bullying in schools too particularly bullying between the peers. Along with the psychological issues, association between bullying, peer relation, teacher support and academic achievement are the main areas of concern (Naz *et al.*, 2014; Strøm *et al.*, 2013). Regardless of categories of bullying, research indicated teacher support as a significant element in reducing the intensity as well as episodes of school bullying. Specially, teachers' attitude in bullying situations and their degree of supervision of classroom activities happened to be most notable (Monks *et al.* 2009; Hong & Espelage, 2012). Strøm *et al.*, (2013) conducted a cross-sectional study on the sample of 7343 of 15-16 years old students from 56 schools in Oslo. They reported positive impact of teachers' support resulted in better grades thus reduced level of bullying. A significant negative interaction between violence and teacher was found; students having perception of positive teacher's experience usually develop positive and constructive sense of responsibility and thus have fewer behavioral problems. Whereas, regarding the target places for bullying, Monks *et al.* (2009) indicated places; corridors, playgrounds and sometimes classrooms. Concerning gender, boys were found more numerous in physical bullying and girls in indirect and relational bullying.

1.3 Home and bullying

Home or family related factors affect child's personality and behavior, his standard of judgment, reaction behavior to incidence and thus risk for bullying. Hong & Espelage (2012) considered Bullying as a process that has emergence roots in the complicated structure of the relationships of family and peers and society. Stevens *et al.* (2002) remarked that family structures and aggressive behaviors have significant relationships. A number of factors have been identified under this category of relation factor, e.g., parents-youth relationship, parenting style, home environment, socio-economic status, inter-parental relationship, relationship with siblings, etc. Children of strict, authoritative, neglecting, non-cooperative and less warm parents are mostly likely to demonstrate anger, aggression and violence in their daily dealings especially to youngers and weak ones. Sometimes, such children lack in their self-confidence and self-esteem and thus become victims of various types of bullying (Vessey *et al.* 2013; Basile *et al.* 2009; Corvo, 2010; Jolliffe, 2011). In a study, Corvo (2010) investigated the connection between violence in family and aggression and victimization in child and concluded that child's exposure to family violence in the form of child maltreatment, power-assertion (physical punishment & violent emotional outburst) is a *risk factor for internalizing and externalizing sequelae* (p.182). On contrary, parents' supervision and parental warmth, parents' social support are factors determined by research as the significantly reducing agents of bullying behavior in children (Demaray & Malechi, 2003; Jolliffe, 2011; Hong & Espelage, 2012).

In addition, research documented a significant relationship between socio-economic status of the family and bullying behavior in child (Nansel *et al.* 2001; Maliki, 2009). Usually, socio economic status is an active agent of defining attitude, behavior, life style, and social recognition etc. Therefore, children belong to low socio-economic status become isolated and less wanted socially. Research indicates that children from low economic class families more likely to confront victimization as compare to the children from high economic class families (Baldry, 2004; Bauer *et al.*, 2006).

Moreover, few research studies examined inter-parental relation as the most significant factor of home environment (Matsunaga, 2009; Laeheem, 2013; Ledwell & King, 2013). Children, witnessing the inter-parental conflicts, violence (quarrelling, beating or cheating) have worse effects on their lives such as, low self-concept, psychological problems, negative behavioral issues etc., and hence more chances to be victim or demonstration of violent behavior and aggression. Bauer et al (2006) reported that the children are at high risk of bullying or victimization of bullying who brought up with inter-parental violence environment.

In addition, research also indicates homes as the bullying place where children targeted by other elders or siblings. Monks et al. (2009) used term “siblings bullying” while explaining the home as bullying place. They explained two reasons for such kind of bullying. First, differences of age, size, physical & psychological strengths, and second, the amount of time siblings spend together which provide the chance of bullying among them in the absence of an adult at home.

Thus summarizing the facts based on literature, school bullying and rejection in the form of victimization in schools, which results in negative experiences of victimization of intentional aggressive behavior at early ages may happen in the relational aggression in children later, reflections of which can be seen on the society as a whole. Keeping in view the dearth of research, particularly in Pakistan, where cultural values, societal norms, home and school environment are quite different from other parts of the world along with high socio-economic inequalities, much work is required to be done, the current study was conducted focusing on the assessment of school bullying and exploring its contributing factors specifically in the province Punjab.

2 Present study

Present study was aimed at measuring the bullying behavior, and investigated the predictors such as: parents’ upbringing style and discipline and their interrelation at home and teacher’s support in schools, of the school bullying. Therefore, the first research objective was to assess the school bullying both for bullied and bully. Second objective was to determine the significant predictors that result in bullying behavior. Lastly, it was aimed at exploring the group differences based on gender, parents’ education and perceived financial situation.

3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A quantitative survey research method was used to collect the data about the students’ experiences of school bullying and their perception of parental and school variables in relation with their bullying behavior through close-end questions and scales based questionnaire.

4 Sample

Target population of the study was the students of grade 10 belong to government and private sector schools selected from the two cities of Punjab; Lahore & Sargodha. A Sample of 300 students (213 girls and 87 boys) from 10th grade was selected through convenient sampling from 12 schools (5 public and 7 private). Average age of students was found 14.78 years. These schools were selected through convenient sampling; all were agreed upon the participating in this study. Only constraint in selecting these schools was that the students belong to working and low or middle class families study in these schools.

5 Research instrument

A questionnaire was constructed to collect the data for testing our hypotheses. There were two major parts of the questionnaire; Part A was based on the personal and demographic information (gender, age, number of sisters and brothers, family structure, perceived financial situation, parents’ education, their occupation). *Family structure*, by inquiring “living with whom”, was measured in five options (with mother & father, mother only, father only, foster parents and others). *Mother and father’s education* was measured in 6 levels and *perceived financial situation* was measured in 3 levels (1=“poor” to 3=“Good”).

In this part along with these questions, two prominent questions; *number of good friends* and *liking of school* measured with 5-points likert scale (1=“none” to 5=“more than 6 friends” and 1=“dislike a lot” to 5=“like a lot” respectively) and “to whom you speak to when you are upset or having hard time” measured with the checklist of nine entities, were also included in this section.

The part B of the questionnaire, consisted of 61 items, was based on the eight scales. These scales were measuring the student’s experiences of *being bullied*, *student being bully*, student’s perception of *Mother and Father’s style of upbringing child (M-UpB& F-UpB)* and *discipline (M-Discp& F-Discp)*, and *teacher’s support (T-Supp)*. Bullying scales: “bullied by other students” and “bullying other students” based on 10, 10 items were adopted from Revised Olweus Bully questionnaire (1996). A 13-items based scale to measure the parents’ upbringing style (8 items) and Discipline (5 items) developed by WHO for the

program HBSC¹ (cited in Papanikolaou *et al.* 2011) was adopted to measure the child's perception for both mother and father's behavior and discipline. Another 3-items scale was developed to measure the student's perception of *Inter-parental relation (P-Rel)*. Lastly, for measuring the perception of "*teacher's support and handling bullying*", 12 items based scale was devised. The theme of these items was taken from "Handling Bullying Questionnaire" devised by Bauman & Rigby (2006). This scale was initially developed for teachers but for this study, it was modified from the student's point of view. New modified version of this scale was measuring students' perception of their teacher's support. A 5-points Likert scale was used to measure the outcome and predictor variables of the study. For Bullying scale, a scale varies from "1=Not happened in past months" to "5=several times in a week" was adopted while for the rest, a 5-point Likert scale ranges from 1="never happened" to 5="Almost always happened" was chosen. In the last, a question about the "place of bullying" was asked based on checklist of nine options to indicate the places where the respondent was bullied.

6 Statistical Procedure

As the scales were borrowed for Pakistan's culture therefore, reliability for internal consistency was required. Since the questionnaire of this study was consisted of eight scales; therefore, Cronbach Alpha was computed for each scale initially on the sample of 40 students during the phase of pretesting of the research instrument by using SPSS v.20. Those items were deleted due to which alpha value was decreasing from the standardized alpha value of the scale. The Alpha values for all scales were found within acceptable limits shown in following table.

Table 1. Internal Consistency (Cronbach Alpha) measures of Scales

Scale	Bullied	Bully	M-UpB	F-UpB	M-Discp	F-Discp	P-Rel	T-Supp
Alpha (α)	0.878	0.899	0.721	0.794	0.653	0.665	0.701	0.733

Though the alpha value for Mother's discipline (M-Discp) and Father's discipline (F-Discp) is less than 0.7 but it doesn't mean that it should be rejected (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007; Field, 2009). However, for the sake of clarity, factor analysis using Varimax rotation (Factor loading greater than 0.4 was selected) was also done on these scales. Two components were found in both scales, positive items loaded on one component while the negative items (which were recoded) loaded on second component. However, both components explained 65% of the variance (in Mother's discipline scale, it was 67%). This might be the reason for small values of alpha for these scales, therefore alpha can be computed for separately for the subscales but this procedure is beyond the scope of this study.

7 Data Analysis

Since the current study was primarily aimed at assessing the school bullying and the predicting variables for it, therefore, outcome variable (bully and bullied) and independent variables (parents' upbringing style, parents' discipline, inter-parental relation and teacher's support) were computed through their respective scales. A regression analysis was done for both "bully" and "bullied" outcome variables. In addition, the secondary aim was to investigate the group differences based on the independent variables (gender, perceived financial situation, living situation and parents' education). For this purpose, analysis of variances and t-test were conducted on the data. Lastly, the aim was to investigate the association between the categorical variables presented in demographic information. Therefore, Pearson's Chi-square test was used to test such associations.

8 RESULTS

Out of the sample of 300 respondents, 71% were the girls and 29% were the boys. Most of the students mentioned their financial situation as *Good* (78%) while 29% of them mentioned *Somewhat good*. It was already mentioned as the constraint of the study that study was conducted on the students belong to

¹ World Health Organization launched a survey in European countries to study the students' health and behavior under the program "Health Behavior in School Children (2005/2006)".

low and middle class families, therefore, majority of the students mentioned their fathers job as private business (40%) and middle level² jobs (30%).

Table 2.Summary of demographic variables and continuous variables

Demographic Variables	Values	
Average Age	14.78 years	
Gender		
• Female	213 (71%)	
• Male	87 (29%)	
Perceived financial situation		
• Somewhat Good	59 (20%)	
• Good	233 (78%)	
Parents' Level of Education		
Mother – Father		
• No Formal Education	14 (5%) – 6 (2%)	
• Till middle school	44 (15%) – 35 (12%)	
• Till Higher secondary school	75 (25%) – 83 (28%)	
• Till under graduate	104 (35%) – 74 (25%)	
• Masters	49 (16%) – 78 (26%)	
• MPhil or above	7 (2%) – 18 (6%)	
How many good friends do you have?		
• None	13 (4%)	
• 1 good friend	56 (19%)	
• 2 to 3 good friends	68 (23%)	M=3.56
• 4 to 5 good friends	73 (24%)	(SD=1.216)
• More than 6 good friends	88 (29%)	
How much do you like your school?		
• Dislike a lot	17 (6%)	
• Dislike	6 (3%)	
• Neither like nor dislike	23 (8%)	M= 4.23
• Like	89 (30%)	(SD=1.095)
• Like a lot	161 (54%)	
Have you been bullied through social media?		
• Yes		
• No	111 (37%)	
	170 (57%)	
Bullied at school in the past couple of months?		
• Not happened in past couple of months		
• Once or twice a month	192 (64%)	
• 2 to 3 times in a month	44 (15%)	M=1.75
• Once a week	32 (11%)	(SD=1.203)
• Several times a week	12 (4%)	
	20 (7%)	
Gender * Bullied at school	$\chi^2_{(4)} = 21.12^{***}$	p<.001
Bullying another student at school?		
• Not happened in past couple of months	193 (64%)	
• Once or twice a month	64 (21%)	
• 2 to 3 times in a month	17 (6%)	M=1.61
• Once a week	11 (4%)	(SD=1.049)
• Several times a week	13 (3%)	
Gender * Bully another student	$\chi^2_{(4)} = 14.02^{**}$	p<.01

A substantial portion of the sample didn't report bullying when asked single question about school bullying. Out of total, 64% of the students mentioned they were neither the victims of school bullying nor they bullied someone in the past couple of months. Remaining 36% of the students were the victim of school bullying for once in a month to several times in a week. On contrary, 21% of the students mentioned that they did bully someone once or twice in a month. Above table 2 presented the categorical variables with the frequencies and percentages while means and standard deviation for continuous variables are given along with.

²Though socio-economic status was not measured directly in this study, however, coding was decided regarding the level of income from a job. Therefore, middle level job mean slow-middle class earning.

When studied further regarding gender, similar percentage (64%) of both boys and girls reported “were not bullied” but for other options of bullied they differed in their opinions. To test whether gender is associated with the being bullied, chi-square was computed. A Significant chi-square ($\chi^2_{(4)} = 21.12^{***}$) proved that victimization of bullying is associated with gender. Further, it was found that 49% of the boys participated in bullying activities as compare to 28% of the girls in past couple of months. A significant gender association ($\chi^2_{(4)} = 14.02^{**}$) was found with school bullying. More boys than girls reported to participate in school bullying. Whereas, perceived financial situation, father’s education and mother’s education were not found significantly associated with school bullying.

Factors were computed by adding the scores of items of respective eight scales (bullied, bully, parents’ behavior, parents’ discipline, inter-parental relation and teacher’s support). T-test was computed to explore the gender differences in these factors. A significant gender difference was found in being bullied factor ($t = -4.064$, $p < .001$). More boys ($M = 17.25$, $SD = 8.14$) than girls ($M = 13.16$, $SD = 5.98$) were found the victims of school bullying. Similarly, boys and girls were found significantly different in bullying other students ($t = -4.129$, $p < .001$). Boys ($M = 16.49$, $SD = 7.78$) significantly reported as more bully than their counterpart girls ($M = 12.44$, $SD = 6.12$). However, no significant gender difference was found in any other variable of the study.

ANOVA was computed to investigate the group differences, no significant difference was found between the Father’s level of education { $F(5, 263) = 2.2$, $p = .055$ } and the students being bullied. However, students being bullied were found significantly different when analyzed for mother’s education level { $F(5, 262) = 2.9^*$, $p < .05$ }. Boneferoni test was conducted in order to locate the groups that were significantly different. It was found that students whose mothers were having education till middle school ($M = 16.23$, $SD = 7.8$) reported significantly more victims of bullying than those whose mothers were having Masters degrees ($M = 11.81$, $SD = 4.8$).

Similarly, for the variable *bully*, students were not found significantly different regarding father’s education { $F(5, 249) = 1.21$, $p = .31$ }. On contrary, students with respect to mother’s education level were found significantly different in the ratio of bullying other students { $F(5, 249) = 2.9^*$, $p < .05$ }. Students whose mothers were having Masters degrees ($M = 10.64$, $SD = 1.7$) were significantly less involved in bullying activities than the students belong to mother having no formal education ($M = 19.86$, $SD = 2.1$) and till middle school ($M = 16.96$, $SD = 1.7$).

Moreover, percentage of Bullied scale indicated that around 75 percent of the students were not bullied of any physical, verbal or social type however, 22% of the students also mentioned that they would keep to themselves and won’t talk to anyone during Hard time. These results indicated that students preferred to remain silent or hesitant to speak up even if he or she is bullied (verbally, physically, or socially) in the classroom.

Table 3. Place where bullying happened and sharing with person of choice.

Place of bullying * talk with someone	Frequencies (percentage)
Place where you have been bullied	
• In Playgrounds or in Sports field	• 77(26 %)
• In Classroom	• 123(41%)
• In Lunch or eating areas or Cafeteria	• 26(9%)
• In Hallways or stairs	• 19(6%)
• In Bathrooms	• 14(5%)
• In the way to or from School	• 35(12%)
• In School bus	• 11(4%)
• In public bus	• 13(4%)
• Somewhere else	• 31(10%)
To whom you talk	
• Friends	100 (33%)
• Adult at home	60 (20%)
• Teacher at school	11 (4%)
• Another family member like a brother, sister, cousin.	60 (20%)
• Keep it to themselves and don’t talk to anyone	52 (17%)
• Principal or Vice Principal	2 (less than 1%)
• Another adult at school	10 (3%)
• Counselor or any other authority at school	2 (less than 1%)
• Someone else	9 (3%)

In the above-mentioned places in table 3, “classroom” is most prominent place where bullying was happened with them. While, only 3.7% of students mentioned “teacher” to whom they use to talk in the

situation when they are upset or having “hard time”, whereas, this percentage reduces to 0.7% for the category “Principal”. These findings provide the evidence of either passive role of school personals or students’ perception of their teachers or school’s ineffective role in dealing with, or preventing the school bullying episodes. In addition, investigating gender association with this situation, results showed that this was same for both boys and girls ($\chi^2_{(1)} = 1.1.43$, $p = .285$). Further, in the category “somewhere else” out of 10% (total 31 students), 54% (17 students) mentioned home and road while rest of the students either didn’t mention the specific place or mentioned internet and recreational events etc.

9 Regression Analysis

In order to determine the contributing factors for the school bullying, regression analysis was done for both outcome variables of the study. By keeping socio-demographic variables as constant, Model 1 & 2 was computed with *Bullied* and *Bully* as outcome variable respectively, and six independent variables (mother & father’s upbringing style, mother & father’s discipline, inter-parental relation and teacher’s support).

Durbin-Watson statistics checks whether the assumption of independent error is satisfied. A value closer to 2 indicates that the assumption is met. Here for both regression models, D-W statistic was found closer to 2, hence satisfying the assumption of independent errors. Moreover, the VIF < 10 (for Model 1 is 1.4 & Model 2 is 1.39) and Tolerance > .2 were found for both models.

In table 4 for Model 1, F-value indicated that independent variables significantly predicted the outcome variable Bullied {F (6, 205)=11.98, $p<.001$ }. Among all variables, students’ perception of father’s discipline and perception of inter-parental relation developed significantly negative effect on the student being bullied in school. Negative values depicted that perception of father’s discipline (reduced bullied by .35 units) as cooperative & understanding, and positive inter-parental relation (reduced bullied by .9 units) reduce the chance for the student to be bullied in school. On the other hand, when regression model 2 was run for the outcome variable *Bully*, regression coefficients of perception of mother’s upbringing style along with the father’s discipline and inter-parental relation were found negative and significant {F (6, 214)=14.86, $p<.001$ }.

Table 4. Regression analysis for “Bullied” and “Bully” by parents and teacher’s factors.

Variable	Model 1 of Predictors of being Bullied		Model 2 of Predictors of Bully	
	Regression coefficients (b)	95% CI	Regression coefficients (b)	95% CI
Constant	39.88***	31.9 to 47.86	42.674***	35.2 to 50.15
Mother’s upbringing style	-0.192	-0.43 to 0.05	-0.242**	-0.46 to -.002
Father’s upbringing style	0.126	-0.13 to 0.38	0.037	-0.2 to 0.27
Mother’s discipline	-0.082	-0.40 to 0.24	-0.211	-0.52 to 0.1
Father’s discipline	-0.352*	-0.68 to -0.03	-0.355*	-0.66 to -0.05
Inter-parental relation	-0.902***	-1.29 to -0.52	-0.746***	-1.11 to -0.38
Teacher’s support	-0.102	-0.23 to 0.03	-0.082	-0.20 to 0.04
R ²	0.29		0.26	
F	11.98***		14.85***	
ΔR^2	0.29***		0.26***	

Note. * $p<.05$; ** $p<.01$ & *** $p<.001$

These results indicated that these independent variables are significant predictors for the situation of a student to become a bully in school. Significant negative regression values for perception of mother’s upbringing style ($b=-0.242^{**}$), father’s discipline ($b=-0.355^{*}$) and inter-parental relation ($b=-0.746^{***}$) were found in this model. These negative signs indicated a negative relative between mother’s warm upbringing style and father’s cooperative discipline with bullying behavior in child. One unit increase in positive perception of mother’s upbringing style reduced being bully by .24 units. Similarly, increase in one unit of positive perception of father’s discipline reduced being bully by .36 units and inter-parental relation reduced being bully by .75 units. As far as concern the effect of teacher’s support, it was found non-significant in both models.

Finally, we wished to investigate whether these models alter if an independent variable *gender* introduced. For this, we rerun the regression models with gender as an independent variable in it keeping same set of predictors. After introducing gender as an independent variable, regression analysis results showed that both models 1 & 2 satisfied the assumption of independent error and Tolerance found greater than .2 (VIF<10).

For females, Model 1 depicted *inter-parental relationship* ($B = -0.76^{***}$) as a significant predictor, significant F-value further support the model 1 { $F(6, 152) = 7.11, p < .001; R^2 = 0.219$ }. Similarly, model 2 also demonstrated *inter-parental relationship* ($b = -0.807^{***}$) as a significant predictor { $F(6, 142) = 5.28, p < .001; R^2 = 0.18$ }.

Further, for males, significant F-values also supported the fact that predictors were significantly predicting the outcome variables {M1: $F(6, 56) = 7.05, p < .001; R^2 = 0.43$ & M2: $F(6, 55) = 11.77, p < .001; R^2 = 0.56$ }. On contrary, for males, both model 1 & 2 showed *teacher's support* as a significant factor for being *Bullied* ($b = -0.32^*$) and being *Bully* ($b = -0.29^*$).

10 DISCUSSION

Current study addressed the assessment of victimization experience in terms of bullied of the students and bullying behavior among the students in schools. Second aim of the research was to analyse the variation of bullying and being bullied under the various conditions of gender, parents' education level, and perceived financial situation along with the indication of places where bullying episodes usually happen. Lastly, the third aim was to investigate the significant predictors among the children's perception of parental and school factors on the outcome variable of bullying and victimization.

Concerning the first aim of our research, we found the results of bullying behavior in Pakistani students consistent with the international literature (Holt *et al.* 2007; Card *et al.* 2008; Monks *et al.* 2009; Strom *et al.* 2013). More boys than girls were found the victims as well as involved in bullying practices. The gender difference found in this study reflect the fact that males have more exposure to the aggression and exertion of power due to their perceived symbolic manhood as being powerful and able to control others (Gini, 2006; Gini, 2008).

In addition, through ANOVA results of bullying regarding the parents' education level we found that mother's education level significantly alter the bullying behavior in children. As the level of mother's education increased, the tendency of being bully decreased, that is, children of highly educated mothers and supportive fathers tend to show relatively low level of bullying behavior than those of less educated mother and strict fathers. These results indicate a positive impact of mother's education and supportive discipline of father on personality building of children. The findings of our research are coherent with other studies (Basile *et al.* 2009; Corvo, 2010; Jolliffe, 2011; Hong & Espelage, 2012), which confirmed the significant negative effect of mother's overprotective and emotionally hostile behavior on the children to be bullied.

However, the results, concerning the indication of most targeted place of bullying, i.e., classrooms, found in this study are not in consistent with international scenario (Monks *et al.*, 2009), which mentioned classrooms as the safer places than the corridors, recess times in cafeteria, toilets and playgrounds for the students to be victimized or bullied. It demonstrates teachers' unvigilant attitude and non-intervening behavior in classroom sitting in Pakistan's context. This finding is also answering the reason that why a considerable percentage of students didn't mention teachers or principals to whom they can discuss their issues of victimization even if it happens in the class. A revelation of "home" in the category "bullying somewhere else" though mentioned by a small number of students yet manifesting the presence of siblings bullying (Monks *et al.*, 2009) in Pakistan too. These reflections found in the current study demands further and in-depth investigations of places and nature of bullying in Pakistani settings.

Lastly, Regression analysis showed that "being a bully" was predicted significantly by the variables of mother's upbringing style, father's discipline and inter-parental relationship for both boys and girls. These findings are in accordance with our earlier findings too regarding the effect of mother's education on child's personality and his confidence. Current research showed that positive parental-youth and inter-parental relationship significantly reduce the bullying behavior. These findings are supported by the studies (Corvo, 2010; Jolliffe, 2011; Hong & Espelage, 2012), which demonstrated the involvement of students in bullying activities who expose to inter-parental violence at home.

Although, the current study was a small-scaled study, which included the sample from two cities only, yet the results demonstrated an interesting scenario in the Pakistan's context. Many areas were discovered during this study, which were hidden when this research was planned. Thus, large scale studies and longitudinal studies are required to investigate these phenomena further, on the one hand, the predicting mechanism of school bullying with other variables including peer relationships, sibling bullying, cultural norms etc., too, and on the other hand, the long term consequences of bullying with trajectories of age and other variation variables.

REFERENCES

1. Atik, G. (2011). "Assessment of school bullying in Turkey: a critical review of self-report instruments". *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 15, 3232–3238.
2. Baldry, A. C. (2004). "What about bullying? An experimental field study to understand students' attitudes towards bullying and victimization in Italian middle schools". *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74(4), 583-598.
3. Basile, K. C., Espelage, D. L., Rivers, I., McMahon, P. M., & Simon, T. R. (2009). "The theoretical and empirical links between bullying behavior and male sexual violence perpetration". *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 14(5), 336-347. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2009.06.001>
4. Bauer, N. S., Herrenkohl, T. I., Lozano, P., Rivara, F. P., Hill, K. G., & Hawkins, J. D. (2006). "Childhood bullying involvement and exposure to intimate partner violence". *Pediatrics*, 118(2), 235-242.
5. Bauman, S., & Del Rio, A. (2006). "Preservice Teachers' Responses to Bullying Scenarios: Comparing Physical, Verbal, and Relational Bullying". *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 98(1), 219-231.
6. Bendixen, M., Muus, K. M., & Schei, B. (1994). "The impact of child sexual abuse, A study of a random sample of Norwegian students". *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 18(10), 837-847. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0145-2134\(94\)90063-9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0145-2134(94)90063-9)
7. Boulton, M. J., & Underwood, K. (1992). "Bully/victim problems among middle school children". *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 62(1), 73-87.
8. Card, N. A., Stucky, B. D., Sawalani, G. M., & Little, T. D. (2008). "Direct and Indirect Aggression During Childhood and Adolescence: A Meta-Analytic Review of Gender Differences, Intercorrelations, and Relations to Maladjustment". *Child Development*, 79(5), 1185-1229. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2008.01184.x
9. Casas, J., Del Rey, R., & Ortega-Ruiz, R. (2013). "Bullying and cyberbullying: Convergent and divergent predictor variables". *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29(3), 580-587.
10. Cécile, C., & Daniel, F. (2003). "Violences à l'école :tendancesinternationales de la rechercheensociologie". *DévianceetSociété* 27(2), 205-225. Cornell, D., Gregory, A., Huang, F., & Fan, X. (2013). "Perceived Prevalence of Teasing and Bullying Predicts High School Dropout Rates". *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 105(1), 138-149.
11. Corvo, K., & deLara, E. (2010). "Towards an integrated theory of relational violence: Is bullying a risk factor for domestic violence?". *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 15(3), 181-190.
12. Demaray, M. K., & Malecki, C. K. (2003). "Perceptions of the Frequency and Importance of Social Support by Students Classified as Victims, Bullies, and Bully-Victims in an Urban Middle School". *School Psychology Review*, 32(3), 471-489.
13. Edwards, S. L., & O'Connell, C. F. (2007). "Exploring bullying: Implications for nurse educators". *Nurse Education in Practice*, 7(1), 26-35.
14. Elwan, A. A., & Alwan, S. M. A. (2013). "The Institutional Factors Affecting the Achievement in Physics in Tripoli, Libya". *VFAST Transactions on Education and Social Sciences*, 1(2).
15. Eslea, M., & Smith, P. (2000). "Pupil and parent attitudes towards bullying in primary schools". *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 15(2), 207-219.
16. Field, A. (2009). "Discovering Statistics Using SPSS" (3 ed.). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
17. Gini, G. (2008). "Italian Elementary and Middle School Students' Blaming the Victim of Bullying and Perception of School Moral Atmosphere". *The Elementary School Journal*, 108(4), 335-354.
18. Giovazolias, A. (2008). Foreword. In K. Rigby (Ed.), "Bullying: Modern views" (pp. 10-12). Athens: Topos.

19. Gregory, A., Cornell, D., Fan, X., Sheras, P., Shih, T.-H., & Huang, F. (2010). "Authoritative School Discipline: High School Practices Associated With Lower Bullying and Victimization". *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 102(2), 483-496.
20. Hamiwka, L. D., Yu, C. G., Hamiwka, L. A., Sherman, E. M. S., Anderson, B., & Wirrell, E. (2009). "Are children with epilepsy at greater risk for bullying than their peers?" *Epilepsy & Behavior*, 15(4), 500-505.
21. Hawker, D. S. J., & Boulton, M. J. (2000). "Twenty Years' Research on Peer Victimization and Psychosocial Maladjustment: A Meta-analytic Review of Cross-sectional Studies". *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 41(4), 441-455.
22. Holt, M. K., Finkelhor, D., & Kantor, G. K. (2007). "Multiple victimization experiences of urban elementary school students: Associations with psychosocial functioning and academic performance". *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 31(5), 503-515. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2006.12.006>
23. Hong, J. S., & Espelage, D. L. (2012). "A review of research on bullying and peer victimization in school: An ecological system analysis". *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 17(4), 311-322.
24. Jolliffe, D., & Farrington, D. P. (2011). "Is low empathy related to bullying after controlling for individual and social background variables?". *Journal of Adolescence*, 34(1), 59-71.
25. Laeheem, K. (2013). "Family and upbringing background of students with bullying behavior in Islamic private schools, Pattani province, Southern Thailand". *Asian Social Science*, 9(7), 162-172.
26. Ledwell, M., & King, V. (2013). "Bullying and Internalizing Problems: Gender Differences and the Buffering Role of Parental Communication". *Journal of Family Issues*.
27. Maliki, A. E. (2009). "Parental Socio-economic Status and Attitude of Towards Cultism in Niger Delta University, Bayelsa State: Implication for Counseling". *Journal of Human Ecology*, 26(1), 65-69.
28. Maria, P., Thomai, C., & Koutra, K. (2011). "Bullying at School: The role of family". *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29.
29. Matsunaga, M. (2009). "Parents Don't (Always) Know Their Children Have Been Bullied: Child-Parent Discrepancy on Bullying and Family-Level Profile of Communication Standards". *Human Communication Research*, 35(2), 221-247.
30. Merrell, K. W., Gueldner, B. A., Ross, S. W., & Isava, D. M. (2008). "How Effective Are School Bullying Intervention Programs? A Meta-Analysis of Intervention Research". *School Psychology Quarterly*, 23(1), 26-42.
31. Mintz-Binder, R. D., & Calkins, R. D. (2012). "Exposure to bullying at the associate degree nursing program director level". *Teaching and Learning in Nursing*, 7(4), 152-158.
32. Monks, C. P., Smith, P. K., Naylor, P., Barter, C., Ireland, J. L., & Coyne, I. (2009). "Bullying in different contexts: Commonalities, differences and the role of theory". *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 14(2), 146-156.
33. Nansel, T. R., Overpeck, M., Pilla, R. S., Ruan, W. J., Simons-Morton, B., & Scheidt, P. (2001). "Bullying Behaviors Among US Youth: Prevalence and Association with Psychosocial Adjustment". *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, 285(16), 2094-2100.
34. Naz, B. A., Iqbal, J., Zaman, A., Ghaffar, A., & Ameen, F. (2014). "Factors Influencing Teaching Process At Abdul Wali Khan University Mardan: A Comparative Study". *VFAST Transactions on Education and Social Sciences*, 2(2).
35. Nocentini, A., Menesini, E., & Salmivalli, C. (2013). "Level and change of bullying behavior during high school: A multilevel growth curve analysis". *Journal of Adolescence*, 36(3), 495-505.
36. Olweus, D. (1993). "Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do". Malden, USA: Wiley.
37. Olweus, D. (1994). "Bullying at school: Basic facts and an effective intervention programme". *Promotion & Education*, 1(4), 27-31.

38. Papanikolaou, M., Chatzikosma, T., & Kleio, K. (2011). "Bullying at School: The role of family". *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29 (0), 433-442.
39. Pellegrini, A. D., & Bartini, M. (2000). "A Longitudinal Study of Bullying, Victimization, and Peer Affiliation during the Transition from Primary School to Middle School". *American Educational Research Journal*, 37(3), 699-725.
40. Pinheiro, P. S. (2006). "Violence against children" (pp. 1-350). Geneva: United Nations.
41. Rivers, I., Poteat, V. P., Noret, N., & Ashurst, N. (2009). "Observing Bullying at School: The Mental Health Implications of Witness Status". *School Psychology Quarterly*, 24((4), 211-223.
42. Rosen, L. H., Beron, K. J., & Underwood, M. K. (2013). "Assessing Peer Victimization Across Adolescence: Measurement Invariance and Developmental Change". *Psychological Assessment*, 25(1), 1-11.
43. Salmivalli, C. (2010). "Bullying and the peer group: A review". *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 15(2), 112-120.
44. Shetgiri, R., Lin, H., & Flores, G. (2012). "Identifying Children at Risk for Being Bullies in the United States". *Academic Pediatrics*, 12(6), 509-522.
45. Stassen Berger, K. (2007). "Update on bullying at school: Science forgotten?" *Developmental Review*, 27(1), 90-126.
46. Stevens, V., De Bourdeaudhuij, I., & Van Oost, P. (2002). "Relationship of the Family Environment to Children's Involvement in Bully/Victim Problems at School". *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 31(6), 419-428.
47. Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. (2007). "Using Multivariate Statistics" (5th ed.). New York: Pearson Education Inc.
48. Tepetas, G. S., Akgun, E., & Altun, S. A. (2010). "Identifying preschool teachers, An opinion about peer bullying". *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 1675-1679.
49. Vanderbilt, D., & Augustyn, M. (2010). "The effects of bullying". *Paediatrics and Child Health*, 20(7), 315-320.
50. Vessey, J. A., DiFazio, R. L., & Strout, T. D. (2013). "Youth bullying: A review of the science and call to action". *Nursing Outlook*, 61(5), 337-345.