Probing the Psychosocial Problems of Bullying Perpetrators and Victim in Private University

Sylvia Icari-Quigao

_____

[1]Cagayan State University, Carig Campus

Probing the Psychosocial Problems of Bullying Perpetrators and Victim in Private University

Sylvia Icari-Quigao
Cagayan State University, Carig Campus
Email:sylvialeighicariquigao@gmail.com

ABSTRACT
Bullying is a complicated behavior that can have a wide variety of underlying reasons, and it can present itself in a variety of different ways. this study is aimed to determine the psychosocial problems of bullying perpetrators and victims of St. Paul University Philippines. The researcher made used of the descriptive research in this study. Descriptive method was employed to determine the psychosocial status, perceived parenting style and attachment styles of bullying perpetrators and victims of SPUP.

Keywords: Bullying, victims

INTRODUCTION
Today, bullying is a problem that affects people all around the world. It can take place in any setting, environment, or environment. It is unfortunate to report that research has shown that bullying occurs in schools even in countries that are considered to be in the first world. Sometimes the bullying occurs online or through cell phones. It has been suggested that bullying may have had a role in the killings and shootings that have taken place on school grounds in the United States and in other countries.

Because of the rise in the number of instances of bullying in the Philippines, a politician there has introduced a bill that would impose penalties on anybody who are found to have engaged in any acts of bullying or any other form of harassment. The frightening number of instances of bullying that occur annually opened the attention of government officials, and they saw the need to codify this issue into legislation. This is Act 10627 of the Republic of the Philippines, more commonly referred to as "The Anti-Bullying Act of 2013." This law was enacted with the intention of preventing children who were enrolled in kindergarten, primary, and secondary schools as well as learning centers from becoming victims of bullying and addressing the concerns of individuals who had suffered mental and psychological agony as a result of the intensification of bullying acts. This law mandates both public and private schools develop anti-bullying policies in order to address the problem of bullying, which occurs in both types of institutions. The act has provided all parties involved, including parents, teachers, and stakeholders, with a definition of bullying that is both clear and all-encompassing. Schools are currently complying with the rule as it is being mandated by the Department of Education in order to shield pupils from the potentially detrimental effects of this newly emerging phenomena.

The child's social, intellectual, and moral growth are all helped along by the school, which serves as the epicenter of the formal education system and provides a setting that is one of a kind. It is in this environment that children have the opportunity to grow, develop, and hone their abilities in order to realize their full potentials. Every student who visits an educational institution with the intention of enrolling is greeted in a warm and cordial manner. The days spent in school are always filled with joy and excitement since each child is exposed to new information, has the opportunity to investigate, investigate, and discover new things, as well as learn how to make friends and relate to others. But why do some children and students find going to school to be nerve-wracking and exhausting at times? What aspects of this experience make it akin to a nightmare, the likes of which no youngster ever wants to recall? What is it that prevents them from taking use of the wonderful chances that schools have to offer?At St. Paul University Philippines, it has been a common observation that over the course of the past three years, there has been a growing and alarming number of cases of bullying that have been reported at the Guidance Office and Discipline Chair Office and have been brought to the notice of the administrators. This trend has been observed both internally and outside.

Due to the massive phenomena that bullying has developed into, it is imperative that it be put an end to or prevented in every way possible, regardless of how much time this may take. It creates a scared environment instead of a learning environment in schools when bullying is allowed to continue, which may lead to further bullying as students may think, "let me bully so I don't get bullied." During the course of the inquiry, the researcher heard the kids' screams and complaints, and it opened his eyes to the predicament that so many students are in, namely that they want to quit school in order to live in an atmosphere that is both healthy and

calm. Individual bullies can be stopped, and victims can also learn how to protect themselves, but the main difficulty for administrators and instructors is how to create an environment that is loving and supportive so that bullying never starts. This is to ensure that we have produced school programs that will become an important part of the curriculum where the children will be able to harness their capabilities and skills, build confidence, gain many friends, and likely have that sense of belongingness. The reason for this is to ensure that we have developed school programs that will become an integral part of the curriculum. When children have a sense of safety, love, and acceptance in the school community for who they are, this will likely lead to a peaceful and caring atmosphere in the school, which is what the policy encourages.

This study was conceived of keeping all of this information in mind. The purpose of this study was to analyze the psychosocial status of bullying perpetrators and victims, as well as to establish a preventative program to combat bullying among students and, as a result, to cultivate a more peaceful learning environment.

Statement of the Problem

Generally, this study is aimed to determine the psychosocial problems of bullying perpetrators and victims of St. Paul University Philippines.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the bullying perpetrators and victims in terms of:
   a) Sex
   b) year level
   c) academic performance
   d) birth order
   e) marital status
   f) whom they live with
2. What are the common forms of bullying as reported to the guidance center and discipline chair office of SPUP?
3. What is the perceived parenting style of the respondents' parents?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The researcher made used of the descriptive research in this study. Descriptive method was employed to determine the psychosocial status, perceived parenting style and attachment styles of bullying perpetrators and victims of SPUP. It also described the differences in the respondents' attachment style when grouped according to profile variables. It further described the relationships of the variables under study. With this, an intervention program was developed to address all probable problems relevant thereto.

Locale of the Study

The researcher conducted the research study at St. Paul University Philippines, a private institution located at the heart of Tuguegarao City. The university caters to pre--school, elementary, high school, college, and graduate school students. However in this study, the researcher only considered those reports from the Basic Education Unit of SPUP particularly, the Junior High School students.

Respondents and Sampling Procedure

Based on the purpose of the present study, the researcher made use of purposive sampling technique. The respondents of the study were the students who are identified by the Guidance Center and the Discipline office of the BEU of St. Paul University Philippines with bullying cases for A.Y. 2016-2017. The perpetrators were also taken as respondents in order to have direct account of the nature of bullying that transpired and to determine the factors that bring about bullying violation against their peace and privacy. The parents and the teachers of both groups were also taken as respondents to validate the former's responses and thereby shed light to the problems under study. Only those students with bullying cases and their victims who are currently enrolled at SPUP were taken as respondents of the study.

Research Instruments

The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) is a brief behavioral screener created by Goodman in 1997. The questionnaire consists of 25 screening items that measure both psychosocial problems (i.e., emotional problems, conduct problems, hyperactivity–inattention, and peer problems) and strengths (i.e., prosocial behaviour) in children and youths aged 3–17 years. This standardized test is a 25 item test that comprises 5 scales of 5 items each. For each item, the respondent marks in one of the three boxes to indicate whether the item is not true, somewhat true or certainly true for the student in question. It is usually easiest to score all 5 scales first before working out the total difficulties score. "Somewhat true" is scored as 1, but scoring of "not

true" and "certainly true" varies with the item. For each of the 5 scales the score can range from 0-10 if all 5 items were completed. Scale score can be prorated if at least 3 items will not be completed.

The reliability for the Total Difficulties score, Impact score, and five subscale scores is satisfactory (Goodman, 2001). Both interrater reliability and test-retest reliability have been found to be satisfactory (Goodman, 2001). Pearson correlations across informants have been found significant (p<.001) for parent, teacher, and self-report for the emotional problems, conduct problems, and hyperactivity-inattention subscales (Goodman, 2001).

Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire psychometric properties (Goodman, 1991; 2001) • Alpha = .73 • Test-retest reliability = .62 • Criterion validity judged to be adequate • Track record of cross-cultural equivalence with translations into over 30 languages

The Scale of Parenting Style Questionnaire was used to measure the perceived parenting styles of parents. The items in the scale are prepared on the basis of studies of Diana Baumrind. So scale was constructed validity in relation to parenting style. Criterion related validity of the scale was found out by correlating the scores of Scale of Parenting Style with Scale of parenting Style developed by Usha and Manjusha (2006) in a sample of thirty students. The validity coefficient is found that 0.80 for responsiveness and 0.76 for control subscale. The reliability of the scale is established by test-retest after an interval of one week. The test-retest coefficient of reliability of responsiveness variable in the scale is 0.81 and for control is 0.83. The index of validity and index of reliability indicate that the scale has validity and reliability for measuring the parenting style of secondary school students.

Data Gathering Procedure

First, permission and approval to conduct the study was sought from the top management and administrators concerned at St. Paul University Philippines. After which, a conference with the Guidance Counselors and the Discipline Chair was conducted to gather data pertinent to the bullying cases at SPUP specifically on the profile of the perpetrators and the victims and the initial actions undertaken to resolve the reported cases. Floating of questionnaires to the different groups of respondents namely: the perpetrators, the victims, and teachers of both the victims and perpetrators were conducted to gather significant data for the study. The questionnaires for the parents of both perpetrators and victims were given during the getting of cards of the last quarter of the school year. Likewise, the General Weighted Average of the participants was requested by the researcher from the advisers with the permission of the principal and the parents as well with the help of the BEU Guidance Counselors. Analysis of results and findings was done in comparison with previous findings from other studies conducted to validate the results of the current study and consequently develop an intervention program to address the problems on bullying at SPUP.

Statistical Tools and Analysis of Data

The data gathered were tallied, analyzed and interpreted using the following statistical tools:

1. Descriptive statistics was used to describe the profile of the respondents using the basic statistical measures such as frequency counts, percentage distribution, and mean. The data on the profile of the respondents' forms of bullying, perceived parenting style, and attachment style of the respondents were treated using frequency counts, percentage distribution, and mean.

Data Analysis

For the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire, the following scales were used to interpret the psychosocial problems of the respondents.

Table 1

Self	Normal	Borderline	Abnormal
Total Difficulties Score	0-15	16-19	20-40
Emotional Problem Score	0-5	6	7-10
Conduct Problem Score	0-3	4	5-10
Hyperactivity Score	0-5	6	7-10
Peer Problem Score	0-3	4-5	6-10
Prosocial Behavior Score	6-10	5	0-4

Table 2

Parent	Normal	Borderline	Abnormal
Total Difficulties Score	0-13	14-16	17-40
Emotional Problem Score	0-3	4	5-10
Conduct Problem Score	0-2	3	4-10
Hyperactivity Score	0-5	6	7-10

| Peer Problem Score | 0-2 | 3 | 4-10 |
| Prosocial Behavior Score | 6-10 | 5 | 0-4 |

Presentation, Interpretation And Analysis Of Data

The results are presented according to the specific problems sought and are as follows:

1. Respondents' Profile

The succeeding tables labeled as Table 1.1 (sex), Table 2 (year level), Table 3 (academic performance), Table 4 (birth order), Table 5 (parents' marital status) and Table 6 (with whom they live with) show the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents' profile.

Table 1.1 presents the sex of the 96 respondents. There are 58 (60.4%) of the respondents who are males while 38 (39.6%) are females. This suggests that bullying perpetrators and victims of SPUP are mostly males. Respondents were only being those who have been voluntary and involuntary visited the Guidance and Counseling Center or have been reported to the Discipline office of the Junior High School department were taken in this study.

Table 1.1: Respondents' Distribution according to Sex

Sex	Frequency	Percentage
Male	58	60.4
Female	38	39.6
Total	96	100.0

Table 1.2 shows the respondents' year level. There are 43 (44.8%) respondents from Grade 7 followed by 26 (27.1%) from the Grade 8, 14 (14.6%) from Grade 9 and 13 (13.5%) from Grade 10.

Table 1.2: Respondents' Distribution According to Year Level

Year Level	Frequency	Percentage
Grade 7	43	44.8
Grade 8	26	27.1
Grade 9	14	14.6
Grade 10	13	13.5
Total	96	100.0

Table 1.3 reveals that 40 (41.7%) of the respondents belong to 80-84 which means "Satisfactory" rating followed by 34 (35.4%) on 75 - 79 with "Fairly Satisfactory" rating, 17 (17.7%) of them belong to 85-89 with "Very Satisfactory and the least is 5 (5.2%) who belong to 90-100 with "Outstanding" rating.

Table 1. 3: Respondents' Distribution according to Academic Performance

Academic Performance	Frequency	Percentage
90-100	5	5.2
85-89	17	17.7
80-84	40	41.7
75-79	34	35.4
Total	96	100.0
Mean = 81.86 SD = 4.129		

Table 1.4 shows that the respondents are of different birth ordinal positions. Most of them are last born (34.4%) and firstborn (30.2%). A handful of them are only child (13.5%) while the rest are middle born (21.9%).

Table 1.4: Respondents' Distribution according to Birth Order

Birth Order	Frequency	Percentage
First Born	29	30.2
Middle Born	21	21.9
Last Born	33	34.4
Only Child	13	13.5
Total	96	100.0

Table 1.5 reveals that majority (79.2%) of the respondents' parents are married followed by 17 (17.7%) who are separated and 3 (3.1%) are widowed respectively.

Table 1.5:Respondents' Distribution according to Parents' Marital Status

Parents' Marital Status	Frequency	Percentage
Married	76	79.2
Separated	17	17.7
Widow	3	3.1
Total	96	100.0

Table 1.6 reveals that majority (67.7%) of the respondents are living with their both parents followed by 17 (17.7%) who are living with their mother only and there are a few who are living with grandparents (6.3%), father only (4.2%), relatives (3.1%) and brother (1.0) respectively.

Table 1.6:Respondents Distribution according to Whom they Live With

With whom they live	Frequency	Percentage
Both parents	65	67.7
Mother only	17	17.7
Father only	4	4.2
Grandparents	6	6.3
Brother	1	1.0
Relatives	3	3.1
Total	96	100.0

2. Common forms of bullying as reported to the Guidance Center and Discipline Chair Office

Table 2 reveals that majority (57.3%) of the respondents are engaged in cyber bullying like continues sending/receiving nasty messages, vulgar words and photos through private messages and group chats followed by verbal bullying like teasing and name calling (17.7%) and physical bullying like pushing, punching and pulling of hair (14.6%) respectively. There are also those who experienced emotional bullying like being left out or excluded (7.3%) and social bullying like being laughed at because of performances and grades (3.1%).

The similar conclusion may be drawn from the research conducted by Witkus (2012) on the subject of cyber bullying among adolescents in the Philippines. In that study, the author discovered that students attending private schools were more likely to be victims of cyber bullying than those attending public schools. According to the findings of this research, kids attending private schools who often used cell phones and the Internet were more likely to become victims of cybercrime than students attending public schools.

In addition, the research that was carried out by Ouano, Buot, and Conwey (2013) indicated that cyberbullying is another common experience among adolescents due to the fact that it is not limited to the confines of a school environment and may occur anywhere. As a result of the increased anonymity afforded to the bully in cyberbullying and the fact that other people are less likely to recognize the existence of the bullying behavior, it is anticipated that this type of bullying will be more widespread than physical bullying in the future.

In addition, Haban (2016) discovered in the course of her research that the individuals who engage in cyberbullying do so in order to feel superior to their victims and for the sheer enjoyment of it.

Table 3:Respondents' Distribution according to Common Forms of Bullying

Forms of Bullying	Frequency	Percentage
Cyber bullying	55	57.3
Physical Bullying	14	14.6
Emotional Bullying	7	7.3
Verbal Bullying	17	17.7
Social Bullying	3	3.1
Total	96	100.0

3. Perceived Parenting Styles of the Respondents' Parents

Table 3.1 reveals that majority (77.1%) of the respondents perceived their fathers as authoritative. Neglectful parenting style (10.4%) also emerged followed by authoritarian (5.2%) and permissive (2.1%) respectively.

The table additionally reveals that the fathers of the respondents are perceived to have high responsiveness (M= 69.74) and have high control (M =70.55) which further affirms that generally, they employ the authoritative parenting style.

There is a direct correlation between the manner in which parents raise their children and the extent to which those youngsters engage in bullying behaviors, either as victims or as bullies themselves.   According to Sean Wernert (2016), authoritative parenting is the optimum type of parenting style because it is not related with bullying tendencies in children. This is due to the fact that if children are brought up in a democratic manner, where they are accepted and respected, then those children will carry on this tradition and respect others. Authoritarian parenting is a form of parenting that employs the use of physical force and psychological coercion in order to coerce children into complying with the parent's wishes. A youngster is more likely to become aggressive and bullying if they are raised in this manner. A child who feels helpless and powerless at home may wish to feel powerful at school by bullying his or her classmates in order to compensate for how they feel at home. Children are more likely to learn by example and act violently themselves if they see their parents modeling aggressive behavior in the home. A youngster who is reared with a parent who has a permissive parenting style is more likely to bully other children. A youngster who is allowed to get away with anything at home and is never reminded that what they did was wrong will not acquire the empathy that is necessary to treat other people with the respect that they deserve. This particular parenting approach produces children that are angry and aggressive toward one another and who believe it is OK for them to insult, mistreat, or harass their classmates.   If a parent has a parenting style that is neglectful, then their child will be more likely to let themselves become a victim of bullying practices. Sadly, children who are brought up in an environment like this do not receive compliments or attention, and as a result, they do not develop high feelings of self-worth. Their classmates view them as "easy targets" because of how vulnerable they are.

Baumrind contends that the authoritative method of parenting is the "just right" way to bring up children. It places moderate demands on the child and similarly moderate expectations on the parents' part in terms of how they should respond to those demands. Positive reinforcement and limited use of punishment are the two primary tenets of authoritative parenting. Authoritative parents are more attuned to their children's emotions and capacities, and they encourage the growth of their children's sense of independence within appropriate boundaries. Communication between a parent and a child takes place in an environment that is marked by a give-and-take dynamic, and it strikes a healthy balance between authoritarian tendencies and nurturing tendencies. According to the findings of recent studies, this approach is more helpful than the very strict authoritarian approach as well as the overly lax permissive approach.

According to Steinberg (1990) and Steinberg et al. (1989, 1991), it has been suggested that in adolescence, there are three specific components of authoritativeness that contribute to healthy psychological development and success in school. These components are parental acceptance or warmth, behavioral supervision and strictness, and psychological autonomy and democracy. In addition to this, authoritarian parents have high expectations for their children's accomplishments and levels of maturity, but at the same time, they are affectionate and responsive.

Accordingly, a negligent parenting style is one in which parents are frequently emotionally absent and occasionally even physically absent from their children's lives. They don't have many, if any, expectations for the child, and their communication with them is often nonexistent. They are unresponsive to the needs of a child and do not require anything of them in terms of the behavioral expectations they have for them. If they are around, they might give the child everything they need to live, although showing little to no interest in the child's life. When it comes to relationships between parents and their children, there is frequently a significant age gap when this parenting style is used. Children who had little or no communication with their own parents were more likely to be the victims of another child's aberrant behavior, and these children were also more likely to participate in some form of deviant behavior themselves.

 Children whose parents are not actively involved in their lives tend to struggle in a variety of areas, including social competence, academic achievement, psychological development, and problem behavior. On the other hand, families in the middle class are more likely to practice permissive parenting than families from lower socioeconomic status. In these types of families, the freedom and autonomy of the child are given a high level of importance, and the parents generally rely more on reasoning and explanation than physical punishment. Because the parents are not overly demanding of their children, there is typically very little, if any, punishment or specific restrictions in this form of parenting. These parents believe that their children are unencumbered by the expectations of others and are highly receptive to whatever their children want at any given time. Children who are raised by parents who are too permissive tend to be content most of the time, but they may struggle with issues of impulse control and lack of independence as a result of the lack of parental authority they receive at home.

In conclusion, authoritarian parents tend to be quite unbending and stringent in their expectations. They have a lot of expectations for the child, but they don't pay attention to what the child has to say. Parents that adhere to an authoritarian parenting style establish a stringent set of rules and expectations for their children, which are

then rigorously carried out and demand unwavering compliance from their children. When the rules are not followed, the most common method of enforcing future conformity is through the application of punishment. In most cases, there is no further explanation of the penalty other than the fact that the youngster is in trouble for disobeying a rule. The phrase "because I said so" is a common one to say in response to a kid who questions an adult's authority. It is more common in families from the working class than in families from the middle class to exercise this kind of authority. It has also been discovered that children who are brought up in homes with authoritarian parenting styles have lower levels of happiness, are more prone to experiencing mood swings, and are more susceptible to experiencing stress. In many instances, these youngsters also exhibit a hostile demeanor without actively trying to hurt anyone.

Table 3.1:Respondents' Distribution in terms of Perceived Parenting Style of Fathers

Parenting Styles	Frequency		Percentage
Authoritative	74		77.1
Authoritarian	5		5.2
Permissive	2		2.1
Neglectful	10		10.4
Missing	5		5.2
Total	96		100.0
Overall Parenting Style of Father	Mean	SD	Descriptive Interpretation
Responsiveness	69.74	13.778	High
Control	70.55	13.205	High

Table 3.2 shows that majority (75.0) of the respondents perceived their mothers to be authoritative. Eleven (11.5%) of the mothers are perceived to be employing the neglectful parenting style. Using the permissive parenting style are observed among 7 (7.3%) and authoritarian with 4 (4.2%) respectively.

In general, respondents' mothers too are found to have high responsiveness (M=72.07) and high control (M=71.63) which affirms that they too are inclined with the use of authoritative parenting style.

The contention of Baumrind supports the current study as she declared that authoritative parenting is the "just right" style. It combines a medium level demands on the child and a medium level responsiveness from the parents. Authoritative parents rely on positive reinforcement and infrequent use of punishment. Parents are more aware of a child's feelings and capabilities and support the development of a child's autonomy within reasonable limits.

Likewise, Baumrind (2012) acknowledges that mothers on the average spend more time taking care of children than fathers and are often perceived authoritative in nature, in which they use reasoning and consistency in interactions with their children, placing high value on verbal give-and-take, set rules and enforce boundaries.

Table 3.2:Respondents' Distribution in terms of Perceived Parenting Style of Mothers

Parenting Styles	Frequency		Percentage
Authoritative	72		75.0
Authoritarian	4		4.22
Permissive	7		7.3
Neglect	11		11.5
Missing	2		2.1
Total	96		100.0
Overall Parenting Style of Mother	Mean	SD	Descriptive Interpretation
Responsiveness	72.07	13.587	High
Control	71.63	14.000	High

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

It is essential for parents to adopt a mode of parenting that encourages empathy, respect, and healthy communication in their children in order to reduce the incidence of bullying. The authoritative parenting style, in which high expectations are combined with warmth, empathy, and emotional support for the child, is generally considered to be the most successful method. In this approach, clear rules and boundaries are established, but parents also make it a point to consider and value their children's thoughts and feelings. Children who are brought up in homes with authoritative parents are less likely to be bullies because they have been taught to respect the thoughts, feelings, and requirements of others, and they have been shown how to approach and solve problems in a constructive manner. In addition, parents should provide a good example for their children by behaving in a positive manner themselves and give their kids the tools they need to resolve

conflicts in a healthy way. In contrast, parenting styles such as authoritarian, permissive, or negligent might increase the possibility that a kid would engage in bullying behavior. This could be the result of a lack of emotional support, inadequate social skills, or a desire for power and attention on the part of the child.

REFERENCES
1. Abrhiem, Talil H. (2014) The role of parenting styles in psychosocial development of adolescents. ISSN: 2047 – 0398. Retrieved on May 3, 2017 from http://www.businessjournalz.org/articlepdf/BMR-31107-September-2014-3(11)-f.pdf
2. Ainsworth, M. D. S., & Bell, S. M. (1970). Attachment, exploration, and separation: Illustrated by the behavior of one-year-olds in a strange situation. Child Development, 41, 49-67.
3. Ali, K., et. al. (2012). Attachment styles and its relationship with cognitive triad (views of the self, others/world and future) Asian Journal of Development Matters. Online ISSN : 0976-4674Retrieved on July 20, 2017 from http://www.indianjournals.com/ijor.aspx?targetijor:ajdm&volume6&issue1&article
4. Areepattamannil, S. (2010). Parenting practices, parenting style and children's school achievement'. Psychological Studies, 55 (4), 283–289.
5. Aunola, K., Stattin, H., &Nurmi, J.E. (2000). Parenting styles and adolescents' achievement strategies. Journal of Adolescents, 23, 205-222.
6. Baldy, A.C. & Farrington D.P. (1998). Efforts to address bullying in the U.S. School Journal, eric.ed.gov/fulltex/EJ853630.
7. Batool, S & Mumtaz, A. (2015). Development and Validation of Parenting Style Scale. Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research, Vol. 30, No. 2, 225-248
8. Batul, R., Mahapatra, S. (2016). Psychosocial consequences of parenting. IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science. Volume 21, Issue 2. Retrieved April 12, 2017 from www.iosrjournals.org. DOI: 10.9790/0837-21251017
9. Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of Authoritative Parental Control on Child Behavior, Child Development, 37, 4, 887-907
10. Beran, T., & Shapiro, B. (2005). Evalauation of an anti-bullying program: Student reports of knowledge and confidence to manage bullying. Canadian Journal of Education, 28(4),700-717. Retrieved from website:http://search.proquest.com/docview/215373879?accountid=33657
11. Borak Z, Kawser U, Haque M, Afroze Sharmin A. (2016)Impact of Parenting Style on Children's Academic Achievement. Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities Research. Retrieved from http://jsshr.anveshika.org/article/impact-of-parenting-style-on-childrens-academic-achievement/ on July 20, 2017
12. Bornstein, M. H. (Ed.). (2002). Handbook of Parenting: Practical Issues in Parenting (2nd ed., Vol. 1). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc
13. Bruce,V.S. (2012,Nov.). Real-worldtips for ending bullying in our schools: Teach, 5-8.Retrieved website: http://search.proquest.com/docview/1400496898?accountid=33657 on May 3, 2017
14. Carlson, C.C. (2008). The extent of elementary principal's knowledge about the nature and prevention of bullying as it relates to the implementation of comprehensive bullying prevention programs. (3324151, Saint Louis University). ProQuest Dissertations and Theses, , 160-n/a. Retrieved from website: http:/search.proquest.com/docview/304456854?accountid=33657. (304456854).
15. Catherine, P.B., Anne, L.S. & Lindsey, M. O. (2007). Bullying and peer victimization at School: Perceptual differences between students and school staff. School Psychology Review, 36(3), 361-382. Retrieved from website:http://search.proquest.com/docview/219657357?accountid=33657
16. Darling, N. (1999, March). Parenting style and its correlates. Retrieved November 13, 2001, retrieved from the website: http://orders.edrs.com/members/sp.cfm?AN=ED427896.
17. Dekovic, M., & Gerris, J. R. M. (1992). Parental reasoning complexity, social class, and child-rearing behaviors. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 54, 675-685.
18. DEPED Child Protection Policy (DO 40, s. 2012) Retrieved on April 3, 2017 from https://www.google.com/search?q=google&ie=utf-8&oe=utf-8#q=googleThe+Department+of+Education+in+the+Philippines
19. Dornbusch, S. M., Ritter, P. L., Leiderman, P. H., Roberts, D. F., & Fraleigh, M. J. (1987). The relation of parenting styles to adolescent school performance. Child Development, 58, 1244-1257.

20. Duffy,A. (2004). The role of social identification and social group norms: Bullying in schools: A social perspective. Retrieved from website: www.Griffith.edu.au/402651/Nesdale.

21. Dulli, L. (2003). Primary socialization theory and bullying: The effects of primary sources of socialization on bullying behaviors among adolescents. North Carolina Journal, Chapel Hill. 4,664-118

22. Eckenrode,John et. Al (1996). The effects of neglect on academic achievement and disciplinary problems: A developmental perspective. Retrieved on July 2, 2017 from http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0145213495001395?via%3Dihub#! https://doi.org/10.1016/S0145-2134(95)00139-5

23. Erikson, E. H. (1963). Childhood and society (2nd ed.). NY: Norton.

24. Erikson, E. H. (1994). Identity: Youth and crisis (No. 7). WW Norton & Company.

25. Farmer, T.W., Hamm, J.V., Leung, M. (2011). Early adolescent peer ecologies in rural communities: Bullying in schools that do and do not have a transition during the middle grades. Journal of Youth and Adolescence,40(9), 1106-17. doi:Retrieved from website:http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10964-100-9684-0

26. Feinberg, T (2003). Bullying prevention and intervention. Principal Leadership, pp 1-11

27. Flores, Helen. (2014), July 28). 1700 Cases of Bullying Reported. The Philippine Star.

28. Forero, Roberto (1999).Bullying Behavior and Psychosocial Health among school students in New South Wales, Australia: cross sectional survey. Dissertations and Theses, Retrieved from website: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC28186/

29. Gafoor, Abdul, & Kurukkan, Abidha (2014). Construction and Validation of Scale of Parenting Style. Guru Journal of Behavioral and Social Sciences. Vol. 2. issue 4. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/272166433 on July 21, 2017.

30. Garcia, F., Gracia, E. (2009). Is always authoritative the optimum parenting style? Evidence from spanish families. Adolescence, 44 (173), 101-131. Retrieved on May 14, 2017 from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=37223852&site=ehost-live

31. Gracia, E., Garcia, F., & Lila, M. (2008). What is the Best for Your Children? Authoritative Vs Indulgent Parenting Styles and Psychological Adjustment of Spanish Adolescents. In F. Erkman (Ed) Acceptance: The Essence of Peace-Selected Papers From the First International Congress on Inter Personal Acceptance and rejection. Incekara Press: Turkey.

32. Goodman, R.(1997) The strengths and difficulties questionnaire: A research note. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry. 1997, 38: 581-586. Retrieved on March 8, 2017 from: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1469-7610.1997.tb01545.x/pdf

33. Goodman, R. & Scott, S. Comparing the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire and the Child Behaviour Checklist: Is small beautiful?Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology. 1999, 27: 17-24. Retrived on May 5, 2017 from https://link.springer.com/article/10.1023/A:1022658222914

34. Goodman, R. The extended version of the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire as a guide to child psychiatric caseness and consequent burden. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry. 1999, 40:791-801.

35. Goodman, R., Ford, T., Simmons H., Gatward R. and Meltzer H. Using the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) to screen for child psychiatric disorders in a community sample. British Journal of Psychiatry. 2000, 177: 534-539.

36. Haban, M. (2016). Personality traits and dynamics of cyber bullying. Masteral thesis, St. Paul University Philippines. March 2016.

37. Hong, Ediva, (2012) Impacts of parenting on children's schooling, Journal of Student Engagement: Education Matters, (1), 2012, 36-41.Retrieved on July 20, 2017 from http://ro.uow.edu.au/jseem/vol2/iss1/7

38. Kashabu, L., et.al. (2014). The Relationship between Parental Demographics, Parenting Styles and Student Academic Performance. Retrieved from website: https://www.google.com.search?q=google&ie=utf-8&oe=utf-8#qWoolfolk+2011+research+on+parenting+style

39. Kirkpatrick, Lee A. et.al (1990) Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion Vol. 29, No. 3 (Sep., 1990), pp. 315-334 retrieved from the website: http://www.jstor.org/stable/1386461

40. Kristen, E.J. & Baumann, S. (2007). Bullying in schools: School counselors' responses to three types of bullying incidents. Professional School Counseling, 11(1), 1-9. Retrieved from website:http://search.proquest.com/docview/213336168?accountid=33657

41. Kokkinos, C..M. (2012). Bullying and victimization in early adolescence: Associations with attachment style and perceived parenting. Retrieved on July 25, 2017 from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2013.766134

42. Konishi, C., Hymel, S. (2009). Investigating the compatibility of a self-report measure of childhood bullying across countries. Canadian Journal of School Psychology, 24(1), 82-93. Retrieved from website:http://search.proquest.com/docview/224367778?accountid=33657

43. Kordi, A. (2010). Parenting Attitude and Style and Its Effect on Children's School Achievements. Journal Of Psychological Studies, 2, 217–222.

44. Lamborn, S. D., Mounts, N. S., Steinberg, L., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1991). Child Development, 62, 1049-1065.

45. Maccoby, E.E., & Martin, J.A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent–child interaction. In P. Mussen and E.M. Hetherington, editors, Handbook of Child Psychology, volume IV: Socialization, personality, and social development. New York: Wiley.

46. Majumber, A., (2016) The Impact of Parenting Style on Children's Educational Outcomes in the United States". Retrieved on July 20, 2017 on website: http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10834-015-9444-5

47. Mercede Shavanddasht & Heike A. Schänzel (2017): Effects of perceived parental style on adolescents' motivations in a tourism context, Anatolia, DOI:10.1080/13032917.2017.1298528

48. Messer, D. J. (1993). Mastery, attention, IQ and parent-infant social interaction. In D. J. Messer (Ed.), Mastery-motivation in early childhood: Development, measurement and social processes (pp. 19-35). New York: Routledge.

49. Odongo, A., et al. (2016). Influence of parenting styles on the adolescent students' academic achievement in Kenyan Day Secondary Schools. Journal of Education and Practice. Online ISSN 2222-1735 (Paper) ISSN 2222-288X Retrieved on July 20, 2017 from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1103108.pdf

50. Olga, G. et.a. (2014) Parenting styles and bullying involvement / Estilos parentales e implicación en bullying, Cultura y Educación: Culture and Education, 26:1, 132-158, DOI: 10.1080/11356405.2014.908665

51. Ouano, J., et. al. (2013). A measure on the experience of being bullied: An initial validation in Philippine schools.

52. Page, A. S., & Larry, L. B., (2005). The organizational trust of elementary schools and dimensions of student bullying. The International Journal of Educational Management, 19(6), 469-485. Retrieved from website:http://search.proquest.com/docview/229108733?accountid=33657

53. Plan International,(2009) Toward a child-friendly education environment: A baseline study on violence Against children in public schools . Retrieved on July 21, 2017 from: https://aboutphilippines.ph/files/philippines-toward-a-child-friendly-education-environment.pdf

54. Postigo, S., Gonzales, R. (2013). Theoretical proposals in bullying Research: A review. Retrieved from Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Murcia. Murcia (espana) . Retrieved from website:http://dox.doi.org/10.6018/analesps.29.2.148251

55. P SLee & K Rigby (1993). The relationship of Eysenck's personality factors and self-esteem to bully –victim behavior in Australian schools boys' in personality and individual differences; Vol.14, Number 2 pp 371-373.

56. Raskauskas, J. (2005). Bullying in adolescence: An analysis of two studies on cyber and traditional forms, California State University, Sacramento.

57. Reid, P., & Monsen., & Rivers,I. (2003). Psychology's contribution to understanding and managing bullying within Schools. Educational Psychology in Practice, Vol 20, No.3, September 2004.

58. Rigby, K.(2003). Bullying in schools: The theory and practice. Trends and Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice Series. Retrieved from website:http://www.aic.gov.au

59. Roeser, R.W. (2009 The relationship between self-efficacy and academic achievement in high school students.. Retrieved May 3, 2017 from web http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042811003594

60. Schaffer, M., Clark, S., & Jeglic, E. L. (2009). The role of empathy and parenting style in the development of Anti-social behaviors. Crime & delinquency.doi:10.1177/0011128708321359

61. Shetgiri, R., Lin, H., & Flores, G. (2013). Trends in risk and protective factors for a child bullying perpetration in the U.S. Canadian Psychiatry and Human Development, 44(1), 89-104.doi:Retrieved from website://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10578-012-0312-3

62. Shumow, L., Vandell, D. L., & Posner, J. K. (1998). Harsh, firm, and permissive parenting in low-income families. Journal of Family Issues, 19, 438-507

63. Smith, D. E. & Moore, T M. (2013) Parenting style and psychosocial outcomes in a sample of Jamaican adolescents, International Journal of Adolescence and Youth, 18:3, 176-190, DOI: 10.1080/02673843.2012.682593. Retrieved on July 25, 2017
from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02673843.2012.682593

64. Smokowski and Kopasz: Bullying in school: An overview. April 2005.cs. Oxford Journals.org/content/27/2/101.

65. Steinberg, L., Lamborn, S., Dornbusch, S., & Darling, N. (1992). Impact of parenting practices on adolescent achievement: Authoritative parenting, school involvement, and encouragement to succeed. Child Development, 63, 1266-1281.

66. Tanya, N.B., Tutty, L., & Steinrath, G. (2004). An evaluation of a bullying prevention program for elementary schools. Canadian Journal of school Psychology, 19(1),99-116. Retrieved from website:http://search.proquest.com/docview/224377110?accountid=33657

67. Underwood, S. S. (2010). Teacher empathy and its impact on bullying in schools. (3404178), Tennessee State University). ProQuest Dissertations and Theses, , 161-n/a. Retrieved from website:http://search.proquest.com/docview/502234290?accountid=33657.(502234290).

68. Wal van der, Marcel F. (2003). Psychosocial health among young victims and offenders of direct and indirect bullying. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses, Pediatrics (Evanston), vol. 111, iss. 6, (2003), pp. 1312-1317. Retrieved from website: http://hdl.handle.net/2066/63227

69. Wentzel, K. R. (1998). Social relationships and motivation in middle school: The role of parents, teachers, and peers. Journal of Educational Psychology, 90, 202-209.

70. Wise, M., & Marchand, L. (2013). Living fully in the shadow of mortal time: Psychosocial assets in advanced cancer. Journal of Palliative Care, 29(2), 76–82

71. Witkus, Shella Guevara (2012). Cyber bullying among Filipino adolescents. Masteral Thesis University of Hawaii, December 2012. Retrieved on July 21, 2017 from: https://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/bitstream/10125/100793/1/Witkus_Shella_r.pdf