

**PARENTAL FACTORS AS PREDICTORS
OF IN-SCHOOL ADOLESCENTS' BULLYING BEHAVIORS
IN KWARA STATE, NIGERIA**

Authors:

Mulikat Ladi A. Mustapha (Ph.D.)
University of Ilorin, Ilorin (Nigeria)

Shuaib A. Muhammed (Ph.D.)
University of Ilorin, Ilorin (Nigeria)

Kamoru A. Tiamiyu (Ph.D.)
Al-Hikmah University, Ilorin (Nigeria)

Falilat A. Okesina (Ph.D.)
University of Ilorin, Ilorin (Nigeria)

Reviewers:

Ferenc Mező (Ph.D.)
University of Eszterházy Károly (Hungary)

Katalin Mező (Ph.D.)
University of Debrecen (Hungary)

...and two other anonymous reviewers

E-mail address of first author:
mustapha.mla@unilorin.edu.ng

Mustapha, Mulikat Ladi A., Muhammed, Shuaib A., Tiamiyu, Kamoru A. & Okesina, Falilat A. (2023). Parental Factors as Predictors of in-School Adolescents' Bullying Behaviors in Kwara State, Nigeria. *Special Treatment Interdisciplinary Journal [Különleges Bánásmód Interdiszciplináris folyóirat]*,9.(1).73-88. DOI [10.18458/KB.2023.1.73](https://doi.org/10.18458/KB.2023.1.73)

Abstract

Bullying is a complicated issue that arises from intricate relationships between family members, peers, the school community, and culture. One of the key indicators of bullying is parental variables. Studies linking various parental factors to bullying behaviour or roles are scarce, particularly in Nigeria. Therefore, this study examined parental factors as predictors of in-school adolescents' bullying behaviors in Kwara state, Nigeria. The population comprised 223, 893 in-school adolescents in Kwara State and a sample of 400 was drawn from this population across the State. The data were collected through the use of researchers' designed scale. The data collected were analysed using descriptive and inferential statistic. In the results, parental factors significantly predict in-school adolescents bullying perpetration and victimization. Based on the findings of the study appropriate recommendations were made.

Keywords: Parental Factors, In-School Adolescents, Bullying Behaviors

Discipline: pedagogy

Absztrakt**A SZÜLŐI TÉNYEZŐK, MINT A SERDÜLŐK ISKOLÁN BELÜLI ZAKLATÓ VISELKEDÉSÉNEK ELŐREJELZŐI NIGÉRIA KWARA ÁLLAMÁBAN**

A zaklatás bonyolult kérdés, amely a családtagok, a kortársak, az iskolai közösség és a kultúra közötti bonyolult kapcsolatából ered. A zaklatás egyik legfontosabb mutatói a szülői változók. Ritkán állnak rendelkezésre (különösen Nigériában) olyan tanulmányok, amelyekben különböző szülői tényezőket kötnének a zaklató viselkedéshez vagy szerepekhez. A populáció 223 893 iskolás serdülőből állt a nigériai Kwara államban, és ebből a populációból 400 fős mintát vettek szerte az államban. Az adatokat a kutatók által tervezett skála segítségével gyűjtötték. Az összegyűjtött adatokat leíró és következtető statisztika segítségével elemezték. Az eredmények szerint a szülői tényezők szignifikánsan előrevetítik az iskolai serdülők megfélemlítését és áldozattá válását. A vizsgálat eredményei alapján ajánlásokat fogalmaztak meg a szerzők.

Kulcsszavak: szülői tényezők, serdülők az iskolán belül, zaklató magatartások

Diszciplína: pedagógia

Introduction

Bullying in schools is regarded as a widespread issue that affects a sizeable number of children and adolescents. It is a severe problem, not just because of the obvious short-term effects, including the disruption of the school climate, but also because of the long-term effects on people who are impacted. Bullying puts both victims and perpetrators at risk for severe mental health concerns, which frequently linger into adulthood (Gini & Pozzoli, 2013; Gini & Espelage, 2014). Bullying is a complicated problem that results from the complexities of family, peer, and school connections as well as culture (Swearer & Doll, 2001). It is also a manifestation of defence mechanisms, which can be a reaction to both existential and identity-related problems (Kokkinos, 2013). Bullying is predicted by a number of factors, which have been found (Atik & Guneri, 2013; Kljakovic & Hunt, 2016). One of the most significant predictors of bullying is parental factors, such as disputes between parents, parental abuse and neglect, parenting methods, parental involvement and support,

parent-child communication, discipline, and so forth (Papanikolaou, Chatzikosma & Kleio, 2011; Wilson, Rush, Hussey, Puckering, Sim, Allely, Dokku, McConnachie, Gillberg, 2012; Kokkinos, 2013; Nocentini, Fiorentini, Di-Paola & Menesini, 2019).

Many parents develop their own parenting style depending on a variety of factors, and this style may alter as their children's personalities develop and as they move through different stages of life. A parent's dependable behavioural patterns toward one or more children are regarded as their parenting styles. It refers to the child rearing strategies adopted by the parents. According to Darling (2007), parenting styles define the emotional environment in which parents raise their kids. This can also be used to describe the parent's level of demands for performance, adherence to rules, and the disciplinary strategy used to enforce those demands (Nwazuoke, 2004). Parenting style, which is largely influenced by one's own parents, culture, family structure, and relationship with the parents, is influenced by the temperaments of both the parents and the children (Alegre, 2008).

Four factors were utilised to categorise parenting styles: parental control, parental communication, parental maturity expectations, and parental nurturing (Alegre, 2008). Baumrind (1991) and Olujinmi (2012) identified four main types of parent interaction styles: authoritarian, permissive, democratic, and uninvolved parents. In a strict, punitive parenting approach known as authoritarian parenting, parents make their kids follow their instructions and value their hard work. It prioritises compliance over all other factors. Parenting that is considered authoritative puts the needs of the kid first, fostering the growth of qualities that will help the child succeed in life (Meteyer & Jenkins, 2009). Democratic parenting, as it is also known, is characterised by few demands, little reactivity, and effective communication.

The term "permissive parenting" describes a parenting approach in which parents are actively involved with their kids yet do not place many restrictions on them or exercise much control over them. They give the youngster their full attention while being accepting and nurturing of their needs. Parents who are permissive do not think of themselves as leaders or role models. Instead of assuming the position of parents, they make an effort to be friends with their children (Rosenthan, 2002). Uninvolved parents are unconcerned with or uncaring about their child's developmental requirements; they are inconsistent with emotion, care, and discipline and might react to their child's behaviour in a variety of ways, from not at all to overly so (Pellerin, 2005). They are emotionally cold and disengaged.

To some extent, a child's experiences in their home environment impact how well they can adjust to the school setting and how they get along with their peers (Vindiova, 2014). The interaction between parents and teenagers may have a beneficial or bad impact on the children's or adolescents' behaviour (Kopko, 2007; Carter, 2011). There is a tonne of evidence to support the notion that

factors related to the family, such as family situation, socioeconomic status, mental health of parents, and attachment to parents (Dykas, Ziv & Cassidy, 2008; Kokkinos, 2013); conflicts between parents (Baldry & Farrington, 2000); parenting styles (Georgiou, 2008; Papanikolaou et al., 2011); maladaptive behaviour of parents, such as abuse and neglect (Lem Fanti, Demetriou & Hawa, 2012) impact adolescents behaviour. According to Mustapha, Bolu-Steve, and Ajiboye (2017), parental socio economic position and educational attainment are predictors of teenagers' bullying behaviour in schools.

Negative parenting practises including inadequate supervision and inconsistent, harsh treatment may help explain why some kids behave badly (Gutman & Vorhaus, 2012). Furthermore, Gámez-Guadix, Straus, Carrobes, Muoz-Rivas, and Almendros (2010) found that children are more likely to engage in antisocial or bad behaviours when their parents use harsh discipline. A correlation between severe punishment and children's bad behavioural adjustment was found by Mulvaney and Mebert in 2007. Poor parent-child relationships and a lack of parental support, according to Van As and Janssens (2002), may contribute to children's behavioural problems. Van As and Janssens (2002) discovered a link between children's behavioural issues and harsh discipline, which is characterised as screaming, yelling, shouting, slapping, and beating a child.

The system theory, which Donna Cross and Amy Barnes proposed in 2014, regarding family influences on children's bullying behavior, was supported by empirical findings on parental factors and bullying behaviors. According to the theory, a cordial family environment eventually leads to a cordial school setting and a bully-free environment. A child who is raised in a home with supportive parents is more likely to be a good person without bullying tendencies. Bullying is thought to have a social history that begins at home, where parents

are thought to have been the first educators during the early stages of development. The child is likely to adopt these characteristics and apply them to their peers at school if the parents punish their children harshly or if their marital conflict leads to physical abuse between them. Additionally, the Classical Ecological Theory, which Bronfenbrenner (2005) advanced, places an emphasis on the connections among human interaction, social context, rejection at home or from peers, and victimising behavior. According to the theory, family influences both peer victimisation and bullying in a reciprocal manner. The breakdown of societal bonds, according to the theory, contributes to delinquency (bullying). The act takes place when a person's connection to society is frayed or broken. This indicates that the qualities that bind people together have been destroyed, and the relationship is thus no longer present. This theory is applied to bullying behaviour that occurs when children are attached to their caregivers. Bullying may occur if the child's parents or caregivers act aggressively toward them. The causes of bullying are unclear, and even after controlling for hereditary factors, the effects of families remain unclear to people. Aggressive modelling and inadequate parental supervision are two contributing factors.

There are few studies, particularly in Nigeria, linking various parental factors or characteristics to bullying behaviour or bullying roles. According to some research results (Mustapha et al., 2017; Bada, Aderinto & Adebayo, 2021; Wokoma & Udochukwu, 2020), there is a positive and significant relationship between parenting practises and adolescents' in-school bullying behavior.

They all concentrated on the role that parenting practises play in how bullying is experienced or committed. This study concentrated on the degree to which in-school adolescents in the study local experienced negative parenting because there were few studies in this area; as well as bullying

behaviour among adolescents at school and parental influences.

The study also looked at whether a particular parental factor could predict a particular type of bullying behaviour among adolescents and which of the parental factors has the strongest correlation with it. The study also investigated whether parental factors predict in-school adolescents' bullying perpetration or victimisation experience.

Research Question

The study provide answer to the following research question: To what extent do in-school adolescents in Kwara state experience negative parenting?

Research Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were raised and tested at 0.05 level of significance:

- HO₁ Parental factors will not significantly influence in-school adolescents bullying behaviours.
- HO₂ Parental factors will not significantly predict in-school adolescents' bullying perpetration and victimization.
- HO₃ Socioeconomic background of the parents will not significantly predict in school adolescents' bullying perpetration and victimization.
- HO₄ Family violence, parental abuse and neglect, parental non-involvement/violent support, parental communication, parental monitoring/supervision, discipline, parent-child communication would not significantly predict in-school adolescents bullying behaviours.
- HO₅ There is no specific parental factor significantly link to certain form of in-school adolescents' bullying behaviour.

Methodology

The study is quantitative and used a cross-sectional correlation type descriptive survey research design. All enrolled adolescents in Kwara state secondary schools, totaling 223, 893, comprise the study's population (Kwara state Ministry of Education and Human Capital Development, 2021). According to Research Advisor (2006), a sample size of 384 respondents is recommended for a study of this size. However, 5% of that number (19) was added to account for attrition, resulting in a final sample size of 403 in-school adolescents from all three senatorial districts in Kwara State. Simple random sampling, stratified sampling, and proportional sampling methods were used to choose the samples. The use of proportionate sampling is justified by the unequal distribution of schools and student populations across the senatorial district. In order to investigate the effects of various moderating variables on the respondents, data on their various factors must be collected. This data can be studied by classifying the respondents into several groups. To eliminate bias, both the school and the respondents were chosen at random. Following a thorough examination of the literature, the researchers created a three-part questionnaire that included a demographic component, a scale measuring parental factors, and a scale measuring bullying behaviour. The demographic part asks about the respondents' age, gender, schooling, and current living arrangements. Parental factors scale contains 10 categories of parental factors that could predict bullying behaviours. The ten categories are: Family violence (six items), parental abuse and neglect (six items), parental non-involvement or negative support (eight items), parental communication pattern (four items), monitoring and supervision (six items), discipline (six items), parent-child interaction (five items), parental attachment, mental health status, socio-economic status (three items). The parental factors scale has a stem: "As an individual, my

parents do:". Examples of items on each category of the parental factors scale include:

Family violence: my parents abuse one another on little misunderstanding, fight each other etc.

Parental abuse and neglect: my parents do not listen or pay attention to me, do not praise or encourage me among others.

The third section; the bullying behaviour scale has 20 items; it is an adapted scale from Mustapha (2020) bullying behaviour measure which originally has 40 items seeking respondents' involvement in the perpetration or experience of different forms of bullying behaviour. The scale has two sections; first section has items on perpetration of bullying behaviour while the second section has items on experience of different forms of bullying victimization. The questionnaire was validated by three experts from Department of Counsellor Education and have reliability coefficient of 0.89 and 0.74 for sections B and C. Questionnaire employed four points Likert-Type rating scale of Almost all the time (AAT) – 4 points, Many Time (MT) – 3 points, sometimes (ST) – 2 points, Rarely (R) – 1 point. For section B, except for item 39-43 which have reverse rating pattern, the rating scale of 5 times/ more – 4 points, 3 or 4 times – 3 points, Once/twice – 2 points and Never – 1 point was used for section C. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyse the information collected from the participants. The demographic information from the respondents and data collected from section B of the instrument was analysed using percentages. Any responder who scored between 145 and 192 in section B was deemed to have experienced parental violence to a significant degree, whereas scores between 97 and 144 were deemed to have had moderate experience and 48 to 96 to have had little to no experience. At significance levels of 0.05, inferential statistics including pair t-tests, regression, and Univariate Analysis were also utilised to evaluate the five null hypotheses.

Results

Demographic Data

This section presents the results of data obtained from the respondents in frequency and percentages (Table 1).

Table 1. Percentage Distribution of Respondents Based on Demographic Data.

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Male	135	34.3
Female	259	65.7
Total	394	100
Age		
10-13 years	224	56.9
14-16 years	128	32.5
17 years and above	42	10.7
Total	394	100
School Type		
Private	40	10.2
Public	354	89.8
Total	394	100
Who do you live with?		
Two biological parents	299	75.9
Father only	23	5.8
Mother only	19	4.8
father and a step mother	17	4.3
Guardian	36	9.1
Total	394	100
Location		
GRA	31	7.9
Typical Area	363	92.1
Total	394	100
Mode of Residence		
Rented Apartment	154	39.1
Family house	162	41.1
Parent-owned house	71	18.0
Squatting	7	1.8
Total	394	100

The table 1 reveals that 135 (34.3%) of the respondents were male, while 259 (65.7%) of the respondents were female. Based on age, the table reveals that 224 (56.9%) of the respondents were between 10-13 years old, 128 (32.5%) of the respondents were between 14-16 years old, while 42 (10.7%) of the respondents were 17 years of age and above. The table also shows that 40 (10.2%) of the respondents were from private school, while

354 (89.8%) of the respondents were from public school. 299 (75.9%) of the respondents were living with their two biological parents, 23 (5.8%) of the respondents were living with their father only, 19 (4.8%) were living with their mother only, 17 (4.3%) were living with father and a step mother while 36 (9.1%) were living with guardian. Majority (92.1%) of the respondents' were living in typical area. 154 (39.1%) of them were living in rented apartment, 162- (41.1%) were in family house, 71(18.0%) were living in parent-owned house while 7 (1.8%) were squatting.

Table 2. Percentage Distribution of Properties Owned by the Respondents' Parents

Properties	Owned	Not Owned
Radio	353 (89.6%)	41 (10.4%)
Mobile phone	162 (41.1%)	232 (58.9%)
IPhone	22 (5.6%)	372 (94.4%)
Television	359 (91.1%)	35 (8.9%)
Satellite/TV decoder	123 (31.2%)	271 (68.8%)
Computer	141 (35.8%)	253 (64.2%)
Solar system of energy	52 (13.2%)	342 (86.8%)
A Car/two	295 (74.9%)	99 (25.1%)
Many cars	222 (56.3%)	172 (43.7%)
Self-owned well	124 (31.5%)	270 (68.5%)
Self-dig borehole	222 (56.3%)	172 (43.7%)
Public well	102 (25.9%)	292 (74.1%)
Public borehole	240 (60.9%)	154 (39.1%)

Table 2 shows that more than 50 percent of the respondents' parents were reported to owned radio, television, a car/two, many cars, self-dig borehole and public borehole. On the other hand, more than 50% did not own mobile phone, Iphone, satellite/TV decoder, computer, solar system of energy, self-owned well and public well. These were used to establish students' socioeconomic class.

Research Question 1: To what extent do in-school adolescents in Kwara state experience negative parenting?

Table 3. Percentage Distribution of the Extent to which Respondents Experience Negative Parenting.

Parental Factor	Great Extent	Some Extent	Low Extent
Family Violence	24 (6.1%)	215 (54.6%)	155 (39.3%)
Parental Abuse and Neglect	3 (0.8%)	237 (60.2%)	154 (39.1%)
Parental non-Involvement	17 (4.3%)	227 (57.6%)	150 (38.1%)
Parental violent support	12 (3.0%)	236 (59.9%)	146 (37.1%)
Parental Communication	16 (4.1%)	248 (62.9%)	130 (33.0%)
Parental Monitoring/Supervision	25 (6.3%)	243 (61.7%)	126 (32.0%)
Discipline	183 (46.4%)	91 (23.1%)	120 (30.5%)
Parent-Child Interaction	158 (40.1)	87 (22.1%)	149 (37.8%)
Attachment to parents	147 (37.3%)	107(27.2%)	140 (35.5%)
Parent Mental Health	24 (6.1%)	87 (22.1%)	283 (71.8%)

Table 3 reveals that all the respondents experience varying levels of negative parenting across the parenting dimensions. Significant percentage of respondents (46.4%, 40.1% and 37.3%) reported experiencing negative parenting in terms of discipline, parent-child interaction and attachment to parents to a great extent. Also, early two third of respondents reported moderate experience of negative parenting in term of parental communication, parental monitoring/supervision, parental abuse and neglect, family violence, parental non-involvement and parental violent support, while majority of the respondents reported low experience of negative parenting in terms of parent mental health.

Hypotheses Testing

Hypothesis 1:

Parental factors will not significantly influence in-school adolescents bullying behaviours.

Table 4 shows that p-value of .000 which is less than 0.05 level of significance which implies that parental factors significantly have influenced on in-school adolescents bullying behaviours.

Table 4. Pair t-test showing the Influence of Parental Factors on Respondents' Bullying Behaviours.

Variable	N	Mean	SD	df	Cal. t-value	p-value
Parenting factors	394	101.7	29.66	393	68.04*	.000
Bullying	208	22.90	3.98			

*Significant, $p < 0.05$

Hypothesis 2:

Parental factors will not significantly predict in-school adolescents' bullying perpetration and victimization.

Table 5a: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.513 ^a	.264	.253	22.675

a. Predictors: (Constant), Parental Factors

Table 5b. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
Regression	26494.47	2	13247.23	25.76*	.000 ^b
Residual	74038.19	144	514.15		
Total	100532.66	146			

a. Dependent Variable: Perpetration and Victimization

b. Predictors: (Constant), Parental Factors

Table 5c. Regression Coefficient showing Parental Factors predicting Bullying Perpetration and Victimization of the Respondents

Model	Un- Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		t	Sig.
	standardized		Coefficients			
	B	Std. Error	Beta	Beta		
(Constant)	187.20	12.70			14.73	.000
Perpetration	-3.52	1.00	-0.26	-0.26	-3.50	.001
Victimization	-1.70	0.33	-0.37	-0.37	-5.05	.000

a. Dependent Variables: Perpetration and Victimization

In the Table 5a, adjusted R square of .253 which is also 25.3% revealed that the independent variables (parental factors) when combined significantly predict in-school adolescents bullying's perpetration and victimization. In the Table 5b, the result of the ANOVA table p-value of .000 which is less than 0.05 implies that there is significant difference in the parental factors significantly predict in-school adolescents' bullying perpetration and victimization. Contribution of parental factors to bullying perpetration and victimization in table 5c also showed that parental factors significantly predict in-school adolescents' bullying perpetration (Beta weight (β) of -0.26, $t = -3.50$, $p < 0.05$) and victimization (Beta weight (β) of -0.37, $t = -5.05$, $p < 0.05$).

Hypothesis 3:

Socioeconomic background of the parents will not significantly predict in-school adolescents' bullying perpetration and victimization.

Table 6a. Model Summary.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.086 ^a	.007	-.006	1.691

a. Predictors: (Constant), Socioeconomic background of the parents

Table 6b: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
Regression	3.070	2	1.535	.537	.586 ^b
Residual	411.597	144	2.858		
Total	414.667	146			

a. Dependent Variable: Perpetration and Victimization

b. Predictors: (Constant), Socioeconomic background of the parents

Table 6c. Regression Coefficient showing Socioeconomic Background of the Parents predicting Bullying Perpetration and Victimization of the Respondents.

Model	Un- Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		t	Sig.
	standardized		Coefficients			
	B	Std. Error	Beta	Beta		
(Constant)	6.913	.947			7.299	.000
Perpetration	.049	.075	.057	.057	.656	.513
Victimization	.015	.025	.051	.051	.589	

a. Dependent Variables: Perpetration and Victimization

The null hypothesis was accepted as the adjusted R square indicated that Socioeconomic background of the parents has small chance (-.006, that is 0.06%) of predicting in-school adolescents' bullying perpetration and victimization (see Table 6a), hence, socioeconomic background of the parents will not significantly predict in-school adolescents' bullying perpetration and victimization (Beta weight (β) of 0.057, $t = .656$, $p > 0.05$) and victimization ((Beta weight (β) of 0.051, $t = .589$, $p > 0.05$)).

Hypothesis 4:

Family violence, parental abuse and neglect, parental non-involvement/violent support, parental communication, parental monitoring/supervision, discipline, parent-child communication would not significantly predict in-school adolescents bullying behaviours.

Table 7a. Model Summary.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.463 ^a	.214	.174	3.617

a. Predictors: (Constant), Parental Factors

Table 7b. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
Regression	702.24	10	70.22	5.36*	.000 ^b
Residual	2576.63	197	13.07		
Total	3278.88	207			

a. Dependent Variable: Bullying behaviour

b. Predictors: (Constant), Parental Factors

Table 7c. Regression Coefficient showing Parental Factors and Bullying Behaviours of the Respondents.

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	22.59	1.12		20.14	.000
Family Violence	2.48	.99	.32	2.50	.013
Parental Abuse and Neglect	1.44	1.82	.18	.79	.428
Parental non-Involvement	-2.96	1.48	-.37	-1.99	.047
Parental violent support	-3.64	1.34	-.46	-2.71	.007
Parental Communication	-2.09	1.22	-.26	-1.70	.090
Parental Monitoring/Supervision	1.507	.98	.19	1.53	.126
Discipline	1.74	.81	.41	2.14	.033
Parent-Child Interaction	-1.12	.61	-.26	-1.84	.066
Attachment to parents	1.12	.46	.23	2.44	.015
Parent Mental Health	1.14	.47	.17	2.43	.016

a. Dependent Variable: bullying

The independent variables (all parental factors) together strongly predict bullying behaviours among teenagers in school, according to Table 7a's adjusted R square of 0.174, which translates to 17.4%.

In Table 7b, the ANOVA table's p-value of 0.000, which is less than 0.05, indicates that there is a significant difference in the parental factors predicting the bullying behaviours of teenagers in school. Table 7c indicates contribution of variables (each of the parental factor) to bullying behaviour. Family violence has a Beta weight (β) of .32, $t=2.50$, $p<0.05$. Parental non-involvement has a Beta weight (β) of -.37, $t = -1.99$, $p<0.05$. Parental violent support has a Beta weight (β) of -.46, $t = -2.71$, $p<0.05$. Discipline has a Beta weight (β) of .41, $t = 2.14$, $p<0.05$. Attachment to parents has a Beta weight (β) of .23, $t = 2.44$, $p<0.05$. Parent Mental Health has a Beta weight (β) of .17, $t = 2.43$, $p<0.05$.

Based on the result, it could be seen that family violence, parental non-involvement, parental violent support, discipline, attachment to parents and parental mental health predict in-school adolescents bullying behaviours.

Hypothesis 5:

There is no specific parental factor significantly link to certain form of in-school adolescents' bullying behaviour.

Table 8 reveals that p-value is less than 0.05 significant level in the various forms of bullying behaviours. This implies specific parental factor significantly link to certain form of in-school adolescents' bullying behaviours. The table showed that family violence influenced physical bullying; parental abuse and neglect influenced physical, verbal, relational and sexual bullying behaviours; parental non-involvement influenced physical, verbal and sexual bullying behaviours; parental violent support influenced physical and relational bullying behaviours; parental communication influenced physical, verbal and relational bullying behaviours; parental monitoring/supervision influenced physical, verbal and sexual bullying behaviours; discipline influenced physical and verbal bullying behaviours; parent-child interaction influenced physical and verbal bullying behaviours; attachment to parents influenced physical, verbal and sexual bullying behaviours while parent mental health did not influence any bullying behaviour.

Table 8. Summary of Regression Coefficient showing Specific Parental Factor Linked to Certain form of Bullying Behaviours of the Respondents.

Variable	Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta			
Family Violence	(Constant)	47.81	4.58			10.43	.000
	Physical	.13	.02	.38		6.30	.000
Parental Abuse and Neglect	(Constant)	1.16	.07				
	Physical	.17	.01	.56		10.40	.000
	Verbal	-.06	.01	-.37		-4.93	.000
	Relational	-.05	.02	-.26		-2.69	.007
Parental non-Involvement	(Constant)	.94	.07				
	Physical	.20	.01	.59		11.02	.000
	Verbal	-.06	.01	-.33		-4.40	.000
	Sexual	.05	.02	.21		2.28	.023
Parental violent support	(Constant)	1.15	.07				
	Physical	.17	.01	.53		9.37	.000
	Relational	-.10	.02	-.42		-4.17	.000
Parental Communication	(Constant)	1.10	.07				
	Physical	.21	.01	.64		11.97	.000
	Verbal	-.03	.01	-.20		-2.66	.008
Parental Monitoring/Supervision	(Constant)	-.06	.02	-.28		-2.96	.003
	Physical	.22	.01	.64		12.39	.000
	Verbal	-.07	.01	-.38		-5.36	.000
Discipline	(Constant)	.07	.02	.26		3.00	.003
	Physical	1.97	.11			17.09	.000
	Verbal	.35	.02	.67		12.84	.000
Parent-Child Interaction	(Constant)	-.09	.02	-.31		-4.34	.000
	Physical	1.64	.12			13.68	.000
	Verbal	.35	.02	.65		12.30	.000
Attachment to parents	(Constant)	-.14	.02	-.44		-5.97	.000
	Physical	2.11	.13			16.22	.000
	Verbal	.21	.03	.40		6.73	.000
	Sexual	-.08	.02	-.26		-3.13	.002
Parent Mental Health	(Constant)	-.11	.04	-.28		-2.79	.005
	nil	nil	nil	nil		nil	nil

Discussion

The study revealed that, sizeable percentage of in-school adolescents were experiencing high level of negative parenting in terms of discipline, parent-child interaction and attachment to parents. Also, significant percentage of respondents reported experiencing moderate negative parenting in term of family violence, parental abuse and neglect, parental non-involvement, parental violent support, parental communication, parental monitoring/supervision while majority of the respondents

have minimal experience of negative parenting regarding parent mental health. The discovery is related to the research of Lincolne (2019), who found a high rate of negative parenting as more than one third of respondents believed they were doing a poor job as parents. This study's findings differ from those of Lincolne (2019) in that this study's respondents were adolescents, whereas Lincolne's respondents were parents. The two studies did discover that adolescents experience negative parenting in a variety of ways. The idea

put forth by Booster, Nissley-Tsiopinis, Van Dyke, and Power (2016) that parents frequently use negative parenting techniques (such as spanking, yelling, shaming, ordering the child around, and using unclear directives) in raising children is also in line with this.

The finding of the study revealed that parental factors significantly have influenced on in-school adolescents bullying behaviours. The finding supports the finding of Cross and Barnes (2014) who hypothesised that bullying and peer victimization are reciprocally influenced by family. Similarly, Vindiova (2014) asserted that children's experiences with their family environment, to some extent, determine their ability to adapt to the school environment both negative and positive ways.

In the findings, it was found that parental factors significantly predict in-school adolescents' bullying perpetration and victimization. The finding relates to the studies of Álvarez-García, García and Núñez (2015), Cook, Williams, Guerra, Kim and Sadek, (2010) who reported that parent-child relationships could be either important risk or protective factors for bullying perpetration and victimization. Likewise, Zurcher et al. (2018) and Govender and Young (2018) reported that authoritarian parenting behaviors served as a risk factor for bullying perpetration and victimization.

The finding showed that socioeconomic background of the parents did not significantly predict in-school adolescents' bullying perpetration and victimization. This suggests that the socioeconomic status of the parents did not have an impact on how bullying was committed and how teenagers were victimised at school. The results contradict a study by Jansen, Verlinden, Berkel, Mieloo, Ende, Veenstra, Verhulst, Jansen, and Tiemeier (2012) that found significant socioeconomic differences in bullying and victimisation in early elementary school: kids from lower socioeconomic families had a higher risk of engaging in bullying - either as a victim, bully, or bully-victim - than kids from

higher socioeconomic backgrounds. According to Tippet and Wolke (2014), bullying behaviours are predicted by socioeconomic status since both victims and bully-victims are more likely to come from low socioeconomic status households.

The result of the finding revealed that family violence, parental non-involvement, parental violent support, defective discipline, attachment to parents and parental mental health predict in-school adolescents' bullying behaviours compared to other parental factors. The finding supports the studies of Baldry and Farrington (2000); Dykas, Ziv and Cassidy (2008); Kokkinos (2013); Fanti, Demetriou and Hawa (2012), Gámez-Guadix, Straus, Carrobbles, Muoz-Rivas, and Almendros (2010); Gutman and Vorhaus (2012); Georgiou (2008); Papanikolaou et al., (2011) who reported that factors such as conflicts between parents, mental health of parents, attachment to parents, parental involvement and support, inconsistent and harsh discipline and parenting styles are predictors of bullying behaviour of in-school adolescents.

The finding revealed that specific parental factor significantly linked to certain form of in-school adolescents' bullying behaviours. It was discovered that all facets of dysfunctional parenting affected bullying's physical manifestation. It is discovered that only physical bullying was influenced by family violence. This backs up the findings of the 2011 study by Papanikolaou, Chatzikosma, and Kleio, which found that student fights with peers at school were influenced by parent-child disputes. Additionally, it has been discovered that physical, verbal, relational, and sexual bullying behaviours are affected by parental abuse and neglect. The discovery is consistent with studies by Lereya et al. (2013) and Veenstra et al. (2005) that found parental maltreatment, abuse, and neglect to be major contributors to student bullying. The results showed that parental neglect had an impact on verbal, physical, and sexual bullying behaviours. This supports Wolke and Skew's (2011) finding

that verbal bullying was associated with sibling composition and a lack of or unfavourable parental involvement. In the study, it was discovered that parental violent support influenced both relational and physical bullying behaviours. This supports the argument made by Bowers, Smith, and Binney (1992), who claimed that families with high levels of cohesion, parental involvement, and support, as well as parental overprotection, are more likely to produce physical bullies.

It was found that poor parental communication influenced physical, verbal and relational bullying behaviours. This finding coincides with the results of the research conducted by Buelga, Belén and María-Jesús (2017) who discovered that having restrictive (non-open) pattern of communication with the mother and avoidant communication with the father, predicted the role of verbal, relational and cyberbullying. Physical, verbal, and sexual bullying behaviours were also influenced by a lack of parental supervision or monitoring.

This is consistent with a study by Duff and Hood (2018) that found a negative correlation between parental supervision and the perpetration of cyberbullying and sexual bullying. Bullying behaviours, both physical and verbal, were found to be influenced by poor or harsh parental discipline. This is relevant to the research by Gamez-Guadix, Straus, Carrob-les, Muoz-Rivas, and Almendros (2010), who found that children who experience corporal punishment from their parents are more likely to engage in antisocial or negative behaviors. Bullying behaviours, both physical and verbal, were also found to be influenced by negative parent-child interactions.

The result of the study by Spriggs, Iannotti, and Nansel (2007) that parent-child interaction was linked to various bullying roles was further supported by the finding. According to Ulfah and Gustina (2020), adolescents' bullying behaviour at school is negatively predicted by their parents' poor communication styles. The conclusion showed that

overly close attachment to parents affected behaviours of physical, verbal, and sexual bullying. In a previous study, Cho, Hong, Sterzing, and Woo (2017) claimed that parental acceptance, warmth, and attachment could all help predict verbal bullying and victimisation among adolescents.

Conclusion

From the findings of this study, it was concluded that significant percentage of in-school adolescents in study area reported experiencing high level of negative parenting in terms of discipline, parent-child interaction and attachment to parents. They also experienced moderate level of negative parenting in term of family violence, parental abuse and neglect, parental non-involvement, parental violent support, parental communication, parental monitoring/supervision.

The negative parenting experience also predict both bullying perpetration and victimisation experience of in-school adolescents in the study locale with the exemption of the parents' socioeconomic background. Of the ten parental factors considered in this study, six (family violence, parental non-involvement, parental violent support, discipline, attachment to parents and parental mental health) significantly predict bullying behaviour of in-school adolescents in the study area.

All the ten parental factors considered in the study significantly linked with physical bullying, seven (Parental Abuse and Neglect, Parental Non-Involvement, parental poor communication, lack of monitoring and supervision, inappropriate discipline measure, parent-child interaction and attachment to parents) of the ten parental factors considered significantly connected with verbal bullying. Four of the ten parental factors (attachment to parents, Parental monitoring/Supervision, Parental non-Involvement and Parental Abuse and Neglect) considered linked with sexual bullying. Two (poor parental communication and parental

violent support) of the parental factors considered linked with relational bullying.

Implications for Counselling Practice

The findings of this study have some implications for Counsellors and counselling practice. The current study revealed that in-school adolescents reported experiencing negative parenting and that parental factors significantly influence in-school adolescents' bullying behaviours.

Counsellors must educate parents on how parenting practices and other parental factors affect children's bullying behaviour because Family violence, parental non-involvement, parental violent support, discipline, attachment to parents and parental mental health affect children's development. Counsellors must orientate parents on parenting methods including using severe and inconsistent punishment on children, which frequently result in child aggressiveness both within and outside the home. Counsellors could also encourage parents to take part in government-sponsored parenting education programs to assist them in their parenting duties.

The client and counsellor's relationship is one of mutual support in counselling. It is crucial to remember that students require help in dealing with bullying in school and at home. In order to introduce them to various tactics for behavioural modification, the professional counsellor should be prepared to identify students who exhibited bullying behaviour as a result of negative parental factors. The school counsellor can educate the teachers on the influence that parental factors have on adolescent bullying behaviour so as to help in identifying students that experience negative parenting for prompt intervention.

Recommendations

Based on the findings, the following recommendations were made:

- The parents should be encouraged to adopt the best parenting practices in the upbringing of their children to prevent bullying behaviours.
- Counsellors should organize regular seminars and conferences for parents to enlighten them on the methods to do away with negative parenting practice and adopt good parenting practices in bullying prevention interventions.
- Parental factors should be considered in the prevention and intervention programmes for all forms of bullying behaviours.
- Counsellors should engage in-school adolescents experiencing negative parenting in bullying prevention programme irrespective of their age, gender or school type

References

- Alegre, A. (2008). Parenting styles and children's emotional intelligence: What do we know? *Family Journal*, 19, 56–66.
DOI [10.1177/1066480710387486](https://doi.org/10.1177/1066480710387486).
- Atik, G., & Guneri, O. Y. (2013). Bullying and victimization: Predictive role of individual, parental, and academic factors. *School Psychology International*, 34(6), 658–673.
DOI [10.1177/0143034313479699](https://doi.org/10.1177/0143034313479699)
- Bada, S. O., Aderinto, S. & Adebayo, B. A. (2021). Parenting styles and bullying behaviour among adolescents in senior secondary schools in Ilorin West Local Government, Kwara State. *Nigerian Online Journal of Educational Sciences and Technology*, 3(1), 87-92.
- Baldry, A.C., & Farrington, D. P. (2000). Bullies and delinquents: Personal characteristics and parental styles. *Journal of Community and Applied social psychology*, 10, 17-31.
DOI [10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1298\(200001/02\)10:1<17::AID-CASP526>3.0.CO;2-M](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1298(200001/02)10:1<17::AID-CASP526>3.0.CO;2-M)

- Baumrind, D. (1991). Parenting styles and adolescent development. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 11(1) 56-95.
DOI [10.1177/02724316911111004](https://doi.org/10.1177/02724316911111004)
- Booster, G. D., Nissley-Tsiopinis, J., Van Dyke, D. & Power, T. J. (2016). Reductions in negative parenting practices mediate the effect of a family-school intervention for children with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. *School Psychology Review*, 45(2), 192–208.
- Bowers L, Smith PK. & Binney V. (1992). Cohesion and power in the families of children involved in bully/victim problems at school. *Journal of Family Therapy*, 14, 371-387.
DOI [10.1046/j.1992.00467.x](https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1992.00467.x)
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (2005). *Making human beings human: Bioecological perspectives on human development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Buelga, S., Belén M. & María-Jesús, C. (2017). Differences in family climate and family communication among cyberbullies, cybervictims, and cyber bully-victims in adolescents. *Computers in Human Behaviour*, 76: 164–73. DOI [10.1016/j.chb.2017.07.017](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.07.017)
- Carter, J. M. (2011). *Examining the relationship among physical and psychological health, parent and peer attachment, and cyberbullying in adolescents in urban and suburban environments*. Wayne State University Dissertations Michigan.
- Cho, S., Hong, J.S., Sterzing, P.R. & Woo, Y. (2017). Parental attachment and bullying in South Korean adolescents: mediating effects of low self-control, deviant peer associations, and delinquency. *Crime Delinq.*;63:1168–1188.
DOI [10.3389/fpsyg.2022.992053](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.992053)
- Cook, C. R., Williams, K. R., Guerra, N. G., Kim, T. E., & Sadek, S. (2010). Predictors of bullying and victimization in childhood and adolescence: A meta-analytic investigation. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 25(2), 65–83. DOI [10.1037/a0020149](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020149)
- Cross, D., & Barnes, A. (2014). Using Systems to understand and respond to family influences on Children's Behaviour. *Friendly Schools Friendly Families Program, Theory Into Practice*, 293-299.
DOI [10.1080/00405841.2014.947223](https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2014.947223)
- Darling, L. (2007). Parenting style and its correlates. Retrieved from www.9thealt.com/practioner/ceduc/parentingstyles/.htm
- Duff, A. L. & Hood, M. (2018). Understanding the relationship between sexual bullying and cyberbullying on Social Network Sites: The role of moderating factors. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 133: 103–8.
DOI [10.1016/j.paid.2017.04.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.04.004)
- Dykas, M. J., Ziv, Y., & Cassidy, J. (2008). Attachment and peer relations in adolescence. *Attachment & Human Development*, 10(2), 123–141.
DOI [10.1080/14616730802113679](https://doi.org/10.1080/14616730802113679)
- Fanti, K.A., Demetriou, A. D., &Hawa, V.V. (2012). A longitudinal study of cyberbullying: Examining riskand protective factors. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 9(2), 168-181.
DOI [10.1080/17405629.2011.643169](https://doi.org/10.1080/17405629.2011.643169)
- Gámez-Guadix, M., Straus, M. A., Carrobbles, J. A., Muñoz-Rivas, M. J., & Almendros, C. (2010). Corporal punishment and long-term behavior problems: The moderating role of positive parenting and psychological aggression. *Psicothema*, 22(4), 529-536. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21044474/>
- Georgiou, S. N. (2008). Bullying and victimization at school: The role of mothers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 78(1), 109–125.
DOI [10.1348/000709907X204363](https://doi.org/10.1348/000709907X204363)
- Gini, G., & Espelage, D. L. (2014). Peer victimization, cyber-bullying, and suicide risk in children and adolescents. *JAMA Pediatrics*, 312(5), 545. DOI [10.1001/jama.2014.3212](https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2014.3212)
- Gini, G., &Pozzoli, T. (2013). Bullied children and psychosomatic problems: A Meta analysis. *Pediatrics*, 132(4), 720–729. DOI [10.1542/peds.2013-0614](https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2013-0614)
- Govender, C. & Kelly, (2018). A comparison of gender, age, grade, and experiences of

- authoritarian parenting amongst traditional and cyberbullying perpetrators. *South African Journal of Education* 38: 1–11.
DOI [10.15700/saje.v38ns1a1519](https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v38ns1a1519)
- Gutman, L. M., & Vorhaus, J. (2012). *The impact of pupil behaviour and wellbeing on educational outcomes*. Child wellbeing research Centre. Department for Education, UK
- Hirschi, T., & Stark, R. (1969). Hellfire and delinquency. *Social Problems*, 17(2), 202–213.
DOI [10.2307/799866](https://doi.org/10.2307/799866)
- Jansen, P.W., Verlinden, M., Berkel, A. D., Mieloo, C., Ende, J., Veenstra, R., Verhulst, F. C., Jansen, W. & Tiemeier, H. (2012). Prevalence of bullying and victimization among children in early elementary school: Do family and school neighbourhood socioeconomic status matter?. *BMC Public Health*, 12, 494. DOI [10.1186/1471-2458-12-494](https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-12-494)
- Jeong, S., Kwak, D., Moon, B. & Miguel, C.S. (2013). Predicting school bullying victimization: focusing on individual and school environmental/security factors. *Hindawi Publishing Corporation Journal of Criminology*, 13-DOI [10.1155/2013/401301](https://doi.org/10.1155/2013/401301)
- Kljakovic, M., & Hunt, C. (2016). A meta-analysis of predictors of bullying and victimization in adolescence. *Journal of Adolescence*, 49, 134–145.
DOI [10.1016/j.adolescence.2016.03.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2016.03.002)
- Kokkinos, C. M. (2013). Bullying and victimization in early adolescence: Associations with attachment style and perceived parenting. *Journal of School Violence*, 12(2), 174–192.
DOI [10.1080/15388220.2013.766134](https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2013.766134)
- Kopko, K. (2007). *Parenting styles and adolescents*. Ithaca, Cornell University.
- Lee, C.H. (2009). Personal and interpersonal correlates of bullying behaviours among Korean middle school students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 25, 152–176.
DOI [10.1177/0886260510370591](https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260510370591)
- Lemstra, M. E., Nielsen, G., Rogers, M. R., Thompson, A. T., & Moraros, J. S. (2012). Risk indicators and outcomes associated with bullying in youth aged 9–15 years. *Canadian Journal of Public Health*, 103(1), 9–13.
DOI [10.1007/BF03404061](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03404061)
- Lincolne, P. (2019). Study finds 20 percent of mums and dads have been called “bad parents”. Retrieved from <https://babyology.com.au/parenting/relationships/study-finds-20-percent-of-mums-and-dads-have-been-called-bad-parents/>
- Meteyer, S. & Jenkins, D. (2009). Relationship of parenting style to behavioural adjustment of graduating high school seniors. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 27, 345–373.
DOI [10.9790/0837-21251017](https://doi.org/10.9790/0837-21251017)
- Mulvaney, M. K., & Mebert, C. J. (2007). Parental corporal punishment predicts behaviour problems in early childhood. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 21(3), 389. DOI [10.1037/0893-3200.21.3.389](https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.21.3.389)
- Mustapha, M. L. A., Bolu-Steve, F. N & Ajiboye, S. K (2017). Family background and bullying behaviours of in-school adolescents in Ilorin metropolis. *Ife Journal of Behavioural Research* 9(1&2), 78-87.
- Mustapha, M. L. A. (2020). Emotional intelligence indices as predictors of bullying behavior forms among in – school adolescents in Kwara State, Nigeria. *Malaysian Online Journal of Psychology and Counseling*, 7(2), 14-29. <https://ejournal.um.edu.my/index.php/MOJC/article/view/27431>
- Nocentini, A., Fiorentini, G., Di Paola, L., & Menesini, E. (2019). Parents, family characteristics and bullying behavior: A systematic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 45, 41–50.
DOI [10.1016/j.avb.2018.07.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2018.07.010)
- Nwazuoke, A. I. (2004). *Correlates of creativity in high achieving Nigerian children*. Unpublished Doctoral thesis, Department of Guidance and Counseling, University of Ilorin, Ilorin.

- Olujinmi, A. (2012). Parenting styles and student academic achievement in selected secondary schools. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 9(2), 181-192. DOI [10.6007/IJARBSS/v7-i14/3677](https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v7-i14/3677)
- Papanikolaou, M., Chatzikosma, T., & Kleio, K. (2011). Bullying at School: The role of family. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29, 433–442. DOI [10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.11.260](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.11.260).
- Rosenthan, A. S. (2002). *Parent-adolescent conflict and adolescent functioning in a collectivist, ethnically heterogeneous culture*. Malaysia. Unpublish PhD. Dissertation, Ohio State University.
- Segrin, C., Woszidlo, A., Givertz, M., Bauer, A., & Murphy, M. T. (2012). The association between over parenting, parent-child communication, and entitlement and adaptive traits in adult children. *Family Relations: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies*, 61(2), 237–252. DOI [10.1111/j.1741-3729.2011.00689.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2011.00689.x)
- Simpkins, S. D., Riggs, N. R., Ngo, B., Ettekal, A. V., & Okamoto, D. (2016). Designing culturally responsive organized after-school activities. *Journal of Adolescent Research*. DOI [10.1177/0743558416666169](https://doi.org/10.1177/0743558416666169)
- Spriggs, A. L, Iannotti, R. J. & Nansel, T. R (2007). Adolescent bullying involvement and perceived family, peer and school relations: commonalities and differences across race/ethnicity. *J Adolesc Health*. 41(3):283–293. DOI [10.1016/j.jadohealth.2007.04.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2007.04.009)
- Swearer, S., & Doll, B. (2001). Bullying in schools: An ecological framework. *Journal of Emotional Abuse*, 2(2-3), 7-23. DOI [10.1300/J135v02n02_02](https://doi.org/10.1300/J135v02n02_02).
- Tippett, N., & Wolke, D. (2014). Socioeconomic status and bullying: a meta-analysis. *American Journal of Public Health*, 104(6), e48–e59. URL: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4061998/>
- Ulfah, M. & Gustina, E. (2020). Bullying behaviour among students. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, 9(3), 644-649. DOI [10.11591/ijere.v9i3.20437](https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v9i3.20437)
- Van As, N. M. C., & Janssens, J. M. A. M. (2002). Relationships between child behaviour problems and family functioning: A literature review. *International Journal of Child & Family Welfare*, 1(2), 40-51.
- Wilson, P., Rush, R., Hussey, S., Puckering, C. H, Sim, F., Allely, C. S., Doku, P., McConnachie & A., Gillberg, Ch. (2012). How evidence-based is an 'evidence-based parenting program'? A PRISMA systematic review and meta-analysis of Triple P. *BMC Medicine*, 10(130), DOI [10.1186/1741-7015-10-130](https://doi.org/10.1186/1741-7015-10-130).
- Wokoma, I. & Udochukwu, N. (2020). The influence of parenting styles on bullying behavior among students of secondary age in Ikerre Local Government Area. *International Journal on Integrated Education*, 3. 99-114. DOI [10.38155/ksbd.835283](https://doi.org/10.38155/ksbd.835283)
- Wolke, D. & Skew, A. J. (2011). Family factors, bullying victimisation and wellbeing in adolescents. *Longitudinal and Life Course Studies*, 3(1), 101-119. DOI [10.14301/llcs.v3i1](https://doi.org/10.14301/llcs.v3i1).
- Zurcher, J. D., Holmgren, H. G., Coyne, C. M., Barlett, C. P. & Yang, C. (2018). Parenting and cyberbullying across adolescence. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking* 21: 294–303. DOI [10.1089/cyber.2017.0586](https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2017.0586)