**INFLUENCEOFSELFEFFICACYONBULLYINGAND**

**VICTIMIZATION AMONGPRE-ADOLESCENTS**

**MUFEEDA T.**

**Dissertation**

**Submitted to the University of Calicut**

**In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of**

**MASTER OF EDUCATION**

****

**FAROOK TRAINING COLLEGE**

**UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT**

**2015**

**DECLARATION**

I,**MUFEEDA T**, do hereby declare that this dissertation, “**INFLUENCE OF SELF EFFICACY ON BULLYING AND VICTIMIZATION AMONG PRE-ADOLESCENTS”**has not been submitted by me for the award of any Degree, Diploma, Title or Recognition before.

Farook Training College

Date: **MUFEEDA T.**

**Dr. K. VIJAYAKUMARI**

Associate Professor

Farook Training College

Calicut

**CERTIFICATE**

I, **Dr. K. VIJAYAKUMARI**., do hereby certify that this dissertation, **“INFLUENCE OF SELF EFFICACY ON BULLYING AND VICTIMIZATION AMONG PRE-ADOLESCENTS”**is a record of bonafide study and research carried out by **MUFEEDA T.**under my supervision and guidance. The report has not been submitted by her for the award of any Degree, Diploma, Title or Recognition before.

Farook Training College, **Dr. K. VIJAYAKUMARI**

Date: ***(Supervising Teacher)***

***Acknowledgements***

*At the very outset the investigator thanks to God, the most merciful and most gracious, who enabled her to complete the task successfully.*

*The investigator underlines the sense of profound indebtedness which undoubtedly owes to her supervising teacher,* ***Dr. Vijayakumari. K.*** *Associate Professor, Farook Training College, which cannot be expressed in words. She has been an unending source of inspiration, a spring of corrective suggestions and invaluable advice and encouragement which have been boost for the investigator from the beginning to the end.*

*The investigator expresses her thanks to* ***Dr. C.A Jawahar,*** *Principal, Farook Training College, for providing all necessary facilities and encouragement to conduct the study. Thanks are all due to all teaching and non teaching staff of Farook Training College, especially to* ***Dr. P. Rekha****, Asst. Professor, Farook Training College.*

*The investigator is obliged to the principals, teachers and students of various Upper Primary schools in Kozhikode, Malappuram and Kannur,who extended their support to collect the data related to this study.*

*The investigator acknowledges the immense moral support and encouragement received from her family and friends who have been a constant source of inspiration for the study.*

*Farook Training College*

*Date:* **MUFEEDAT.**

**CONTENTS**

**LIST OF TABLES**

**LIST OF FIGURES**

**LIST OF APPENDICES**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Chapter** | **Title** | **Page No.** |
| **I** | **INTRODUCTION** | **1-18** |
| **II** | **REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE** | **19-53** |
| **III** | **METHODOLOGY** | **54-73** |
| **IV** | **ANALYSIS** | **74-111** |
| **V** | **SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS** | **112-123** |
|  | **REFERENCES** | **124-137** |
|  | **APPENDICES** |  |

**LIST OF TABLES**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table No.** | **Title** | **Page No** |
| 1 | Critical ratio with mean and standard deviation of items for the Bullying scale | 64 |
| 2 | Critical ratio with mean and standard deviation of items for Victimization scale | 65 |
| 3 | Details of Items under Different Dimensions of Self efficacy | 69 |
| 4 | Preliminary Statistics of Self efficacy, Bullying and Victimization | 79 |
| 5 | Mean and Standard deviation of the variable Self efficacy for the Total sample and Relevant subsamples based on Gender, Type of management and Residential status of parents | 83 |
| 6 | Mean and Standard deviation of the variable Bullying for the Total sample and Relevant subsamples based on Gender, Type of management and Residential status of parents | 86 |
| 7 | Mean and Standard deviation of the variable Victimization for the Total sample and Relevant subsamples based on Gender, Type of management and Residential status of parents | 88 |
| 8 | Critical ratio for mean scores of Self efficacy for the subgroups based on Gender and Residential status of parents | 91 |
| 9 | Critical ratio for mean scores of Bullying for the subgroups based on Gender and Residential status of parents | 93 |
| 10 | Critical value for comparison of Victimization for the classificatory variable Gender and Residential status of parents | 95 |
| 11 | One way ANOVA of Self efficacy for students studying in Government, Aided and Unaided schools | 97 |
| 12 | One way ANOVA of Bullying for students studying is Government, Aided and Unaided students | 98 |
| 13 | One way ANOVA of Victimization for students studying in Government, Aided and Unaided schools | 99 |
| 14 | Pearson’s Product Moment Coefficient of Correlation for Self efficacy with Bullying and Victimization of pre-adolescents | 100 |
| 15 | Influence of Self efficacy on Bullying among pre-adolescents | 104 |
| 16 | Mean, standard deviation and size of Low-, Average - and High – Self efficacy groups in Bullying and Victimization behaviour | 105 |
| 17 | Mean comparison of Bullying behaviour on the basis of Self efficacy using Scheffe’s test | 105 |
| 18 | Influence of Self efficacy on Victimization among pre-adolescents | 106 |
| 19 | Mean comparison of victimization behavior on the basis of Self efficacy using Scheffe’s test | 107 |

**LIST OF FIGURES**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FigureNo.** | **Title** | **Page No** |
| 1 | Split up of the basal sample | 60 |
| 2 | Histogram for Self efficacy | 80 |
| 3 | Histogram for Bullying | 81 |
| 4 | Histogram for Victimization | 82 |
| 5 | Scatter diagram showing a slight negative relationship between Self efficacy and Bullying | 101 |
| 6 | Scatter diagram showing a negligible negative relationship between Self efficacy and Victimization | 102 |

**LIST OF APPENDICES**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Appendices No** | **Title** |
| I | Bullying and Victimization Scale |
| II | Self efficacy Questionnaire |
| III | List of Schools selected for data collection |

**CHAPTER I**

**INTRODUCTION**

* Need and significance
* Statement of the problem
* Definition of key terms
* Objectives
* Hypotheses
* Methodology
* Scope and limitations of the study
* Organisation of the report

Education is the process of developing the inner abilities and powers of an individual. It aims at an all round and total perfection of individual and society. The function of education is not merely to supply knowledge to the individual, but to develop in him desirable habits, interest, skills and emotions.It sublimates the basic instincts in a child to socially useful activities, habits of thinking and behaving and inculcates higher moral and social ideals together with spiritual values, so that he is able to form a strong character useful to his own self and the society of which he is an integral part.

Education has to make the individual capable of satisfying and prepare for the future life. It culturizes the child promoting social and refined patterns of behaviour and develops all his intellectual and emotional powers, so that he is able to meet the problems of life and solve them successfully. It also develops the social qualities of service, tolerance, co-operation and fellow feeling.

Behaviour of the child is influenced by a number of factors,thefamily,society, school, being some of them. Behaviours, which show a lack of feeling and concern for the welfare of others are known as anti-social behaviours. One such anti-social behaviour is aggression. It refers to some behaviour intended to harm or destroy another person who is motivated to avoid such treatment. All children are occasionally aggressive and some are more aggressive than others. Childhood aggression is a problem faced by many of the teachers and parents. It range from the least harmful kind of aggression (e.g, calling someone a name for psychologically upsetting) to the more serious onesto inflict physical injury on another person or damage property.

Usually children start being physically aggressive towards things rather than people, from around two or four years of age. After four, many children are more likely to use verbal rather than physical aggression. This is intended to hurt someone’s feelings. From about six or seven many children channel their energies more into competition and sports.Outburst of aggression are increasingly likely to be controlled as the child grows.

According to Bandura (1973), the Social Learning theorist, many aspects of aggression can be explained by social influence. The aggression in his words is learned through a mixture of tuition, observation, imitation, reinforcement and punishment.

**Need and Significance of the study**

Theparents, educators,administrators,other educational expertsare responsible for the formation of good behaviour among children.The school is to be a place of training, providing him with lot of experiences of life thus mirroring the outside society. But now a day school and social environment is not as much congenial as the level of general expectancy. School crime and violence have recently received much public attention. This is a serious issue to be considered by the academicsimmediately.

Researchers’ attention has now focused on schoolbasedprogrammes to understanding and presenting a specific form of aggression labelledbullying(Cornell, 2006).Bullying has conceptualized as a distinct type of aggression characterized by a repeated and systematic abuse of power (Olweus, 1999; Smith & Sharp, 1994). Research indicates that 10 to 30 percentage of children and youth are involved inbullying, although prevalence rates vary significantly as function ofhow bullying is measured (Nansel, Overpeck, Pilla, Ruan, Simons-Morton, &Scheidt 2001; Solberg &Olweus, 2003). This bully nature of child causes the emergence of villains in the society.

Students who are engaged in bullying behaviours seems to have a need to feel powerful and in control. The bully also may be aggressivetowards teachers and parents. They appear to derive satisfaction from inflicting injury and suffering on others, seem to have little empathy for their victims and they try to defend their actions by establishing that the pure course is the victim who provoked him to such an action. Generally bullies are characterized by impulsivity and a strong need to dominate others.

One of the most prevalent issues facing school personnel today is school violence and the threat of this behaviour to a safe school environment. Between 1997 and 1998, several schoolshootings occurred across the United States resulting in 40 deaths (Macallair,& Males,2000). The most frequent motivation for these shootings wasrevenge for being bullied (Dedman, 2000). As a result, United States of America have introduced changes in Federal,state, and local statutes regarding school safety (Garrity, Jens, Porter, Sagar, & Short-Camilli,1997). According to Ferrell-Smith (2004), 16 states have passed anti-bullying laws since1999 that define bullying, establish policies that prohibit this behaviour, and ensure that parentsand students are aware and have a clear understanding of this policy.

Bullying is the repeated, unprovoked aggressive behaviours that can be either physical orpsychological and include verbal harassment, gestures, and exclusion, or simply pressure toconform in which there is an actual or perceived power imbalance between the bully and thevictim (Bently& Li, 1995; Boulton& Underwood, 1992; Olweus, 1991; Veenstra, Lindenberg, Oldehinkel, De Winter, Verhulst&Ormel, 2005).

Bullying was once thought of as a harmless behaviour or a “rite of passage”; however, it is nowknown to have long-term effects for both the bully and the victim (Dedman, 2000). Brewster andRailsback (2001) report that 16,000 students are absent from school daily due to fear of an attackor intimidation by a bully, 7percent of eighth graders stay home at least once a month because ofbullies, and 20percent of students are scared throughout much of the school day. They further suggest that these percentages underestimate actual occurrences of bullying.

Many students do not report bullying because they believe adults are unsympathetic and rarelytry to stop bullying even when they are informed (Limber, 2002). As a result, victims feel thatthis lack of action creates an environment in which bullying is accepted. According to the U.S.Departments of Education and Justice (2000), bullying is probably the most rampant andunderreported problem facing the nation’s school systems.

A number of initiatives have been undertaken to address this threat to students and a safeschool environment. Attempts like No Child Left Behind (NCLB)legislation, advocate for all children a safe learning environment. Through the NCLB Act, theU.S. Department of Education provides funding for research in the area of school violence andrequires all school systems to submit a report card related to school safety issues (U.S.Department of Education, 2002).

The bully nature of child leads to another groups in the classrooms. Theyarevictims,whocannoteasilydefend himorherself. The term victimization extent the construct to account for the measurable psychological and physical harm experiences by the victim of bullying. Victim of bullying often suffer long term psychological problems including loneliness, diminishingself-esteem, psychosomatic complaintsand depression (Hawker and Boulton, 2000; Heino,Rimpela,Rantanen&Rimpela,2000).Theymaylacksocial skills and friends, and they are socially isolated. Olweus(1993) pointed out thatbullyingpeaks during the middle school years and decreasing precipitously during the high school years.

So many factors are affecting bullying and victimization.The causes of bullying and victimization are categorized as individual, family dysfunction, mass media, peer influence and psychological factors.Self-efficacy is the extent or strength of one’s own ability to complete tasks and reach goals. It affects every area of human endeavour. Social cognitive theory claims thatself efficacy has been shown to predict a wide range of specific social and cognitive competences, determines the way people interact with their social environment andarranges their social relationships. Self- efficacy beliefs for social interactionand academic performance facilitate and ‘protect’ children’s and adolescents’ psychological adjustment (Caprara,2004). Youngsters with a high sense of personal efficacy in key life domains, such as academic performance and social interactions, are more likely to face challenges in a persevering and relatively anxiety- free manner (Bandura, 1977). On the contrary, those with low self - efficacy are likely to engage in, among other maladaptive behaviours, bullying and victimization(Jarvinen&Pakasiahti, 1999). Research (Natwig, 2001) has revealed that an increasing degree of general Self-efficacy was associated with an increased risk of Bullying behaviour.

As a result of globalisation, even remote villages have enough facilities to interact globally, surely a positive aspect of liberalisation, privatisation and globalisation. But at the same time, the cultural beliefs were also changed, and the evidences of bullying and victimization outside India are applicable to Indian situation. Kerala is the educationally developed state in Indiaand the academic environment in Kerala is far better than other states in India. Even then, studies report the bullying behaviour among students of Kerala. Hence it will be relevant to study the extent of bullying and victimization and Self Efficacy among preadolescent students and their inter relationships, the findings of which will give a clear idea about the classrooms in Kerala and help the administrators to form future policies and programmes.

**Statement of the Problem**

The present study is entitled as “INFLUENCE OF SELFEFFICACY ON BULLYING AND VICTIMIZATION AMONG PRE-ADOLESCENTS”.

**Definition of Key Terms**

**Influence**

The dictionary meaning of ‘Influence’ is that, ‘The capacity or power ofa personorthings to be compelling force on or produce effects on the actions, behaviours, opinions etc.of others.

In the present study ‘influence’ means the extent of relationship of selfefficacy with bullying and victimization, tested through Pearson’s Product Moment coefficient of correlation and mean comparison.

**Self- efficacy**

Self – efficacy is defined as the personal judgment of one’s capabilities to organize and execute courses of actions, to attain designated goals and to organize their psychological functioning. (Bandura, 1977)

The term self-efficacy in the study stands for the score obtainedby a respondent in self-efficacy questionnaire - children by Muris, (2001).

**Bullying**

Bullying is usually defined as being an aggressive, intentional act or behaviour that is carried out by a group or an individual repeatedly and overtime against a victim who cannot easily defend him / herself (Olweus,1993).

The term bullying in the study stands for the extent of bullying behaviour of a respondent represented by the total score obtained for the items on bullying behaviour by him or herin ‘Bullying and victimization scale’developed by the investigator.

**Victimization**

Victimization means sustaining physical or mental injury caused by an intentional act or deed of another (Rigby, 2002).

The term victimization in the study stands for the extent of victimization behaviour of a respondent represented by the score obtained by him or her for the same from the ‘Bullying and victimization scale’.

**Pre-adolescents**

The developmental period preceding puberty, approximately between the age of 10 and 12 in girls and 11 and 13 in boys is the pre-adolescence stage. (Basavanna, 2000).

The term pre-adolescents in the study stands for the students studying in standards V, VI, VII of schools in Kerala.

**Objectives**

The objectives set for the study are

1. To find out the extent of Self efficacy among pre-adolescents for the total sample and relevant subsamples based on
2. Gender
3. Type of management and
4. Residential status of parents.
5. To find out the extent of Bullying among pre-adolescents for the total sample and relevant subsamples based on
6. Gender
7. Type of management and
8. Residential status of parents.
9. To find outthe extent ofVictimization among pre-adolescents for the total sample and relevant subsamples based on
10. Gender
11. Type of management and
12. Residential status of parents.
13. To compare the extent of Self efficacy among pre-adolescents between subgroups based on
14. Gender
15. Type of management and
16. Residential status of parents.
17. To compare the extent of Bullying among pre-adolescents between subgroups based on
18. Gender
19. Type of management and
20. Residential status of parents.
21. To compare the extent ofVictimization among pre-adolescents between subgroups based on
22. Gender
23. Type of management and
24. Residential status of parents.
25. To find out the relationship of Self efficacy with Bullying among pre-adolescents.
26. To find out the relationship of Self efficacy with Victimization among pre-adolescents.
27. To find out whether Bullying differ among pre-adolescents with high-, average - and low - Self-efficacy.
28. To find out whether Victimization differ among pre-adolescents with high-, average - and low - Self efficacy.

**Hypotheses**

The hypotheses formulated for the study are

1. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of Self efficacy among pre-adolescents between the subgroups based on
2. Gender
3. Type of management and
4. Residential status of parents.
5. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of Bullying among pre-adolescents between the subgroups based on
6. Gender
7. Type of management and
8. Residential status of parents.
9. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of Victimization among pre-adolescents between the subgroups based on
10. Gender
11. Type of management and
12. Residential status of parents.
13. Self efficacy has significant relationship with Bullying behaviours among pre-adolescents.
14. Self efficacy has significant relationship with Victimization behaviours among pre-adolescents.
15. Bullying behaviour significantly differ among pre-adolescents with high-, average- and low - Self efficacy.
16. Victimization behaviour significantly differ among pre-adolescents with high-, average - and low - Self efficacy.

**Methodology**

**Designofthestudy**

Thepresentworkisaquantitativestudy.Herethe investigator attempted to findtheinfluenceofSelf-efficacyonBullyingand victimization by using the ‘survey method’.

**Variables of the study**

Majorvariablesunder study areSelf-efficacy, Bullyingand Victimization.

Here Self-efficacy is theindependent variable and Bullying and Victimization are the dependent variables.

As the study tries to find out gender difference in the variables under study, gender was taken as a classificatory variable.

The school environment, the rules and norms of the school etc. may influence the behaviour of the learners and hence type of management of the school was taken as another classificatory variable.

The family environment also influences the individuals behaviour. It is observed that in many cases the presence and influence of parents is ultimate in child’s behaviour. Hence the residential status of the parents was also considered as a classificatory variable.

**Sample**

The population of study is upper primary school students in Kerala. The study was conducted on a sample of 625 upper primary school students from three revenue districts of Kerala via; Kannur, Calicut and Malappuram.

**Tools for Data Collection**

The following are the tools used for thestudy.

1. ‘BullyingandVictimization Scale’tomeasure Bullyingandvictimizationofpreadolescentsprepared by the investigator.
2. Self - efficacy questionnaire for children (Muris, 2001).

**Statistical Techniques Used**

The following statistical techniques were used for the analysis of collected data.

1. Preliminary analysis

2. Test of significance of difference between means for two large independentgroups.

3. Pearson’s product moment coefficient of correlation.

4. On-way ANOVA, with Scheffe test as follow up.

**Scope and Limitations of the Study**

The study tried to find out the Influence of Self-efficacyon BullyingandVictimizationamongpre-adolescents. It also analyses the relationship of Self efficacy on Bullying and Victimization. Standardized tools with reliability and validity were used to measure the variables. The sample of the study includes 625upper primary school students of Kannur, Calicut and Malappuramdistricts of Kerala selected using stratified sampling technique. Adequate representation of strata like gender and type of management was given to enable the generalisation of the result to the entire population. The investigator hopes that the study yields reliable results, the findings of which will help the students to improve their self efficacy and control their Bullying and Victimization behaviour.

Even though attempt was made to make the study as accurate and precise as possible, some limitations may be there, some of which are listed below.

* Due to the shortage of time, the investigator failed to collect data from all districts of Kerala. Data was collected from three revenue districts only.
* Theoretical /logical validity of the tool was ensured, but it was not established statistically or empirically.
* The population of the study was upper primary school students. But data was collected only from seventh standard students.

**Organisation of the Report**

The report has been presented in five chapters and each chapter is explained in the relevant subunits,

**Chapter 1** contains a brief introductionto the problem, need and significance of the study, objectives, hypotheses, methodology and scope and limitations of the study.

**Chapter 2** presents the theoretical overview of the concerned variables and review of related studies.

**Chapter 3** gives an account of the methodology of the study in detail. It includes objectives, hypotheses, variables,description of tools, sample drawn, data collection procedure and statistical techniques used for analysis.

**Chapter 4** describes the statistical analysis andinterpretation of data, conclusion and tenability of hypotheses.

**Chapter 5** deals with the summary of study, major findings, educational implications of the study and suggestions for further research in the area.

**CHAPTER II**

**REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

* **Theoretical Overview**
* **Review of Related studies**

**REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

Review of related literature is an important aspect of any investigation. Any worthwhile study in any field of knowledge requires an adequate familiarity with the work which has already been done over the same area. “A summary of the writings of recognized authorities and of previous research provides evidence that the researcher is familiar with what is already known and what is still unknown and untested”(Best & Kahn, 2010).It is a valuable guide to defining the problem, recognizing its significance, suggesting promising data gathering devices, appropriate study design and sources of data.

The result of the review is summarized in this chapter. For convenience, this has been attempted in two sections. The first section is the theoretical overview related to the variables of the study. The second section provides a review of the studies conducted in the field.

**Theoretical Overview**

It includes the concepts of Bullying and Victimization as well as Self-efficacy.

**The Concept of Bullying and Victimization**

Bullying in schools is a serious issue of widespread concern. The systematic examination of the nature and prevalence of school bullying only began with the work of Olweus in 1970s in Scandinavia. The concept originally used in Scandinavian languages to refer bullying as mobbing and the phenomenon was described as someone shows unpleasant behaviour (rude and mean behaviour), abuse and mistreatment to others.

**Definitions of Bullying**

Bullying can be defined in different ways, depending on its context. The definitions of Bullying will give clear picture about victimization also.

In the words of Askew (1989) bullying is a continuum that involves an attempt to gain power and dominance over other.Ronald (1989) defined bullying as ‘long standing violence, physical or mental, conducted by an individual or group and directed against an individual who is not able to defend himself in the actual situation’.Randall (1991) defined bullying in terms of aggression. According to him ‘bullying is an aggressive behaviour arising out of a deliberate intent to cause physical or psychological distress to others’.Farrington (1993) considered bullying as a repeated oppression of a less powerful person by a more powerful person or a group of persons.Olweus (1994) has given a clear meaning to bullying as ‘a person is bullied when he or she is exposed repeatedly over time to negative actions by one or more others, excluding cases where two children of similar physical and psychological strength are fighting’. According to Smith and Sharp (1994) a student is bullied when another student says nasty and unpleasant things to him or her and when a student is hit, kicked, threatened, locked inside a room, send nasty notes and when no ever talks to him.

The experience among children of being a target of aggressive behaviour of other children, who are not siblings and not necessarily age mates can be considered as bullying (Hawker &Boulton,2000). Rigby (2002) had made a distinction between interpersonal conflicts or rough play and bullying as teasing and conflict are part of growing up, bullying is an extreme form of peer conflict or teasing and can be harmful both physically and psychologically. Bullying, according to Reynolds (2003) is the use of physical, psychological or direct verbal means either individually or in a group to cause physical or psychological distress to others. The repeated, unprovoked aggressive behaviours intended to harm or disturb another person is bullying according toVeenstra, et al., (2005).

**Components of Bullying**

Three most common components of bullying are the power imbalance, repetitive action and intentional actions (Olweus,1994). When there is a imbalance of power, it is hard for the target to defend himself against the bullies attacks (Boulton& Under wood,1992).This difference in power may be physical or psychological. In cases of physical imbalances, the bully may be a gang of bullies targeting the victim, whereas, psychological imbalances are harder to distinguish. The result of any power imbalance is that the target of the bullying feel weak, oppressed, threatened and vulnerable.

The second component is repetitive actions. Bullying is not a single act of meanness. Instead, it is usually ongoing and sustained. Bullies often target their victims multiple times (Bently& Li, 1995; Olweus, 1991). It will include a variety of actions such as calling target names, tripping them in the halls and posting mean comments online or demanding homework or lunch money. But isolated incidents do not come under bullying

The third component intentional actions (Bently& Li, 1995; Olweus, 1991) means that, bullies harass other people on purpose. Their behaviour is not accidental and it is not a “joke”. There is nothing fun about bullying for the victim. Bullying can become so mean that the target can begin to feel anxious and worry about going to school.

**Types of Bullying**

The different types of bullying are physical bullying, verbal bullying, relational aggression and cyber bullying. Bullying can be physical, verbal or relational(Bjurkquist, Lagerspetz&Kaukiainen,1992),Griffin and Gross (2004) classified bullying as direct and indirect.Direct bullying is when bully openly attacks the victim either physicallyor verbally(Olweus, 1991). Indirect or relational bullying involvesbehaviours that include manipulating relationships by withdrawing,threatening to withdraw or excluding from friendship.

Physical bullying is the most obvious form of bullying. It occurs when kids use physical action to gain power and control over their targets. Physical bullies tend to be bigger, stronger and more aggressive than their peers. Examples of physical bullying include kicking, hitting, punching, slopping, shoving, physical assault and direct vandalism. (Hanish&Gurra, 2000; Hawker &Boulton, 2000).Unlike the other form of bullying, physical bullying is the easiest to identify.

Perpetrators of verbal bullying use words, statements, hurtful name calling, emotional intimidation, persistent teasing, gossip and recist remarks as well as social exclusion (Mishna, 2003). Researches have shown that verbal bullying and name calling has serious consequences. In fact it can leave deep emotional scars, but are difficult to identify the verbal bullying as it is often one person’s word against another person’s word.

Relational aggression is defined as aggression directed at damaging a relationship put another way. In relational aggression, relationships are used as means to harm (Crick&Grotpeter,1996).Relational bullying or bullying with exclusionary tactics, involves deliberately preventing someone from joining or being part of group, whether it is at a lunch table, game, sport or social activity. The goal behind a relationally aggressive bully is to increase their own social standing by controlling or bullying another person. In general, girls tend to use relational aggression more than boys, especially between fifth and eighth grade (Crick, 1996; Olweus, 1991).

In recent years, a new form of aggression or bullying has emerged, labelled ‘cyber bullying’. in which the aggression occurs through modern technological devices like internet, cell phone or other technology to harass, threaten, embarrass or target another person, posting hurtful messages, making online threats and sending hurtful emails or text (Li, 2006). Cyber bullying also include stealing person’s account information to break into their account and send damaging messages, taking unflattering pictures of a person and spreading them through mobile phones or the internet, sexting or circulating sexually suggestive pictures or messages about a person. Different types of cyber bullying were reported ranging from flaming to cyber stalking. Willard (2004) identified seven different categories of common cyber bullying actions. It include flaming, online harassment, cyber stalking, denigration (put down), masquerade (sending or posting material that makes that person look bad), outing (sending sensitive private embracing information about a person) and exclusion (cruelly excluding someone from an online group)

**Types of Participants**

Bullying generally involves three types of participants; the bully, the victim and the bystanders. These roles are not usually fixed and children can oscillate among roles. Young people within each of these groups share many similarities. Each group can be further divided into subgroups of students with different personalities, motivation and behaviours.

In a 1978 study Olweus described the three different types of participants of bully; the aggressive bully, the passive bully and the bully victim.

**Characteristics**

*The bully*

According to the American Heritage Dictionary (1996) a bully is “a person who is habitually cruel or overbearing, especially to smaller or weaker people; a hired ruffian; a thug”. Additionally, relational bullying can come in the form of social isolation, gossiping, intentionally leaving a student out of activities, spreading rumours, and other methods to seek changes in peer groups (Olweus, 1993). Bullies may exhibit oppositional and defiant behaviours toward adults and are more likely to break school rules, drink, smoke, drop out of school, steal property, be truant, and carry a weapon to school. Contrary to previous beliefs, bullies may also have average or above average self-esteem, be popular, and have average or above average grades in elementary school; however, in junior high, bullies tend to be less popular and have lower grades (Brewster &Railsback, 2001;Nansel, Overpeck, Pilla, Ruan, Simons-Morton &Scheidt, 2001).

One distinct characteristic that bullies seem to have in common is an aggressive personality type. A connection exists between children who display aggressive behaviours and bullying (Olweus, 1991). According to Brewster and Railsback (2001),characteristics of bully are

* regularly engages in teasing, name calling, and intimidation of others
* believes he/she is superior to other students
* frequently initiates fights with others who are, or are believed to be, weaker
* little empathy for others.

Although a single cause has not been identified for bullying, certain risk factors may predispose children to aggressive behaviours (Olweus, 1991; Orpinas& Horne, 2006). Risk factors are defined as “characteristics of an individual or environment that increase the likelihood that an individual will behave in a certain way” (Orpinas& Horne, 2006). Veenstra et al., (2005) state that the parents of bullies often use physical punishment as a form of discipline and are permissive of aggressive behaviours. Four factors related to rearing practices are conducive to the development of aggressive personality types (Brewster &Railsback, 2001; Olweus, 1991):

1. The emotional attitude of the caregiver – if the caregiver has a negative emotional attitude; one that lacks warmth and involvement.

2. Permissiveness for aggressive behaviour – if the caretaker is tolerant of aggressive behaviour and does not set appropriate limits and boundaries for aggressive behaviour.

3. Physical punishment and violent emotional outburst – if these methods are used by caretakers.

4. Temperament of the child – “hotheaded” children are more likely to develop aggressive behaviours.

*The victim*

Victims of bullying display poor psychosocial functioning and are withdrawn, depressed, anxious, cautious, quiet, and insecure (Olweus, 1991, 1997; Schuster, 1996; Veenstra et al., 2005). Victims often experience loneliness, anxiety, low self-esteem, increased school absences, increased health issues, and suicidal thoughts (Rigby, 1996). Victims tend to be less popular than bullies and are often social isolates with few friends (Olweus, 1991, 1997). Additionally, victims are often physically weaker or convey a message to others that they are insecure and weak (Bently& Li, 1995; Olweus, 1997). These behaviours do not typically develop during school-age years but are present early in life. Family members of victims report that these children are cautious and sensitive at a young age (Olweus, 1991, 1997). Veenstra et al., (2005) suggest that over protection and poor identification with parents contribute to victimization.

There are two different types of victims: provocative and passive-anxious (Olweus,1991).Provocative victims are hot-tempered, restless, and anxious. This type of victim will retaliate; however, they represent less than 5 percent of all victims. Passive-anxious victims are sensitive and insecure. They do not provoke attacks from bullies, nor will they defendthemselves when attacked (Olweus, 1991). Passive-anxious victims are lonely and do not have many, if any, friends. Certain characteristics are used to identify victims of bullying (Brewster &Railsback, 2001; Limber, 2002). The characteristics include:

* Nonassertive and appear weak or are dominated by others
* Regularly have unexplained injuries, have damaged or missing belongings, or regularly have bruises or torn clothing
* Social isolates or have few friends
* Frequently chosen last for activities
* Often stay close to adults or teachers during recess or breaks to avoid isolated areas
* Appear sad, depressed, or moody
* Anxious
* Low self-esteem

*The bystander*

Bystanders are individuals, who witness bullying acts (Orpinas& Horne, 2006; Senn, 2007). Bystanders can contribute negatively or positively to bullying situations depending on how they react. Bystanders can encourage fighting or retaliation either verbally or nonverbally by simply watching the incident, thus contributing to the problem. Conversely, they can have a more positive effect on the situation by asking for help from an adult, trying to diffuse the situation themselves, or befriending a student who is often a target of bullying. Some bystanders may not have the knowledge or skills to intervene in bullying situations. As a result, these bystanders may experience feelings of anxiety, fear, shame, and guilt for not helping to diffuse the situation (Brewster &Railsback,2001; Orpinas& Horne, 2006). Additionally, observing violent behaviour causes bystanders to be more accepting of bullying behaviours and increases their chances of becoming more aggressive in the future. When bystanders were asked if they should help someone who is being bullied, 33 percent of the students stated that they should help the victims but do not, and 24 percent said that the bullying was none of their business (Brewster &Railsback, 2001).

**Causes of Bullying**

* Bullies come from dysfunctional families: A dysfunctional family is not a guarantee that a child will become a bully. However, a large number of bullies come from homes there is little affection and openness. They may often witness their parents being aggressive toward friends, siblings or other members of the family.
* Bullies need to be in control: Kids who push others around are often driven by the need for power. They enjoy being able to subdue others. These types of kids are typically impulsive and hotheaded and they thrive when their victims cower in their presence.
* Bullying behaviour gets rewarded: Most people don’t do this intentionally; however, the perpetrator is in advertently rewarded anytime victims give up their lunch money or belongings. They also get rewarded or the power of having others afraid of them. These unintentional rewards reinforce Bullying behaviour and encourage the perpetrator to keep pushing others around.
* Bullies don’t care how others feel: Some children either lack empathy or just relish seeing others in pain. When they hurt someone, they have no sense of what the victims or the people around them are feeling. Sometimes a perpetrator may even get pleasure from seeing a child yelp as he kicks him down the hallway. The reactions of the victims gives the bully a sense of accomplishment, so he continues the behaviour.
* Bullies can’t regulate their emotions: When people get frustrated and angry, they usually stop themselves from doing things that will hurt others.

**Self-efficacy**

Self-efficacy is defined as “the degree to which individuals consider themselves capable of performing a particular activity” (Larson & Daniels, 1998). Self-efficacy theory is based on Albert Bandura’s Social Cognitive Theory, which states that individuals can control their thoughts, motivation, and actions (Bandura, 1977, 1986). Bandura (1997) defined self-efficacy as “beliefs in one’s capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to produce given attainments”. Self-efficacy beliefs are an individual’s judgments about what he/she can do with the skills they possess (Bandura, 1986). According to Bodenhorn (2001), the determining factor that an individual will use a certain skill is the belief that the use of that skill will result ina positive outcome. The extent to which an individual believes he/she can adequately perform acertain task reflects the individual’s self-efficacy beliefs regarding that task.

***Development of Self-efficacy***

An individual develops self-efficacy through four sources of information: performanceaccomplishments, vicarious experience, verbal persuasion, and emotional arousal (Bandura,1977). Performance accomplishments are based on direct personal experiences in which selfefficacyexpectations are increased as a result of successes and lowered based on repeatedfailures. However, once selfefficacy is established through direct successes, the impact ofoccasional failures has a minimal effect on selfefficacy and selfefficacy is then generalized toother situations (Bandura, 1986). If a person experiences success in addressing a bullying situation, the person will believe that he/she will be successful in addressing otherbullying situations in the future. This type of selfefficacy from direct experiences has a strongereffect than selfefficacy developed through vicarious experiences (Bandura, 1986).Vicarious experiences occur when individuals observe another person handling asituation and imagine how he/she would handle the same or a similar situation (Bandura, 1986). For example, if a teacher observes another teacher dealing with a bullying situation in a positive way, that person will believe that he/she will also succeed in a similar situation. Thistype of modeling has been successfully used in reducing anxiety in students who have phobias.Modeling has also been used with counselor trainees as well as in conflict-resolution training(Bandura, 1986). The third source of selfefficacy beliefs—verbal persuasion—is whenindividuals are led by suggestion into believing that they can successfully handle a situation thatthey may not have been able to handle in the past. This has a much weaker effect on efficacyexpectations and does not sustain long-term effects because it is not a direct experience.Therefore, the efficacy expectations accomplished can be easily extinguished through failedexperiences. However, if verbal persuasion is paired with performance success, it can have amuch stronger effect on selfefficacy (Bandura, 1986).Emotional arousal is the fourth source of selfefficacy. An individual’s selfefficacy isaffected by his/her physical and emotional reaction to a situation. If an individual experiences anincreased sense of anxiety in a given situation, these negative emotions could reduce feelings ofselfefficacy. If an individual is consistently successful with a certain task, this lowers theanxiety level, thus increasing the level of self efficacy (Larson & Daniels, 1998). When a taskbecomes more challenging, anxiety levels rise; higher anxiety levels produce reduced feelings ofselfefficacy. According to Bandura (1986),humans require a positive sense of self-efficacy.

There are three components to selfefficacy:efficacy expectations, outcome expectations,and outcome values (Bandura, 1977). Efficacy expectations are the beliefs that an individual hasabout his/her ability to perform behaviours to produce a specific outcome. The higher the efficacyexpectations, the more likely an individual will sustain effort through a difficult task to obtain thedesired outcome. Therefore, if school counselors have a high selfefficacy for implementingbullying interventions, they will exert more effort in implementing the programs until the desiredoutcome is achieved.Outcome expectations are the expectations that certain behaviours will result in a specificoutcome. Outcome values are the values and significance that are placed on the expectedoutcomes of a specific behaviour. Individuals are most likely to engage in and sustain effort intasks that have high outcome value and expectancy. The perceived level of selfefficacydetermines the course of action that individuals will take, how long they will continue at the task,how much effort they will expend and for how long they will sustain this effort in the face ofobstacles, and how much their thought patterns and emotions will be influenced (Bandura, 1986).

**Survey of Related Studies**

Austin and Joseph(1994) conducted a study on Assessment of Bully/victim problems in 8 to 11 years old. Respondents were 425 school children (204 boys and 221 girls) aged between 8 and 11 years, attending five primary schools in Mersegside. Instruments used for this study were the Bullying- behaviour scale and peer victimization scale.Result revealed that 46 percent of the children were classified as bullies, victims, or both: 22 percent were classified as victims only, 15 percent as bully/victims, and 9percent as bullies only.

Kokkinos and Krptitsi(2001) conducted a study as the relationship between bullying, victimization, trait emotional intelligence, self efficacy and empathy among preadolescents.Result indicated that boys repeated significantly more direct and indirect bullying behaviours than girls, and higher victimization. Bullying was negatively correlated with overall self efficacy and it is academic comparative, trait emotional intelligence, empathy and its cognitive component, while victimization was negatively correlated with overall self efficacy and its three dimensions trait emotional intelligence, affective and cognitive empathy. Gender, cognitive empathy and trait emotional intelligence significantly predicted bullying whereas victimization was predicted by gender, trait emotional intelligence and affective empathy.

Several surveys have been conducted to explore cyber bullying issues. In a survey conducted in Britain in 2002, it was found that one out of four youngsters aged 11 to 19 had been cyber bullied (National Children's Home, 2002). An earlier survey conducted in New Hampshire in 2000 found that about 6 percent of youths had the experience of being harassed online (Thorp, 2004). A study reported at a cyber bullying conference in Westchester indicated that “only six kids out of 200 said they had not been involved in some form of cyber bullying” (Dickstein, 2005).

A study conducted by Li(2007) titled as “Bullying in the new play ground: research in cyber bullying and cyber victimization” examined the nature and extentof adolescents’ cyber bullying experiences and explored the extent to which various factors including bullying, culture, and gender, contribute to cyber bullying and cyber victimization in 3 junior high schools from Canada and 2 secondary schools from China. Total sample include 461 students. Results showthat factors like gender, culture, knowledge of safety strategies and frequency of computer use, may provide valuable information to assess possible involvement with Cyber bullying. Also gender played a significant role as males compared to female were more likely to be cyber bullies.

Georgiou(2008) examined the influence of maternal characteristics on their child’s bullying or victimization experiences at school. The participants were 252 elementary school students and their mothers. Results show that maternal responsiveness was positively related to the child’s adjustment at school (achievement and social adaptation), while the same factor was negatively related to school aggression (bullying and disrupting behaviour). Over protective mothering was associated with high degrees of victimization experienced by the child whereas maternal depressiveness was related to both victimization and bullying behaviouron the part of the child.

Allen and Espelage(2009) conducted a comparative analysis on Bullying and victimization rates among students in general and special education. The participants include 14315 high school students from a Mid western country from 18 different high schools of ninth grade to twelth grade. The mean age of these students was 15. 8 years. Data collection include the Illinois Bully Scale. Result indicates that students in special education reported greater rates of bullying and fighting perpetration and victimization than general education students.

Charlton, (2009) conducted a research on school counselor’s previewed self efficacy for addressing bullying in the elementary school setting. The study was conducted on 137 elementary schools in a large suburban school district in theMid Atlantic region. Instruments used for the study are counseling self estimate inventory, king instrument and counselor self efficacy and bullying interventions scale. The results of the study revealed that school counselors were efficacious regarding their overall counseling skills and counseling skills for providing bullying interventions.

Sreeja(2009) investigated the relationship of maternal behaviour with bullying and victimizationof adolescents. The study was conducted on 674 government and aided, rural and urban higher secondary school students from three district of Kerala. Data was collected using bullying and victimization inventory and perceived maternal behaviour inventory. The result of the study indicate that maternal behaviour is related with bullying and victimization experiences of adolescents and there is no significant difference in the relationship of maternal behaviours with bullying and victimization of adolescents.

Menesini, Ersilia and Camodeca (2010) examined the bullying among siblings and the role of personality and relational variables. The study was conducted on 195 children using the instruments ‘a self report questionnaire for bullying and victimization, the big five questionnaire for children and siblings inventory of behaviour. Results highlighted that the presence of an older brother is a risk factor for the emergence of siblings victimization. For both boys and girls, high levels of conflict in the dyad and low levels of empathy were significantly related to sibling bullying and sibling victimization. It also showed that for males, energy was associated with sibling bullying and indirectly to school bullying Friendliness and high emotional instability were directly associated with School bullying.School victimization was directly associated with emotional instability for both males and females. Finally, both sibling bullying and sibling victimization were associated with bullying and victimization at school.

Byers, Caltabiano and Caltabiano(2011) conducted a study on teachers’ attitudes, towards overt and covert bullying and perceived efficacy to intervene. This study explored teacher characteristic thatinfluence their attitudes and responses to covert bullying. Responses to three scales measuring teacher attitudes towards bullying, perceived self efficacy and preferred style of handling bullyingincidents as well as back ground questions were sought from 62 teachers from a Catholic Dioeesein Queensland. The result of the study shows that overt bullying incidents were perceived by teachers to be more serious than were cases of covert bullying. Teachers felt more empathy for victims of overt bullying than for those victims of covert bullying. Teachers were also more likely to intervene in overt bullying incidents than they were if the incidents were covert in nature. The most predominant style for handling bullying was ensuring bully was suitably punished.

Jose, Kljakovic, Scheib, Notter and Olivia (2012) investigated the stabilities and interrelationships among traditional (i.e., face-to-face) bullying, traditional victimhood, cyber bullying, and cyber victimhood among adolescents. About 1,700 adolescents aged 11-16 years at Time 1 self-reported levels of both bullying and victimization in four contexts (in school, outside school, texting, and on-line) annually for 2 years. Results indicated that all four dynamics were moderately stable over time. The following variables were found to be directionally reinforcing and predicting each other over time: traditional bullying and traditional victimization; traditional bullying and cyber bullying; and traditional victimization and cyber victimization. These results indicate that bullying and victimhood in both face-to-face and cyber-based interactions are related but not identical interpersonal dynamics.

Inaresearch by Hertick and Jenrifer(2012), namely the relationship between type of bullying experienced inchildhood and psychosocial functioning in young adulthood, they examined the relationship between overt, relational, cyber bullying and long term psychosocial functioning. A total of 277 under graduates from Gainesville, participated in this study.Findings revealed that, females reported a higher rate of involvement as victims of cyber bullying and males reported a higher rate of involvement as overt aggressors. Each bullying type was related to specific psychosocial difficulties. This study also found that higher rates of involvement as a perpetrator of aggressive bullying behaviours were positively associated with self esteem and negatively associated with school maladjustment. In regards to victimization, higher rates of victimization were negatively associated with sensation seeking behaviours and positively associated with social stress is young adulthood.

Chan, Oliver, Chui and Hong(2013) conducted a study in Mecanesemale adolescents, namely social bonds and school bullying: A study of Mecanese male adolescents on bullying perpetration and peer victimization. Participants include 365 males, aged between 10 and 17 years. University of Illinois bully scale, victimization scale and social bonding scale were used for collecting data. Findings of the study revealed that school bullying behaviours are positively related to theft and violent delinquency, particularly, bullying behaviours negatively correlated with different social bonds. This also shows that an increase in age and organizational involvement, there is decrease in educational commitment andbelief in the legal system are likely to increase the tendency to engage in bullying perpetration. Conversely, a decrease in age and the presence of paternal criminality are significantly related to being victimized at school.

Seixas, Coelho, and Fischer(2013) investigated the impact of health profile on Bullies, victims and Bully victims. Data was from a random sample, using the health behaviours in school - aged children (HBSC) by the WHO, the susanharterself perception profile for adolescents, a peer nomination inventory and a sociometricquestionnaire. A total of 581 Portugees adolescents aged 12 to 17 years who attended eleven public middle schools in the Lisbon region, were selected. The students were defined as bullies, victims, bully victims and not involved, on the basis of the Peer Nomination Inventory. Result shows a connection between these four groups and some health behaviours, providing a distinctive profile for each one. In general bullies show a more health profile compared to victims, with the exception of substances use. Bully victims show the most contraversal profile, similar to bullies in their higher levels of self- esteem and self -confidence, but also similar to victims in their higher levels of rejection and weakness.

A study conducted byMiller, Williams, Catbush, Gibbs, Sherrod, Jones, and Sarah. (2013) examined classes (subgroups) and transition between classes over three time points based on dating violence, bullying and sexual harassment perpetration and victimization experienced by youth. The sample consisting of 795 seventh grade students from schools that were part of a multisite, longitudinal evaluation of a dating violence initiative. (50 percent female, 27 percent white, 32 percent African American, 25 percent Latino and 16 percent other or multiple races). Results from latent transition analyses revealed five classes of students with distinct behavioural profiles, multi problem (victimization and perpetration), bullying and sexual harassment (victimization and perpetration), bullying (victimization and perpetration), sexual harassment (victimization only), and a least problem group. The majority of classes characterized by reports of both perpetration and victimization for at least one behaviour, Girls were more likely to be in the less problematic classes. Class membership was fairly stable across the three times points. When students transitioned to different classes, the shift was most often from a more problematic to a less problematic class particularly for girls.

Vanhorn(2013) conducted a study to explore predictors and moderators of bullying involvement, social and emotional problems, vocabulary knowledge and crimes. This research consisted of 377 adolescents, between the ages of 11 and 18. Adolescents were required tocompletethreequestionnaires.Thequestionnaire were the RevisedOlweusBully/victimQuestionnaires, strength and Difficulties Questionnaire and vocabulary for achievement.Findings of the study shows that bully,victim, bully-victim were related to social and emotional problems.VocabularyknowledgeandQuadrant 4 (class clown category)were related to bully and bully-victim, also these three groups were related to peer problems and conduct problems. But victim and bully victim are related to emotional symptoms. Also they were found that crime was moderator for bully, social and emotional problems.

A study titled as Personality and connectedness as predictors of school bullying among adolescent boys was conducted by Zou, Ganguli, and Shahnawaz, (2014) on a sample of 50 bully boys who were identified by the school or counselor. Result revealed that bullies are generally social, having lots of emotionally connected peers but low on conscientiousness and bullies are likely to have well connected peers who would indulge in bullying if they are low on conscientiousness.

Nickerson, Schnurr, Collen, and Helen, (2014) investigated perception of school climateas a function of bullying involvement. In this study 2,240 middle and high school students participated in a district wide effort to assess the prevalence and effects of building and cyber bullying as well as perception of school climate.Students reported positive school climate perceptions, although bullying was a prevalent occurrence. Types of bullying effects on students and coping strategies used varied across sex and school level, girls reporting more experiences with cyber bullying than boys. Students involved in bullying as perpetrators, victims or both had more negative perceptions of school climate, although this varied by specific aspect of climate studied.

Objectives of the study by Yoon, and Kerber (2015) was to investigate teachers attitudes towards three types of bullying behaviours (verbal, physical & Social exclusion) and examine disciplinary strategies used by teachers. Participants of this study consisted of 94 elementary teachers enrolled in graduate level classes in Education at a large Urban state University in the Mid -west. Data were collected by using the modified Bullying attitude questionnaire.Result indicated that teachers less seriously took the social exclusion and are less likely to intervene than in the cases of verbal and physical aggression. They also reported using more lenient intervention strategies (ie; ignoring)

Cacas,Jose, Ruiz, Rosario, and Delray(2015) conducted a study on the impact of teacher management and trait emotional intelligence on bullying. The aim of the study was to analyse the ways in which teacher management and trait emotional intelligence effect involvement in bullying aggression and victimization. Total of 2,806 Spanish School children participated in this transversal study. Self report questionnaires, school wide climate scale, Spanish version of the TMMS-24 EI questionnaire were used for collecting data. Results showed that both positive and negative teacher management were closely linked to involvement in bullying aggression and victimization. Emotional Intelligence was also found to be directly related to bullying involvement

**Related studies onSelf efficacy**

Suvitha(2007) conducted a study on interaction effect of gender, social motivation and academic self efficacy in academic achievement of secondary school pupils. The study conducted on 800 secondary school students from different schools of Kerala. Data was collected using social motivation scale and academic self efficacy scale. Findings of the study indicate that gender and social motivation have significant main effects on academic achievement of secondary schools students, but there is no significant main effect for academic self efficacyon academic achievement. The study also revealed that gender, social motivation and academic self efficacyhave sno interaction effect on academic achievement of secondary school pupils.

Ghaderi and Kumar (2009) conducted a comparative study to determine the level of self efficacy and gender differences between the Indian and Iranian students studying at university of Mysore. The data were collected from among population of 160 students by using self efficacy scale. The findings of the study show that self efficacy of Iranian students is higher than that of Indian students. It also show that the self efficacy of male and female is not different.

Wright and Perrone(2010) examined interrelationship between attachment, social self efficacy, career decision making Self efficacy and life satisfaction. A conceptual model was proposed and tested to determine if social self efficacy and career decision self efficacy were full or partial mediators between attachment and life satisfaction. Structural equation modeling methods were utilizedto test the model. Findings indicated that social self efficacy and career decision self efficacy partially mediated between attachment and life satisfaction among college students.

Dastgerdi (2011) investigated students’ self efficacy and attitudes toward internet usage in higher education of Iran and India. Theparticipants of research was chosen from 400 students in Aligarh Muslim university in India and Isfahan university in Iran. The results indicated that the students in India have more access to internet and utilize it more than Iranian students. The self efficacy of Indian students was better than Iranian students, however it is revealed that most of students in both countries had moderate knowledge of the internet and were positive towards it.

Effect of social self efficacy on academic life satisfaction of higher secondary school students in Kerala was examined by Harsha(2011), Data was collected from 627 higher secondary school students using social self efficacy scale and academic life satisfaction scale. Results suggest that academic life satisfaction is dependent on social self efficacy. High social self efficacy groups shows high mean score in academic satisfaction. So it can be interpreted that the students with high social self efficacy have high academic life satisfaction.

Burns, Garyn and Doncan (2013) examined the relationship between evaluation of academic services and students athletes career decision making self efficacy.Results indicated that evaluation of academic support service were positively related to levels of career decision making self efficacy.

Chadha and Thind (2013) conducted a study on self efficacy of teachers in relation to their role conflict. The sample was selected randomly and tools were administrated on 140 teachers of schools and colleges of Ludhiana district. The study concludes that the male teachers of schools and colleges show significant relationship between role conflict and self efficacy. Also significant relationship was found among school teachers and college teachers in regard to self efficacy and role conflict.

Darolia and Khanna (2013) explored the extent to which self efficacy,work commitment andperceived organizational support predict individual differences in job performance. The sample comprised 300skilled industrial workers from various industries. Data was collected using occupational commitment scale and Eisenberger’s perceived organizational support questionnaire. Result indicated that self efficacy correlated highest with job performance; perceived organizational support, affective and normative occupational commitment have shown modest degree of association with job performance.

Huang and Chiungjung (2013) conducted a meta- analysis of 187 studies containing 247 independent studies on gender difference in academic self efficacy identified on overall effect size of .80 with small difference favoring males.Moderation analysis demonstrated that content domains was significant moderator in explaining effect size variation. Females displayed language acts self efficacy than males.Gender difference in academic self efficacy also varied with age.

Chabra and Grover (2014) conducted a study on self efficacy of adolescents:inter play of gender and locality. Hundred adolescents both males and females of 14 to 18 years of age constituted the sample of this study. Data was collected from the sample using self efficacy scale. The results revealed that adolescents had low self efficacy, which is not an encouraging sign. Further, there is no significant difference in self efficacy of adolescents based on gender or locality.

Vilma(2013) investigated influence of self efficacy in academic procrastination of secondary school students. The main purpose of the study is find out if there exist any significant relationship between self efficacy and academic procrastination, participants of the study include 480 secondary school students from Calicut and Malappuram districts of Kerala. Data was collected using self efficacy scale and academic procrastination scale. Result indicate that there exist a significant negative and moderate relationship between variables self efficacy and academic procrastination.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter the investigator tried to give a brief account of the concept of Self efficacy, Bullying and Victimization and the related studies in the area.From the review of related literature the investigator could understand that a number of studies are conducted in the area of Self efficacy, Bullying and Victimization. Majority of the studies showed that self efficacy influences the Bullying and Victimization behaviour among students. Some studies revealed that there is no difference between self efficacy of boys and girls, but boys show more Bullyimgbehaviour than the girls.Studies related to cyber bullying indicated that this type of bullying widely spread all over the world and gender played a significant role as males compared to female were more likely to be cyber bullies. Still there exists inconsistencies in the findings of the studies. Hence the present study is relevant to test the consistency of the findings of the earlier studies.

**CHAPTER III**

**METHODOLOGY**

* **Design of the study**
* **Variables of the study**
* **Objectives**
* **Hypotheses**
* **Participants of the study**
* **Instruments used for data collection**
* **Data collection procedure, scoringandconsolidation of data**
* **Statistical technique used for analysisof data**

**METHODOLOGY**

The procedure or technique employed in a research study is known as the methodology of research. The methods and tools determine the validity of the study and the accuracy of the result. Also a suitable method helps the researcher to explore the diverse area of the study.

The present study is intended to find out the influence of Self efficacy on Bullying and Victimization among Pre-adolescents. The methodology followed by the investigator is given under the following headings.

1. Design of the study
2. Variables of the study
3. Objectives
4. Hypotheses
5. Participants of thestudy
6. Instruments used for data collection
7. Data collection procedure, scoring and consolidation of data
8. Statistical techniques used for analysis of data.

**Design of the study**

The present study is a descriptive type research in whichthe influence of Self efficacy on Bullying and Victimization was studied.

**Variables of the study**

The present study includes two types of variables namely independent and dependent variables. The independent variable of the study is Self efficacy whereas Bullying and Victimization arethe dependent variables.

Gender, Type of management of the school, Residential status of parents were taken as categorical variables.

**Objectives**

The objectives set for the study are

1. To find out the extent of Self efficacy among pre-adolescents for the total sample and relevant subsamples based on
2. Gender
3. Type of management and
4. Residential status of parents.
5. To find out the extent of Bullying among pre-adolescents for the total sample and relevant subsamples based on
6. Gender
7. Type of management and
8. Residential status of parents.
9. To find out the extent of Victimization among pre-adolescents for the total sample and relevant subsamples based on
10. Gender
11. Type of management and
12. Residential status of parents.
13. To compare the extent of Self efficacyamong pre-adolescents between subgroups based on
14. Gender
15. Type of management and
16. Residential status of parents.
17. To compare the extent of Bullying among pre-adolescents between subgroups based on
18. Gender
19. Type of management and
20. Residential status of parents.
21. To compare the extent of Victimization among pre-adolescents between subgroups based on
22. Gender
23. Type of management and
24. Residential status of parents.
25. To find out the relationship of Self efficacy with Bullying among pre-adolescents.
26. To find out the relationship of Selfefficacy with Victimization among pre-adolescents.
27. To find out whether Bullying differ among pre-adolescents with high-,average - and low - Self-efficacy.
28. To find out whether Victimization differ among pre-adolescents with high,average - and low - Self efficacy.

**Hypotheses**

The hypotheses formulated for the study are

1. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of Self efficacy among pre-adolescents between the subgroups based on
2. Gender
3. Type of management and
4. Residential status of parents.
5. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of Bullying among pre-adolescents between the subgroups based on
6. Gender
7. Type of management and
8. Residential status of parents.
9. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of Victimization among pre-adolescents between the subgroups based on
10. Gender
11. Type of management and
12. Residential status of parents.
13. Self efficacy has significant relationship with Bullying behaviour among pre-adolescents.
14. Self efficacy has significant relationship with Victimization behaviour among pre-adolescents.
15. Bullying behaviour significantly differ among pre-adolescents with high-,average- and low - Selfefficacy.
16. Victimization behaviour significantly differamong pre-adolescents with high-, average - and low -Self efficacy.

**Participants of the study**

Selection of sample is an important aspect of any research. A sample is a small proportion of a population selectedfor observation and analysis. By observing the characteristics of the sample, one can make certain inferences about the population, from which it is drawn (Best and Kahn,2010).

A sample of 650 students studying in seventh standard from three revenue districts of Kerala, viz., Kannur, Calicut and Malappuram was selected using stratified sampling method. Proportionate sampling technique was adopted as per the following criteria.

1. Gender

Gender difference may exist in many characteristics under study. As comparison of boys and girls is a major aspect of the study, and in the population, boys and girls being approximately equal, investigator gave equal representation to both boys and girls in the sample.

1. Type of management

Type of management of the school may have some influence on learner characteristics. Comparison of variables under study among students of various types of schools is intended in the study, and hencethe investigator selected schools from the threecategories viz., Government, Aided and Unaided based on the proportion of these types of schools in the population (2:3:1).

The basal sample includes 650 pre-adolescents from the three revenuedistricts. The split up of thesample is given as figure 1.

Total Number of Students

(650)

Management

Government (6) Aided (9) Unaided (3)

(216) (326) (108)

Gender

Boys Girls Boys Girls Boys Girls

(108) (108) (163) (163) (54) (54)

*Figure 1:* Split up of the basal sample

**Instruments used for data collection**

Selection of appropriate instruments or devices required to collect data is an important step in an investigation. A researcher requires many data gathering tools or techniques which vary in their complexity, design, administration and interpretation.

For this study data were collected using the following instruments.

Bullying and Victimization scale prepared and standardized by the investigator withthe help of the supervising teacher.

Self efficacy Questionnaire for Children (Muris,2001).

Personal data sheet

Detailed descriptions of these tools are given below.

**Bullying and victimization scale**

Bullying and Victimization scale was constructed to measure the extent of Bullying and Victimization among pre-adolescents.

The first step of the construction of a tool is planning. For thepreparation of the scale, the investigator made an intensive search through the available literature and analysed different aspects of Bullying and Victimization.

**Bullying**

Bullying has been conceptualized as a distinct type of aggression characterized by a repeated and systematic abuse of power (Olweus,1991).Different dimensions of bullying include calling bad names, play nasty tricks, take belongings without permission, blackmail, hit or beat someone and systematically exclude from the groups. Cyber bullying is the new form of bullying.

**Victimization**

Victimization means sustaining physical or mental injury caused by an intentional act or deed of another (Rigby,2002). It is the other end of bullying.

Common items were given for both, because Bullying and Victimization are the two sides of a coin. The items are phrases on some behaviour based on the definition of Bullying. At the left side of the item, instruction was given to mark the frequency of his/her behaviour during last month, the choices being ‘Never’, ‘One or two times’ and ‘More than two times’. This part is thus for Bullying. The Victimization part was given on the right side of the statements with instruction as to mark the frequency of the behaviour towards him/her during last month, with the same choices as in the case of Bullying.

Initially 30 items were written and it was scrutinized by a group of experts, resulting in a draft scale with 25 items.

**Standardization Procedure**

In order to ensure quality of the scale, item analysis was done initially and after finalizing the scale reliability and validity were established.

Item Analysis

The procedure of the item analysis is described below.

The draft scale was administered on a sample of 370 upper primary school students selected bystratifiedsampling technique giving due representation to Gender and Type of management of school.

The 370 response sheets obtained were scoredseparately for Bullying and Victimization and the total scores for each variable was calculated. Then these score sheets were arranged in ascending order of the total scoreof Bullying and the highest 27 percent and lowest 27 percentare separated and the discriminating power (Dp) of each item was calculated using the formula.

t =

Where

1 = Mean of upper group

2 = Mean of lower group

1 =Standard Deviation of upper group

2 = Standard Deviation of lower group

N1 = N2Size of each group (100)

The critical ratio obtained for each item together with mean and standard deviation of the scores on Bullying are given in the table 1.

Table 1

*Critical ratio with mean and standard deviation of items for the Bullying scale*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Item | Upper group | | Lower group | | N1=N2  =N | Critical ratio (t) |
| Mean | Standard deviation | Mean | Standard deviation |
| 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10  11  12  13  14  15  16  17  18  19  20  21  22  23  24  25 | 1.20  1.39  1.07  0.82  1.23  0.87  0.58  0.50  0.99  0.28  1.26  0.60  1.14  1.04  0.75  0.74  0.88  1.08  0.64  0.77  1.28  0.80  1.20  1.02  0.87 | 0.725  0.737  0.742  0.716  0.723  0.812  0.727  0.732  0.703  0.637  0.760  0.667  0.739  0.777  0.796  0.787  0.782  0.677  0.772  0.802  0.740  0.696  0.696  0.778  0.800 | 0.21  0.38  0.13  0.13  0.12  0.19  0.02  0.01  0.15  0.03  0.19  0.03  0.06  0.05  0.02  0.08  0.02  0.13  0.03  0.06  0.37  0.03  0.16  0.22  0.10 | 0.433  0.528  0.338  0.338  0.356  0.394  0.141  0.100  0.386  0.171  0.419  0.223  0.239  0.219  0.141  0.273  0.141  0.338  0.171  0.239  0.506  0.171  0.368  0.440  0.362 | 100  100  100  100  100  100  100  100  100  100  100  100  100  100  100  100  100  100  100  100  100  100  100  100  100 | 11.724  11.142  11.528  8.714  13.776  7.532  7.560  6.635  10.469  3.790  12.324  8.109  13.910  12.257  9.029  7.929  10.822  12.566  7.711  8.483  10.157  10.738  13.202  8.949  8.770 |

Critical ratios obtained for the items are greater than 2.58, value required for significance at 0.01level. This indicates that all items are capable of discriminating pupils with Bullying behaviour and not with such behaviour. Hence all the items were included in the scale. Same procedure was followed for the Victimization scale and the details are given in Table 2.

Table 2

*Critical ratio with mean and standard deviation of items for Victimization scale*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Item | Upper group | | Lower group | | N1=N2  =N | Critical ratio (t) |
| Mean | Standard deviation | Mean | Standard deviation |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10  11  12  13  14  15  16  17  18  19  20  21  22  23  24  25 | 1.37  1.48  1.29  1.02  1.37  1.19  1.24  0.80  1.19  0.49  1.20  1.02  1.38  1.33  0.86  1.25  1.01  1.18  0.88  0.86  1.58  1.17  1.46  1.38  1.45 | 0.734  0.674  1.076  0.791  0.720  0.800  0.780  0.829  0.813  0.718  0.765  0.829  0.736  0.739  0.766  0.783  0.835  0.809  0.808  0.792  0.622  0.792  0.688  0.749  0.716 | 0.24  0.49  0.15  0.27  0.24  0.25  0.06  0.08  0.14  0.09  0.13  0.05  0.06  0.08  0.01  0.15  0.06  0.16  0.04  0.09  0.50  0.07  0.22  0.18  0.06 | 0.429  0.611  0.359  0.510  0.474  0.479  0.239  0.339  0.377  0.321  0.338  0.261  0.278  0.273  0.100  0.359  0.239  0.368  0.197  0.288  0.541  0.293  0.440  0.386  0.239 | 100  100  100  100  100  100  100  100  100  100  100  100  100  100  100  100  100  100  100  100  100  100  100  100  100 | 13.292  10.881  10.052  7.970  13.110  10.077  14.465  8.042  11.722  5.088  12.788  11.166  16.789  15.863  11.008  12.766  10.942  11.477  10.106  9.142  13.093  13.024  15.187  14.238  18.198 |
| 25 | 1.45 | 0.716 | 0.06 | 0.239 | 100 | 18.198 |

Critical ratio obtained is greater than 2.58 for all the 25 items, indicating all items have enough discriminating power. Hence all the items are included in the scale. A copy of the final version of the scale is appended as Appendix I (Malayalam).

**Scoring Procedure**

The scale is a three point scale with the three options ‘Never’, ‘One or two times’ and ‘More than two times’. If the response is never, then the score assigned is 0, if it is one or two times, the score is 1 and if the response is more than two times, the score is 2. This scoring procedure was used for both dimensions, Bullying and Victimization.

The total score on eachpart was taken and the least score obtainable is 0 and maximum is 50. An individual with a score greater than 25 on Bullying scale can be considered as a bully and if his score on Victimization scale is greater than 25, he is a victim.

**Reliability**

Reliability of the test is it’s ability to yield consistent result from one set of measure to another. According to Best and Kahn (2010) “Reliability is the degree of consistency that the instrument or procedure demonstrates: whatever it is measuring, it does so consistently”.

The internal consistency of the Bullying and Victimization scale was calculated using Cronbach’s alpha.The obtained value for Bullying scale is 0.82 and for the Victimization scale is 0.87.These values indicate that the scale is a reliable one.

**Validity**

The scale can be considered as having face validity as it was undergone thorough scrutiny by the experts. A test is said to have face validity when it appears to measure whatever the author had in mind, namely, what he thought he was measuring (Garret, 2004).

The scale has content validity as the different behaviours considered as Bullying /Victimization were included in the scale.

**Self - efficacy Questionnaire for Children (SEQ –C )**

Self - efficacy questionnaire was adapted by the investigator. The questionnaire was constructed and standardized by Muris (2001). This tool was in English language and it consists of 24 items that are hypothesized to represent three domains of Self efficacy viz.,

Social Self efficacy, that has to do with the perceivedcapability forpeer relationship and assertiveness.

Academic Self efficacy, that is concerned with the perceived capability to manage one’s own learning behaviour, to master academic subjects, and to fulfill academic expectation and

Emotional Self efficacy, that pertains to the perceived capability of coping with negative emotion.

This questionnaire was translated to Malayalam by the investigator.

Details of items under different dimensionsare given as Table 3

Table 3

*Details of Items under Different Dimensions of Self efficacy*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Sl No | Dimensions | Number of items |
| 1.  2.  3. | Social Self efficacy  Academic Self efficacy  Emotional Self efficacy | 2,6,8,11,14,17,20,23.  1,4,7,10,13,16,19,22.  3,5,9,12,15,18,21,24. |

**Scoring Procedure**

Responses are to be made in a five point scale as ‘Not at all’, ‘Very little’, ‘Little’, ‘Well’ and ‘Very well’. A score of 1,2,3,4 or 5 was given for the responses from not at all to very well respectively.

**Reliability**

The internal consistency of the SEQ-C scale was calculated using Cronbach’s alpha. The obtained value is 0.79, indicating that the tool is reliable.

**Validity**

The tool has content validity as the different dimensions of Self efficacy were included in the scale.

A copy of the tool is appended as Appendix II (Malayalam).

**Personal Data Sheet**

To get the demographic details personal data sheet was used.

**Data Collection Procedure, Scoring and Consolidation of Data**

After the sample selection, the investigator prepared a time schedule for visiting the schools for data collection.The investigator approached the heads of the concerned institutions for obtaining permission for data collection. Before administration, the investigator explained the necessary instructions to the students to respond to the items. The investigator carefully clarified the doubts of the students. When the scale administration was over, the investigator collected back the copies of the tools.

The response sheets were scored according to the scoring procedure of each tool and then consolidated and tabulated for statistical analysis. While scoring, incomplete response sheets were rejected and hence the final sample size was reduced from 650 to 625.Analysis of the data was done later with the necessary statistical techniques.

A list ofschools and details of sample selected is given as Appendix III.

**Statistical Techniques used for Analysis of Data**

The following statistical techniques were used foranalysis of collected data.

**Preliminary analysis**

Preliminary analysis was done in order to arrive at a conclusion about the nature of the distribution. Preliminary analysis involves the following statistical techniques.

a) Measures of central tendency

b) Standard deviation

c) Skewness and

d) Kurtosis

**Test of Significance of Difference between Means for two large independent groups.**

The statistical technique Test for Significance of Difference between Means for two large independent groups was used to find out if there exist any significant difference in Self efficacy and Bullying and Victimization between the relevant subsamples based on Gender and Residential status of parents.

The formula is

t =

Where

1 = Mean of the Group I

2 = Mean of the Group II

1 =Standard deviation of Group I

2 =Standard deviation of Group II

N1 = Sample size of Group I

N2 = Sample size of Group II

The tabled value for significance at 0.01 level is 2.58 and the tabled value for 0.05 level is 1.96.

**Pearson’s Product Moment Coefficient of Correlation.**

To know the extent and nature of relation between the variables, Pearson’s product moment coefficient of correlation was calculated using the formula.

r =

Where,

X = sum of the X scores

∑Y = sum of the Y scores

∑X2 = sum of the squares of X scores

∑Y2 =sum of the squares of Y scores

∑XY =sum of the product of paired X and Y scores

N =Number of paired scores

**ANOVA**

One way analysis of variance was used to test the significance of the difference between the means of a number of different population. It is an effective way to determine whether the means of more than two groups are too different to attribute to sampling error.

Major calculations were executed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The findings and conclusion of the study are presented in the following chapter.

**CHAPTER IV**

**ANALYSIS**

* **Objectives**
* **Hypotheses**
* **Preliminary Analysis**
* **Extent of Self efficacy, Bullying and Victimization among pre-adolescents**
* **Comparison of mean scores of Self efficacy, Bullying and Victimization**
* **Relationship of Self efficacy with Bullying and Victimization**
* **Influence of Self efficacy on Bullying and Victimization**

**ANALYSIS**

The main purpose of the present study is to find out the influence of Self efficacy on Bullying and Victimization among Pre-adolescents. The collected and tabulated data were analysed in accordance with the objectives of the study. Details of analysis together with the objectives and hypotheses are presented under the following sections.

A. Objectives

B. Hypotheses

1. Preliminary Analysis
2. Extent of Self efficacy, Bullying and Victimization for the total sample and relevant subsamples
3. Comparison of mean scores of Self efficacy, Bullying and Victimization of relevant subsamples.
4. Relationship of Self efficacy with Bullying and Victimization.
5. Influence of Self efficacy on Bullying and Victimization

**Objectives**

The objectives set for the study are

1. To find out the extent of Self efficacy among pre-adolescents for the total sample and relevant subsamples based on
2. Gender
3. Type of management and
4. Residential status of parents.
5. To find out the extent of Bullying among pre-adolescents for the total sample and relevant subsamples based on
6. Gender
7. Type of management and
8. Residential status of parents.
9. To find outthe extent ofVictimization among pre-adolescents for the total sample and relevant subsamples based on
10. Gender
11. Type of management and
12. Residential status of parents.
13. To compare the extent of Self efficacy among pre-adolescents between subgroups based on
14. Gender
15. Type of management and
16. Residential status of parents.
17. To compare the extent of Bullying among pre-adolescents between subgroups based on
18. Gender
19. Type of management and
20. Residential status of parents.
21. To compare the extent of Victimization among pre-adolescents between subgroups based on
22. Gender
23. Type of management and
24. Residential status of parents.
25. To find out the relationship of Self efficacy with Bullying among pre-adolescents.
26. To find out the relationship of Self efficacy with Victimization among pre-adolescents.
27. To find out whether Bullying differ among pre-adolescents with high-, average - and low - Self-efficacy.
28. To find out whether Victimization differ among pre-adolescents with high-, average - and low - Self efficacy.

**Hypotheses**

The hypotheses formulated for the study are

1. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of Self efficacy among pre-adolescents between the subgroups based on
2. Gender
3. Type of management and
4. Residential status of parents.
5. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of Bullying among pre-adolescents between the subgroups based on
6. Gender
7. Type of management and
8. Residential status of parents.
9. There is no significantdifference in the mean scores of Victimization among pre-adolescents between the subgroups based on
10. Gender
11. Type of management and
12. Residential status of parents.
13. Self efficacy has significant relationship with Bullying behaviours among pre-adolescents.
14. Self efficacy has significant relationship with Victimization behaviours among pre-adolescents.
15. Bullying behaviour significantly differ among pre-adolescents with high-, average- and low - Self efficacy.
16. Victimization behaviour significantly differ among pre-adolescents with high-, average - and low - Self efficacy.

**Preliminary Analysis**

As the first step of analysis, preliminary analysis of the data was done to know the nature of distribution of each variable. For this, important statistical constants such as Mean, Median, Mode, Standard deviation, Skewness and Kurtosis were computed for each variable.

Details of the preliminary analysis for Self efficacy, Bullying and Victimization are presented in Table 4.


Table 4

*Preliminary Statistics of Self efficacy, Bullying and Victimization*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | N | Mean | Median | Mode | S.D | Skewness | Kurtosis |
| Self efficacy  Bullying  Victimization | 625  625  625 | 84.97  11.23  14.69 | 86.00  10.00  13 | 89  10  11 | 11.77  6.75  8.67 | -.321  .978  .815 | .16  1.47  .51 |

Table 4 shows that values of mean, median and mode for the variable Self efficacy are 84.97, 86 and 89 respectively. Though the value of mode is greater than the mean and median, the difference is not a remarkable one, indicating possibility of normality of the distribution. The standard deviation obtained is 11.77 and the skewness and kurtosis are -0.32 and 0.16 respectively. Slightly high value of standard deviation indicates a scattering of values from mean. The negative sign of skewness shows the possibility of negatively skewed curve, and the value of kurtosis indicates the distribution is mesokurtic. But negligible value of skewnessshows that the curve is almost normal in nature.

To get amoreclear picture, histogram of distribution of Self efficacy is given as figure 2.




**Self-efficacy**

*Figure 2:*Histogram for Self efficacy

The value of mean, median, and mode obtained for the variable Bullying are 11.23, 10 and 10 respectively. Almost equal values of mean, median and mode indicate normal distribution. The standard deviation obtained is 6.75 indicates scattering of the individual measure from mean. The extent of skewness is 0.98 which shows the distribution is positively skewed. The measure of kurtosis is 1.47 shows that possibility of more peakedness than the normal curve.

To get a moreclear picture, histogram of distribution of Bullying is given as figure 3.




**Bullying**

*Figure 3:*Histogram for Bullying

For the variable Victimization, the values of mean, median and mode are 14.69, 13 and 11 respectively. The values of mean and median are almost equal but mode is lesser than the other two values. The obtained values shows that there is not much variation between the values of three measures of mean, median and mode, indicating the possibility of normality of distribution. The obtained standard deviation is 8.67, which means, the individual scores are deviating from mean score. The values obtained forskewness and kurtosis are 0.82 and 0.51 respectively. The value of skewness indicates a positively skewed curve but negligible and the value of kurtosis, almost mesokurtic. Thus the values of skewness and kurtosis show that the curve is almost normal in nature.

To get a more clear picture, histogram of distribution of Victimization is given as figure 4.



**Victimization**

*Figure 4:*Histogram for Victimization

**Extent of Self efficacy, Bullying and Victimization among Pre-adolescents**

In order to find the extent of Self efficacy, Bullying and Victimization among pre-adolescents for the total sample and relevant subsamples based on Gender. Type of management and Residential status of parents, the mean and standard deviation were calculated. Here the two levels of gender are taken as Boys and Girls, the three levels of type of management as Government, Aided and Unaided schools, and Residential status of parents as Resident and non resident. Student is considered as having resident parent, when both parents are in Kerala and is considered as having non resident parent when either mother or father or both are not residing in Kerala.

The mean and standard deviation of the variable Self efficacy for the total sample and relevant subsamples based on Gender, Type of management and Residential status of parents are presented inTable 5.

Table 5

*Mean and Standard deviation of the variable Self efficacy for the Total sample and Relevant subsamples based on Gender, Type of management and Residential status of parents*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Group | Mean | Standard deviation |
| Gender | Total sample  Boys  Girls | 84.97  84.59  85.33 | 11.77  11.59  11.93 |
| Type of management | Government  Aided  Unaided | 86.66  83.46  87.81 | 11.46  12.31  8.91 |
| Residential status of parents | Resident parents  Nonresidentparents | 84.95  85.02 | 11.90  11.50 |

Table 5 shows that the mean score obtained for the total sample for variable Self efficacy is 84.97 with standard deviation 11.77. The maximum value obtainable in the scale is 120 and minimum is 24. The average scale value is 72 (24 X 3). A mean score of 84.97 indicates that the students are having moderate level of Self efficacy as it is greater than the average scale value (72). It is very less than the maximum value in the scale. Therefore students are not found to be high in their Self efficacy.

The mean score obtained for boys and girls are 84.59and 85.83 respectively. The standard deviation obtained are11.59 and 11.93 respectively. The obtained mean score 84.59 for boys is greater than the middle value in scale (72).But it is less than the maximum value (120). So it can be interpreted that the extent of Self efficacy of boys is moderate. The mean score obtained for girls is 85.83, indicating a moderate level of Self efficacy.

For the government, aided and unaided upper primary school students, obtained mean scores are 86.66, 83.46 and 87.81 respectively. Obtained standard deviationsare 11.46, 12.31 and 8.91respectively. A mean score of 86.66 for the government school students shows that they have moderate level of Self efficacy. A mean score of 83.46for aided school students show that, they have moderate level of Self efficacy as it is greater than the middle value in the scale (72). A mean score of 87.81 for unaided school students show that they have moderate level of Self efficacy.

The mean score obtained for the variable residential status of parents- parents resident and parents non resident are 84.95 and 85.62 with standard deviation 11.90 and 11.50 respectively. A mean score of 84.95 for students whose parents are resident of Kerala shows that they have moderate level of Self efficacy as it is greater than the average scale value (72).Also mean score obtained 85.62 for students whose parents are non resident shows that they also have moderate level of Self efficacy.

**Conclusion**

From the analysis of the data, it can be concluded that students are found to have moderate level of Self efficacy for the total sample and relevant subsamples based on gender, type of management of school and the residential status of parents.

The mean and standard deviation of the variable Bullying for the total sample and relevant subsamples based on Gender, Type of management and Residential status of parents are given in Table 6.

Table 6

*Mean and Standard deviation of the variable Bullying for the Total sample and Relevant subsamples based on Gender, Type of management and Residential status of parents*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Group | Mean | Standard deviation |
| Gender | Total sample  Boys  Girls | 11.23  13.24  9.34 | 6.75  7.20  5.68 |
| Type of management | Government  Aided  Unaided | 10.98  11.80  9.42 | 6.77  7.20  5.68 |
| Residential status of parents | Resident parents  Non resident parents | 11.07  11.55 | 6.37  7.46 |

Table 6 shows that the mean score obtained for the total sample for the variable Bullying is 11.23 with standard deviation 6.75. The maximum value obtainable in the scale is 50 and the minimum is 0. The average scale value is 25(25X1).A mean score of 11.23 indicates that the level of Bullying among students is below the middle value, but it is greater than the minimum scale value (0).Therefore students are not found to be high in their Bullying.

The mean score obtained for boys and girls are 13.24 and 9.34 with standard deviation 7.20 and 5.68 respectively. A mean score of 13.24 for boys indicates that they have moderate level of Bullying. But mean score for girls indicates that it is very less than the average scale value. So girls found to be very low in their Bullying.

The mean score obtained for government, aided and unaided school students are 10.98, 11.80 and 9.42 with standard deviation 6.77, 6.88 and 6.05 respectively.A mean score 10.98 for government school students indicates that they have no high level of Bullying as it is less than the average scale value (25). A mean score of 11.80 for aided school students indicates that they also have no high level of Bullying. A mean score of 9.42 for unaided school students indicates that they have a low level of Bullying as it is far less than the middle scale value (25).

The mean score obtained for the variable bullying for students with resident parents and nonresidentparents are 11.07 and 11.55 with standard deviation 6.37 and 7.46 respectively. A mean score of 11.07 for students whose parents are resident of Kerala shows that they have moderate level of Bullying as it is greater than the minimum scale value (0).Also mean score obtained 11.55 for parentsnon resident shows that they also have moderate level Bullying.

**Conclusion**

From the analysis of the data, it can be concluded that students are found to have moderate level of Bullying for the total sample and relevant subsamples based on gender, type of management of school and the residential status of parents, but low level of bullying is found among girls and unaided school students.

The mean and standard deviation of the variable Victimization for the total sample and relevant subsamples based on Gender, Type of management and Residential status of parents are given in Table 7.

Table 7

*Mean and Standard deviation of the variable Victimization for the Total sample and Relevant subsamples based on Gender, Type of management and Residential status of parents*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Group | Mean | Standard deviation |
| Gender | Total sample  Boys  Girls | 14.69  16.78  12.71 | 8.67  8.49  8.37 |
| Type of management | Government  Aided  Unaided | 14.24  15.10  13.87 | 8.42  8.86  8.36 |
| Residential status of parents | Resident parents  Non resident parents | 14.65  14.77 | 8.83  8.32 |

Table 7 shows that the mean score obtained for the total sample for the variable Victimization is 14.69 with standard deviation 8.67. The maximum value obtainable in the scale is 50 and the minimum is 0. The average scale value is 25(25X1). A mean score of 14.69 indicates that level of victimization among students is at a moderate level.

The mean score obtained for boys and girls are 16.78 and 12.71 respectively. Obtained standard deviations are 8.49 and 8.37 respectively. The obtained mean score for boys 16.78, (SD = 8.44) is nearer to medium scale value (25). So boys have moderate level of Victimization. The mean score for girls is 12.71, (SD = 8.37) indicates that they have low level of Victimization.

For government, aided and unaided school students obtained mean scores are 14.24, 15.10 and 13.87respectively. Obtained standard deviations are 8.42, 8.86 and 8.36 respectively. A mean score of 14.24 for government school students indicates that the students are having not high level of Victimization. A mean score of 15.10 for aided school students indicates that they have moderate level of Victimization. A mean score of 15.87for unaided school students indicates that students are having moderate level of Victimization.

The mean score obtained for the variable victimization for students with parentsresident and parents nonresident are 14.65 and 14.77 with standard deviation 8.83 and 8.32 respectively. A mean score of 14.65 for students whose parents are resident of Kerala shows that they have moderate level of Victimization as it is greater than the minimum scale value (0). Also mean score obtained (14.77)for students with parents nonresident shows that they have also moderate level of Victimization.

**Conclusion**

From the analysis of the data, it can be concluded that students are found to have moderate level of Victimization for the total sample and relevant subsamples based on gender, type of management of school and the residential status of parents.Though bullying is found to be low among girls and unaided school students, they are not low in victimization.

**Comparison of Mean scores of Self efficacy, Bullying and Victimization**

In this section mean scores of the variables Self efficacy, Bullying and Victimization of pre-adolescents were tested for comparison. Two tailed test of significance of mean difference in variables on the basis of Gender, and Residential status of parents was used. For the comparison of the variable on the basis of Type of managementof the school, one way ANOVA was used.

**Comparison of mean scores of Self efficacy for subsamples based on Gender and Residential status of parents**

Mean and standard deviation of variable Self efficacy for the subsamples based on Gender and Residential status of parents and the critical ratio obtained in each caseare given in table 8.

Table 8

*Critical ratio for mean scores of Self efficacy for the subgroups based on Gender and Residential status of parents*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Classificatory variable | N | Mean | Standard  Deviation | t value |
| Gender | Boys  Girls | 303  322 | 84.59  85.33 | 11.59  11.93 | -.79 |
| Residential  Status of  Parents | Residentparents  Nonresident parents | 423  202 | 84.95  85.02 | 11.90  11.50 | -.70 |

From the table 8 it is found that the mean scores of Self efficacy obtained for boys and girls are 84.59 and 85.33 respectively. The standard deviations obtained are 11.59 and 11.93 respectively. The calculated ‘t’ value is -0.79. The tabled valueof ‘t’at 0.05 level of significance is 1.96. Since the calculated ‘t’ value is less than the tabled value, it can be inferred that the mean difference in Self efficacy between the two groups, boys and girls is not significant at 0.05 level. That is boys and girls do not differ in their mean Self efficacy score.

The mean scores of Self efficacy obtained for sub groups based on residential status of parents are 84.95 and 85.02 and standard deviation are11.90and 11.50 respectively. Critical ratio obtained is -0.7 which is less than the tabled value for significance at 0.05 level, 1.96 hence the mean difference in self efficacybetween the two groups, based on residential status of parentsis not significant at 0.05 level.

**Conclusion**

From the analysis of the data, it can be concluded that boys and girls do not differ significantly in their Self efficacy. Also children who have parents (both) as resident of Kerala and those with non resident (single or both) do not differ significantly in their Self efficacy.

**Comparison of meanscores of Bullyingforsubsamples based on Gender and Residential status of parents**

Mean and standard deviation of variable Bullying for the subsamples based on Gender and Residential status of parents and the critical ratio obtained in eachcase aregiven in table 9.

*Table 9*

*Critical ratio for mean scores of Bullying for the subgroups based on Gender and Residential status of parents*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Classificatory variable | N | Mean | Standard  Deviation | t value |
| Gender | Boys  Girls | 303  322 | 13.24  9.34 | 7.20  5.68 | 7.5 |
| Residential status of parents | Resident parents  Non residentparents | 423  202 | 11.07  11.55 | 6.38  7.47 | -.83 |

From the table 9 it is found that the mean and standard deviation of Bullying obtained for boys are 13.24 and 7.20 respectively. The mean and standard deviation obtained for girls are 9.34 and 5.68 respectively. The calculated ‘t’ value for the variable Bullying is 7.5. The tabled value of t at 0.01 level of significance is 2.58. Since the calculated ‘t’ value is greater than the tabled value,it can be inferred that the mean difference in Bullying between the two groups, boys and girls is statistically significant at 0.01 level. Hence it can be concluded that boys and girlsdiffer in their Bullying behaviour. A high value of mean score of Bullying for boys indicates that boys are more Bullying than girls.

The mean scores of Bullying obtained for sub groups based on residential status of parents are 11.07 and 11.55 and standard deviation are 6.38and 7.47 respectively. Critical ratio obtained is -.83 which is less than the tabled value for significance at 0.05 level, 1.96, hence the mean difference in bullying between the two groups, based on residential status of parents is not significant at 0.05 level.

**Conclusion**

From the analysis of the above data, it can be concluded that boys and girls differ significantly in their Bullying behaviour. Children who have parents (both) as resident of Kerala and those with non resident (single or both) do not differ significantly in their Bullying behaviour.

**Comparison of mean scores of Victimization for subsamples based on Gender and Residential status of parents**

Mean and standard deviation of variable Victimization for the subsamples based on Gender and Residential status of parents and the critical ratio obtained in each case are given in table 10.

Table 10

*Critical value for comparison of Victimization for the classificatory variable Gender and Residential status of parents*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Classificatory variable | N | Mean | Standard deviation | t value |
| Gender | Boys  Girls | 303  322 | 16.78  12.71 | 8.49  8.37 | 6.03 |
| Residential status of parents | Resident parents  nonresident parents | 423  202 | 14.65  14.77 | 8.83  8.32 | -.16 |

Table 10 shows that the mean and standard deviationof Victimization obtained for boys are 16.78 and 8.49 respectively. The mean and standard deviation obtained for girls are 12.71 and 8.37 respectively. The calculated ‘t’ value for the variable Victimization is 6.03. The tabled value of t at0.01 level of significance is 2.58. Since the calculated ‘t’ value is greater than the tabled value, it can be inferred that the mean difference in Victimization between the two groups, boys and girls is statistically significant at 0.01 level. Hence it can be concluded that boys and girls differ in their Victimization behaviour. A high value of mean score of Victimization for boys indicates that boys have more victimization than girls.

The mean scores of Victimization obtained for sub groups based on residential status of parents are 14.65 and 14.77 and standard deviation are 8.83 and 8.32 respectively. Critical ratio obtained is -.16 which is less than the tabled value for significance at 0.05 level, 1.96 hence the mean difference in victimization between the two groups, based on residential status of parents is not significant at 0.05 level.

**Conclusion**

From analysis of the above data, it can be concluded that boys and girls differ in their Victimizationbehaviour. Children who have parents (both) as resident of Kerala and those with non resident (single or both) do not differ significantly in their Victimizationbehaviour.

**Comparison of mean scores of Self efficacy for Government, Aided and Unaided school students**

To find out whether there exists any significant difference in Self efficacy for groups based on the Type of management of school, the investigator used the technique of one way ANOVA.

The details of one way ANOVA done in the case of Self efficacy is given as Table 11.

Table 11

*One way ANOVA of Self efficacy for students studying in Government, Aided and Unaided schools*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Source of variable | Sum of squares | Df | Mean square | F |
| Self efficacy | Between groups  Within groups | 2050.315  84340.222 | 2  622 | 1025.158  135.595 | 7.56\*\* |
|  | Total | 86390.538 | 624 |  |  |

\*\* p ≤ 0.01

From the table 11 it can be seen that F value obtained is 7.56 which is greater than the F value (4.61) required for significance at 0.01 level with (2, 622) degrees of freedom. It means that Self efficacy of pre-adolescents belonging to government, aided and unaided schools differ significantly.

The details of one way ANOVA done in the case of Bullying is given as Table 12.

Table 12

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Source of variable | Sum of squares | Df | Mean square | F |
| Bullying | Between groups | 421.002 | 2 | 210.501 | 4.68\*\* |
| Within groups | 27982.736 | 622 | 44.988 |
| Total | 28403.738 | 624 |  |

*One way ANOVA of Bullying for students studying is Government, Aided and Unaided students*

\*\* p ≤ 0.01

From the table 12, it can be seen that the F value obtained is 4.68 which is greater than the F value required for significance at 0.01 level with (2, 622) degrees of freedom (4.61). It means that Bullying of pre-adolescents belonging to government aided andunaided schoolsdiffer significantly.

The details of one way ANOVA done in the case of Victimization is given as table 13.

Table 13

*One way ANOVA of Victimization for students studying in Government, Aided and Unaided schools*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Source of variable | Sum of squares | Df | Mean square | F |
| Victimization | Between groups  Within groups  Total | 158.840  46721.694  46880.534 | 2  622  624 | 79.420  75.115 | 1.06 |

From the table 13 it can be seen that the F value obtained is 1.06 which is less than the F value required for significance at 0.01 level with (2.622) degrees of freedom (4.61). It means that students of government, aided and unaided schools do not differ significantly in their Victimization behaviour.

**Conclusion**

From the analysis of the above data it can be concluded that Self efficacy and Bullying behaviour of the pre-adolescents belonging to government aided and unaided schools differ significantly. Victimization behaviour of the preadolescents belonging togovernment, aided and unaided schools donot differ significantly.

**Relationship of Self efficacy with Bullying and Victimization**

The collected data has been analyzed to find out the relationship between Self efficacy with Bullying and Victimization of pre-adolescents. It is estimated using Pearson’s product moment coefficient of correlation (r). The details are given as table 14.


Table 14

*Pearson’s Product Moment Coefficient of Correlation for Self efficacy with Bullying and Victimization of pre-adolescents*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Self efficacy | Victimization |
| Self efficacy | - | - |
| Bullying | -.243 | .680 |
| Victimization | -.197 | - |

From Table 14 it can be found that the coefficient of correlation for Self efficacy with Bullying is -.243. The numerical value of the coefficient is greater than the tabled value 0.115,the value required for significance at 0.01 level. Hence the two variables are significantly related (P< 0.01). A value of 0.243 indicates a low relationship between the variables and a negative sign of the coefficient indicates the relationship is negative. That is for an increase or decrease in Self efficacy, there will be a corresponding decrease or increase in Bullying. Thus Self efficacy and Bullying are significantly, negatively related but the relationship is low.

To get a clear picture ofrelationship between Self efficacy and Bullying, the scatter diagram is given as figure 5.




**Self efficacy**

**Bullying**

*Figure5:*Scatter diagram showing a slight negative relationship between Self efficacy and Bullying

Also from the table 14, the coefficient of correlation between Self efficacy and Victimization is -.197 which shows a significant relationship as the obtained value is greater than 0.115,value required for significance at 0.01 level (N=500). A value of 0.197 indicates slight relationship between the variablesand a negative sign of the coefficient indicates the relationship is negative. That is for an increase or decrease in Self efficacy, there will be a corresponding slightdecrease or increase in Victimization. Thus Self efficacy and Victimization are significantly negatively related. But the relationship is negligible.

To get a clear picture of the relationship between Self efficacy and Victimization, Scatter diagram is given as figure 6



**Self efficacy**

**Victimization**

*Figure 6:*Scatter diagram showing a negligible negative relationship between Self Efficacy and Victimization.

**Conclusion**

From the analysis of the above data it can be concluded that the relationship between Self efficacy and Bullying of pre-adolescents is low, negativebut significant. Also the relationship between Self efficacy and victimization of pre-adolescents is significant, negative but negligible.

**Influence of Self efficacy on Bullying and Victimization**

The influence of Self efficacy on Bullying and Victimization was tested using one way ANOVA. For this the entire group was classified in to the groups based on their Self efficacy as High- Average- and Low, by½rule. The mean and standard deviation of the variable Self efficacy was calculated for the total sample, the values being 84.97 and 11.76 respectively, and those who score less than -½ where taken as low group

(-½79.09), those in between -½and + ½ as average group (between 79 and 91) and above + ½as high group (above 91). The result and discussion of each case is given under the following headings.

1. Influence of Self efficacy on Bullying among pre-adolescents.
2. Influence of Self efficacy on Victimization among pre-adolescents.

**Influence of Self efficacy on Bullying among pre-adolescents**

The result of one wayANOVA done in the case of Bullying is given as table 15.

Table 15

*Influence of Self efficacy on Bullying among pre-adolescents*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variables | sources of variable | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F |
| Bullying | Between groups | 1668.63 | 2 | 834.32 | 19.41\*\* |
| Withingroups | 26735.11 | 622 | 42.98 |
| Total | 24403.74 | 624 |  |  |

\*\* p ≤ 0.01

The influence of Self efficacy on Bullyingis significant at 0.01 level as the obtained F value for (2, 622) degrees offreedom is 19.41 which is greater than the tabled value for (2,622) degrees of freedom (4.61).That is, mean score of Bullying, significantly differ among the threegroups: high, average and low Self efficacy groups.Thus students’ level of Self efficacy significantly influences their Bullying behaviour.

Forknowing which groups differ in their Bullying and victimization behaviour based on Self efficacy,Scheffe’s test was done. The men scores, standard deviation and size of each group are given as table 16.

Table 16

*Mean, standard deviation and size of Low-, Average - and High – Self efficacy groups in Bullying and Victimization behaviour*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Self efficacy | Bullying | | Victimization | | N |
| Mean | SD | Mean | SD |
| Low group | 13.32 | 6.77 | 16.84 | 8.72 | 180 |
| Average group | 11.40 | 6.72 | 14.81 | 8.64 | 245 |
| High group | 9.14 | 6.14 | 12.59 | 8.19 | 200 |

Which groups differ in their Bullying behaviour is demonstrated in table 17

Table 17

*­Mean comparison of Bullying behaviour on the basis of Self efficacy using Scheffe’s test*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Self efficacy | Low | Average | High |
| High | 9.14 |  |  |
| Average |  | 11.40 |  |
| Low |  |  | 13.32 |

Table 17 reveals that High-Self efficacy group differs significantly from Low- and Average-Self efficacygroup in their mean Bullying behaviour. Average - Self efficacy group differs significantly from the Low- Self efficacy group in their Bullying behaviour.

**2. Influence of Self efficacy on Victimization among pre-adolescents**

The results of one way ANOVA done in the case of victimization is given as table 18.

Table 18

*Influence of Self efficacy on Victimization among pre-adolescents*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variables | sources of variable | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F |
| Bullying | Between groups | 1721.15 | 2 | 860.57 | 11.85\*\* |
| Withingroups | 45159.39 | 622 | 72.60 |
| Total | 46880.53 | 624 |  |  |

*\*\** P≤ 0.01

Influence of Self efficacy on Victimization is significant at 0.01 level, as the obtained F value is 11.85 which is greater than the tabled value of F for (2,622) df(4.61). That is mean scores of victimization significantly differ among the three groups: high-, average-andlow-Self efficacy groups. The student’s level of Self efficacy significantly influence their Victimization behaviour.

Which groups differ in their Victimization behaviour is demonstrated in table 19 and the mean scores with standard deviations are given in table 16.

Table 19

*Mean comparison of victimization behaviour on the basis of Self efficacy using Scheffe’s test*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Self efficacy | Low | Average | High |
| High | 12.59 |  |  |
| Average |  | 14.81 |  |
| Low |  | 16.84 |  |

Table 19 reveals that High Self efficacy group differs significantly from Low- and Average-Self efficacy groups in their mean Victimization behaviour. Average Self efficacy group does not differ significantly from the Low-Self efficacy group, in their Victimization behaviour

**Conclusion**

From the analysis of the data it can be concluded that High-Self efficacy group differs significantly from Low-and-Average Self efficacy groups in their mean Bullying behaviour. Average –Self efficacy groups differ from the Low Self efficacy groups in this Bullying behaviour. Also high-Self efficacy group differs significantly from Low-and- Average Self efficacy groups in their mean Victimization behaviour. But Average Self efficacy groups does not differ significantly from the Low Self efficacy group in their Victimization behaviour.

**Tenability of Hypotheses**

Based on the findings tenability of hypotheses for the study were reviewed.

The first hypothesis states that There is no significant difference in the mean scores of Self efficacy among pre-adolescents between the subgroups based on

a) Gender

b) Type of management and

c) Residential status of parents’

The findings revealed that there is no significant difference in the mean scores of Self efficacy among the relevant sub samples based on gender and residential status of parents. But there is a significant difference in the mean scores of self efficacy among students of government, aided and unaided school students. So the first hypothesis is partially accepted.

Second hypothesis states that ‘There is no significant difference in the mean scores of Bullying among pre-adolescents between the subgroups based on

* 1. Gender
  2. Type of management and
  3. Residential status of parents’

The findings revealed that there is significant difference in the mean scores of Bullying among boys and girls and students of schools with different types of management. But there is no significant difference in the mean scores of children with resident parents and non-resident parents. Therefore the second hypothesis is partially accepted.

Third hypothesis states that ‘There is no significant difference in the mean scores of Victimizationamong pre-adolescents between the subgroups based on

1. Gender
2. Type of management and
3. Residential status of parents’

The findings revealed that there is significant difference in the mean scores of Victimization among boys and girls and students of schools with different types of management. But there is no significant difference in mean scores of Victimization of pupils with parents who are resident and non-resident. Hence the third hypothesis is partially accepted.

Forth hypothesis states that ‘Self efficacy has significant relationship with Bullying behaviour among pre-adolescents. Findings revealed that there is a significant relationship between Self efficacy and Bullying in total sample. The coefficient of correlation obtained for the variables Self efficacy with Bullying for pre-adolescents is -0.243, significant at 0.01 level. The relationship is lowand negative. Thus the fourth hypothesis is fully accepted.

Fifth hypothesis states that ‘Self efficacy has significant relationship with Victimization behaviour among pre-adolescents’. The findings revealed that there is a significant relationship between self efficacy and victimization in total sample. The coefficient of correlation obtained for the variables self efficacy with victimization for pre-adolescents is -.197, significantly at 0.01 level. The relationship is negative but negligible. So the fifth hypothesis is fully accepted.

Sixth hypothesis ‘states that Bullying behaviour significantly differ among pre-adolescents with high-, average- and low- Self efficacy.Finding of the study revealed that there is a significant different between Bullying behaviour among pre-adolescents with high-, average- and low- Self efficacy. Hence the sixth hypothesis is fully accepted.

Seventh hypothesis states that ‘Victimization behaviour significantly differ among pre-adolescents with high-average - and low - Self efficacy’. Findings revealed that there is a significant difference between victimization behaviour among pre-adolescents with High-, Average- and Low- Self efficacy. Thus the last hypothesis is fully accepted.

**CHAPTER V**

**SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS**

* **Findings of the study**
* **Educational Implications**
* **Suggestions for further research**

**SUMMARY, FINDINGS AND SUGGESTIONS**

This chapter provides an over view of the significant aspects of the study viz; study in retrospect, major findings of the study, educational implications, conclusions and suggestions for further research in the area.

**Study in retrospect**

The present study was entitled as “INFLUENCE OF SELF EFFICIENCY ON BULLYING AND VICTIMIZATION AMONG PRE-ADOLESCENTS”

**Variables**

The study was a descriptive type and it includes two types of variables, namely independent and dependent variables. The independent variable of the study is Self efficacy whereas Bullying and Victimization are the dependent variables.

Gender, Type of management of the school, Residential status of parents were taken as categorical variables.

**Objectives**

The objectives set for the study are

1. To find out the extent of Self efficacy among pre-adolescents for the total sample and relevant subsamples based on
2. Gender
3. Type of management and
4. Residential status of parents.
5. To find out the extent of Bullying among pre-adolescents for the total sample and relevant subsamples based on
6. Gender
7. Type of management and
8. Residential status of parents
9. To find out the extent of Victimization among pre-adolescents for the total sample and relevant subsamples based on
10. Gender
11. Type of management and
12. Residential status of parents.
13. To compare the extent of Self efficacy among pre-adolescents between subgroups based on
14. Gender
15. Type of management and
16. Residential status of parents.
17. To compare the extent of Bullying among pre-adolescents between subgroups based on
18. Gender
19. Type of management and
20. Residential status of parents.
21. To compare the extent of Victimization among pre-adolescents between subgroups based on
22. Gender
23. Type of management and
24. Residential status of parents.
25. To find out the relationship of Self efficacy with Bullying among pre-adolescents.
26. To find out the relationship of Self efficacy with Victimization among pre-adolescents.
27. To find out whether Bullying differ among pre-adolescents with high-, average- and low - Self-efficacy.
28. To find out whether Victimization differ among pre-adolescents with high-, average- and low- Self efficacy.

**Hypotheses**

1. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of Self efficacy among pre-adolescents between the subgroups based on
2. Gender
3. Type of management and
4. Residential status of parents.
5. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of Bullying among pre-adolescents between the subgroups based on
6. Gender
7. Type of management and
8. Residential status of parents.
9. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of Victimization among pre-adolescents between the subgroups based on
10. Gender
11. Type of management and
12. Residential status of parents.
13. Self efficacy has significant relationship with Bullying behaviour among pre-adolescents.
14. Self efficacy has significant relationship with Victimization behaviour among pre-adolescents.
15. Bullying behaviour significantly differ among pre-adolescents with high-, average- and low - Self efficacy.
16. Victimization behaviour significantly differ among pre-adolescents with high-, average - and low -Self efficacy.

**Methodology**

Participants for the study

The study was conducted on a sample of 625 students studying in seventh standard from three revenue districts of Kerala viz., Kannur, Calicut and Malappuram. Duerepresentation to the strata of population like gender of the students and type of management of the school were ensured using proportionate sampling technique.

Tools used for Data collection

The following tools were used for collecting relevant data for the study.

1. Bullying and victimization scale.

2. Self efficiency questionnaire for children.

**Statistical Techniques used**

The following statistical technique were used for the analysis of collected data.

1. Preliminary analysis

2. Test of significance of difference between means for two large independent groups.

3. Pearson’s product moment coefficient of correlation.

4. One-way ANOVA.

**Major Findings of the study**

Analysis of the data made the investigator to arrive at the following major findings.

* Pre-adolescents have moderate level of self-efficacy for the total sample and relevant subsamples based on gender, type of management and residential status of parents.
* Bullying behaviour among pre-adolescents is found to be at low level for the total sample and relevant subsamples based on gender, type of management and residential status of parents.
* Victimizationbehaviour among pre-adolescents is found to be at a low level for the total sample and relevant subsamples based on gender, type of management and residential status of parents.
* There is no significant difference in Self efficiency between boys and girls(t value = -0.79)
* There is a significant difference in Self efficiency between government, aided and unaided school students at 0.01 level. (F = 7.56,P ≤ 0.01)
* Pre-adolescents having parents as resident of Kerala and non- resident do not differ significantly in their self efficacy .(t value = -0.70)
* There is significant difference in Bullying between boys and girls (t value = 7.5, P ≤ 0.01)
* There is significant difference in Bullying between government, aided and unaided school students. (F= 4.68, P ≤ 0.01)
* Pre-adolescents having parents resident and non-resident do not differ significantly in their Bullying behaviour. ( t value = -0.83)
* There is significant difference in victimization between boys and girls. (t value = 6.03)
* There is no significant difference in victimization among government, aided and unaided school students. ( F = 1.06)
* Pre-adolescents having parents as resident and non-residentdo notdiffer in their victimization. (t value = -0.16)
* There is a significant negative and low relationship between self efficiency and bullying amongPre-adolescents. ( r = -0.243, P ≤ 0.01)
* There is a significant negative and negligible relationship between self efficiency and victimization among pre-adolescents. (r = -0.197, P ≤ 0.01)
* There is a significant difference in Bullying behaviour among pre-adolescents with high-, average- and low - self efficacy. (F = 19.41 , P ≤ 0.01)
* There is significant difference in the Victimization behaviour among pre-adolescents with high-, average- and low- self efficacy. ( F=11.85, P ≤ 0.01)

**Conclusion**

Based on the major findings, the investigator reached at the following conclusion.

Pre-adolescents have moderate level of self efficacy for total sample and relevant subsamples, boys and girls, government, aided and unaided school students, and student’s whose parents are resident and non resident of Kerala. But bullying and Victimization are found to be at a low level among pre-adolescents for total sample and relevant subsamples, based on gender, type of management and residential status of parents.

The study also revealed that there is no significant difference in the mean scores of Self efficacy for boys and girls and students whose parents are resident and non resident of Kerala. At the same time, government, aided and unaided school students show significant difference in their self efficacy. In the case of Bullying and Victimization, there is a significant difference among boys and girls, government, aided and unaided school students, but not differ significantly in Victimization. Students whose parents are resident and non-resident of Kerala do not differ significantly in their Bullying and Victimization behaviour.

There exists a significant negative but low relationship between Self efficacy and Bullying among pre-adolescents. Also there exists negligible negative and significant relationship between self efficacy and Victimization among pre-adolescents.

In the case of influence of self efficacy on Bullying and Victimization behaviours, there exist significant difference in Bullying and Victimization behaviour among pre-adolescents with high-,average- and low- self efficacy groups.

**Educational Implications**

The findings of the present study made the investigator put forward the following suggestions for improving educational practice.

The study revealed that students have moderate level of self efficacy. Therefore provisions should be arranged to conduct personality development programmes for the all round development of the students. This will encourage the students to control their Bullying behaviour and immature emotions.These classes will also develop self efficacy among students.Cultivatingstudents academic self efficacy is a worthwhile goal for any educator. So instructional practices designed to develop student’s self efficacy and improve learning must be followed by teachers.

A teacher has to

* Encourage students to set clear, specific and challenging proximal goals.
* Provide students with honest and explicit feedback.
* Facilitate accurate calibration of self efficacy and
* Use peer modelling which may enhance students efficacy.

Bullying has many negative effects on the Bully, Victim and the bystander it may affect the school climate also.Bullying is a systematic problem and therefore, requires programs that include training in social andconflict resolution skills as well as establishing and enforcinganti bullying rules. Additionally, a successful program must involve everyone staff, parents, teachers and all studentsand not just Bullies and theirVictims.

The present study found that there is a low negative relationship between Self efficacy with Bullying and Victimization. So for an increase in self efficacy, there will be a low decrease in bullying and Victimization behaviour. So adequate programs for improving self efficiency are essential.School wide interventions that support safe, supportive, engaging environment and helpfully challengingnorms, expectations, beliefs, teaching and learning and leadership must be implemented.

Such intervention programmes include

* Constructive sanctions, positive behavioural supports.
* Dissemination of simple rules and rights.
* Consistently enforced and fair rules.
* Safe ways to report Bullying as well as recognizing bystanders behaviour withfocus in helping to make the school safer for all.
* Considering all forms of bullying, as bullying and not categorising as common or specific.
* Small group (class room, advisory) interventions that promote awareness and skill building that supports by stander behaviour including.
* Teach students about Bullying, rules and the role of the witness; by stander or up stander.
* Social, emotional and civic learning for students and adult.
* Providing opportunities for students to develop up stander skills and dispositions (role plays, exercises, student led activities)
* Infusing bully – victim – witness themes into the curriculum and life of the class room.
* Recognizing and addressing students who chronically ‘fall into’ the role of bully and / or victim.
* As victimization is the other side of bullying students must be made more confident, assertive and with self respect. So that one will not be surrendered for bullying.

**Suggestions for Further Research**

The experience of conducting this study made the investigator to suggest the following further research in this area.

* The same study can be replicated by comparing the students of rural and urban areas.
* Pre-adolescents are the participants of this study. The study can be extended to adolescents also.
* Now a day, Cyber bullying is spread all over the world so it can be verified in school also.
* A study can be conducted to find out various factors that contributed to Bullying and Victimization.
* Anindepth study can be conducted on antibullying or prevention programmes in the schools.

**REFERENCES**

**REFERENCES**

Allen, R.C., Espelage, D.L., &Mondamaya, L.E. (2009). Bullying and Victimization rates among students in general and special education: a comparative analysis. *Educational psychology*, 29(7), 761-776.

*American Heritage Dictionary.*(9th ed.). (1996). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Askew, S. (1989). *Aggressive Behaviour in Boys: To What Extent is it Institutionalized?*,in D.P. Tattum and D.A. Lane (eds) Bullying in School, 59–71.

Austin, S., & Joseph, S. (1994).Assessment of bully/ victim problems in 8 to 11 years olds.*BritishJournal of Educational Psychology*.66, 447- 456.

Bandura, A., &Barab, P.G. (1973).Processes governing this inhibitory effects through symbolic modelling. *Journal of abnormal psychology*, 82,1-9.

Bandura, A. (1977).*Social Learning Theory.*Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1986).*Social foundations of thought and action.*Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control.* New York: Freeman.

Basavanna, M.(2000).*Dictionary of Psychology*.Allied Publishers, New Delhi.

Bently, K., & Li, A. (1995). Bully and victim problems in elementary schools and student’s beliefs about aggression. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology,* 11,153–165.

Best, J.W., & Kahn, J.V. (2012).*Research in education* (10thed). NewDelhi: Prentice Hall of India Private Limited.

Bjorkqvist, K.,Lagerspetz, K.M.J.,&Kaukiainen,A. (1992).Do girls manipulate and boys fight? Developmental trends in regard to direct and indirect aggression.*AggressiveBehaviour*,18,117-127.

Bodenhorn, N. (2001).Development of the school counselor self-efficacy scale.(Doctoral,dissertation, Michigan State University, 2001).*Dissertation Abstracts International*,62(03),922.

Boulton, M.J., & Underwood, K. (1992).Bully/victim problems among middle school children.*The British Journal of Educational Psychology,* 62,73–87.

Brewster, C., &Railsback, J. (2001).*Schoolwide prevention of bullying: Bullying resource packet.* Center for School Mental Health Assistance: Northwest Regional Educational Library. Retrieved March 5, 2007, from <http://www.nwrel.org>

Burns, Garyn, Jasink, Dale, Dunn Steve Fetcher &Doncon.(2013). *Eric* No.EJ 100423.

Byers, D,L., Caltabiano, N.J., &Caitabiano, M. L. (2011). Teachers towards overt and covert bullying and perceived efficacy to intervene.*Australian Journal of Teacher education*, 36 (11).

Cacas, Jose, A., Ruiz, O., Rosario, & Delray, R. (2015).Bullying: the impact of teacher management and trial emotional intelligence.*British Journal of Developmental Psychology,* 85(3), 407-423. EJ-1071493.

Caprara, G.V., Barbarnelli, C., Pastorelli, C., &Cervone, D. (2004).The Contribution of Self-efficacy beliefs to Psychological outcomes is adolescents; Predicting beyond global dispositionaltendencies. *Personality and individual differences*,37, 751-763.

Chabha, M., &Thind, M. (2013).A study of self efficacy of teachers in relation to their role conflict.*Recent researchers in Education and Psychology*, 157(8), 109-134.

Chabra, & Grover, N. (2014).Self efficacy of adolescents, interplay of gender and locality.*Journal of Educational and Psychological research*, 4(1), 36-39.

Chan, Oliver, C.H., Chui, Hong, W. (2013). School bonds and school bullying: A study of Macanese mail adolescents on bullying perpetration and peer Victimization. *Child and youth care forum*, 42 (6), 599-616.

Charlton, A.L. (2009). *School counsellors perceived self efficacy for addressing bullying in the elementary school setting*. Ph.D dissertation, Falls Church, Virgina.

Cornell, D.G. (2006). *School Violence: Fears versus Facts*. Mahwah,NJ: Erlbaum.

Crick, N.R. &Grotpeter, J.K. (1996).Childrens treatment by Pears: Victims of relational and overt aggression. *Development and Psycho pathology*, 8, 367-380

Darolia, C.R., &Khanna, S. (2013). Self efficacy occupational and perceived organisational support as predictors of job performance.*Journal of Psychological researchers*, 57 (1), 31-39.

Dastgerdi, N.B. (2011). Comparing student self efficacy and attitude towards internet usage in higher education of Iran and India. *BRICS*, *Journal of Educational Research*, 1(1), 9-12.

Dedman, B.(2000). School Shooters: Secret Service Findings. *The Chicago sun times.*http://www/secretservice.gov/ntac/chicago son/case15.html.

Dickstein, L. (2005). *School bullies find a new playground.* http:// www.nydailynews.com/front/story/298461p-255094c. html.

Farrington,&Baldry. (1999).Bullies and delinquents: personal characteristics and parental styles. *Journal of commu*nity *and applied Psychology,*10(1), 17-25.

Ferrell-Smith, F. (2004).Tackling the schoolyard bully: Combining policy making with prevention.*National Conference of State Legislatures.*

Garret, H.E. (2004).*Statistics in psychology and education*. New Delhi: Paragon International Publishers.

Garrity, C., Jens, K., Porter, W.W., Sagar, N., & Short-Camilli, C. (1997).Bully proofing your school: Creating a positive climate. *Intervention in School and Clinic,* 32(4), 235–243.

Georgiou, S.N. (2008). Bullying and Victimization at school: the role of mothers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 78, 109-125.

Ghaderi, A.R., Kumar, G., & Kumar, S. (2009). Self efficacy and gender differences among the Indian and Iranian students.*Journal of psychological researchers*, 53(1), 1-5.

Griffin,& Gross. (2004). School violence from the perspective of Griffin.*Journal of counselling and development*, 4(2), 77-80.

Hanish, L.D., & Guerra, N.G. (2000).Children treatment by peers, victims of relational and overt aggression.*Development and psychopathology*, 8, 367-380.

Harsha, S. (2011).*Effect of social self efficacy on academic life satisfaction of higher secondary school students in Kerala*.Unpublished M.Ed dissertation, Farook Training College.

Heino, K.R., Rempela, M., Rantanen, P., &Rempela, A. (2000).Bullying at school: An indicator of Adolescents at risk for mental disorders.*Journal of Adolescents*, 23, 661-674.

Heretick& Jennifer, A. (2012). *The relationship between type of bullying experienced in childhood and psycho social functioning in young adulthood*. Ph.D dissertation, University of Florida.

Howker, D.S.J., &Beulton, M.J. (2000). Twenty years research on peer Victimization and Psychosocial maladjustment: A meta analysis review of cross-sectional studies. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 41, 441-455.

Huang, Chiang, Jung. (2013). Gender difference in academic self efficacy a meta analysis, *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, EJ 996773.

Jarvinen, K.L., &Pakasiahti, L. (1999).Development of Social problems solving strategies and changes is aggressive behaviour. A 7 year follow-up from childhood to late adolescents.*Aggressive behaviour*, 25, 269-279.

Jose, Paul, E., Kljarkovic, Moja, Schelb, Notter, E., & Olivia (2012).The joint development of traditional bullying and Victimization with cyber bullying and Victimization in adolescence.*Journal of research on adolescents*, 22(2), 301-309, EJ 966073.

Justice. (2000). Bullying in schools: School counsellors’ responses to three types of bullying incidence. *Professional school counselling*. 11(1), 1-9.

Kokkinos, M.C., &Kipritsi, E. (2001).The relationship between bullying, victimization, trait emotional intelligence, self efficacy and empathy among preadolescents.*Social psychology of education*, 15(1), 41-58.

Larson, L.M., & Daniels, J.A. (1998).Review of the counseling self-efficacy literature.*The Counseling Psychologist, 26, 179–218.*

Larson, L.M., Clark, M.P., Wesely, L.H., Koralski, S.F., Daniels, J.A., & Smith, P.L. (1999).Video versus role plays to increase counselingself efficacy in prepractica trainees.*Counselor Education and Supervision,* 38, 237–249.

Li, Q. (2007).Bullying in the new playground: research into cyber bullying and cyber victimization. *Australian Journal of Educational Technology*,23(4), 435-454.

Limber, S. (2002).Youth Bullying: Addressing youth bullying behaviours. American Medical Association.*Educational Forum on Adolescent Health.*

Macallair, D., & Males, M. (2000). School house hype: The school shootings, and the real risks kids face in America (Report, April 2010) Centre on juvenile and criminal justice.

Menesini, Ersilia, Camodeca, Marina, &Nocentini.(2010).Bullying among siblings: the role of personality and relational variables. *British Journal of Developmental Psycholog*y, 28(4), 921-939. EJ-906907.

Miller, W.S., Catbush,J., Gibbs,S., Sherrod,C.D., Jones,M., & Sarah. (2013). Dating violence,bullying and sexual harassment: longitudinal profiles and transition overtime. *Journal Youth and Adolescence*, 42(4), 697-618.EJ-1000331.

Mishna, F. (2003). Factors associated with perception and responses to bullying situations by children, parents, teachers and principals. *Victims and offenders*,1(3), 255-288.

Muris, P. (2001). A brief questionnaire for measuring self-efficacy in youths.*Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment,*23, 145-149.

Nansel, T.R., Overpeck, M., Pilla, R.S., Ruan, W.J., Simons-Morton, B., &Scheidt, P. (2001).Bullying behaviour among U.S. youth: Prevalence and association with psychosocial adjustment.*Journal of the American Medical Association*, *285*, 2094–3100.

National Children's Home (2002).*NCH 2002 Survey.*

Natwing, G.K., Albrektsen, G, &Qvarnmstree, U. (2001).School-related stress experience as a risk factor for bullying behaviour.*Journal of Youth and Adolescents*, 30, 561-575.

Nickerson,A.B., Schnurr,D., Collen,B., & Helen, M. (2014).Perception of school climate as a function of bullying involvement.*Journal of Applied School Psychology,*30(2), 157-181. EJ-1030134

Olweus, D. (1978). *Aggression in the schools: Bullying and whipping boys.*Washington, DC: Hemisphere.

Olweus, D. (1991). Bully/victim problems among school-children: Basic facts and effects of a school based intervention program. In D. J. Peplerand K. H. Rubin (Eds.).*The Development and Treatment of Childhood Aggression,* 411–448.

Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do*. New York:Blackwell.

Olweus, D. (1994). Annotation: Bullying at school: Basic facts and effects of a school based intervention program. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines,* 35(7), 1171–1190.

Olweus, D. (1997). Bully/victim problems in schools: Facts and intervention. *European Journal of Psychology Education,* 12,495–510.

Olweus, D. (1999). *The nature of school Bullying: A cross-national perspective*, 7-27.

Olweus, D. (2001).*Olweus’ core program against bullying and anti-social behaviour.*A teacher handbook. Bergen, Norway: Research Center for Health Promotion,University of Bergen.

Orpinas, P., & Horne, A.M. (2006).*Bullying prevention: Creating a positive school climate and developing social competence*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Randall. (1991). Bullying among Australian school children: Reported behaviour and attitude towards victims. *Journal of school psychology*, 131, 615-627.

Reynolds. (2003). Aggression, depression and bullying others.*Aggressive behaviour*, 28, 198-206.

Rigby, K. (1996). Strategies for reducing bullying in schools.*Human Rights Education Newsletter.*

Rigby, K. (2002). *New perspective on bullying*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publication.

Ronald, E. (1989). Bullying: The Scandinavian research tradition.In D.P. Tactum and D.A. Lane (eds.), *Bullying in schools*.Stroke-on-trend, 21-32.

Salmivalli, C., Lagerspetz, K., Bjo¨rkqvist, K., Osterman, K., &Kaukiainen, A. (1996).Bullying as a group process: Participant roles and their relations to social status within the group.*Aggressive Behaviour, 22,* 1–15.

Schuster, B. (1996). Rejection, exclusion, and harassment at work and in schools: An integration of results from research on mobbing, bullying, and peer rejection. *EuropeanPsychologist,* 1(4), 293–317.

Seixas, S.R., Coelho, J.P., & Fischer, G.N. (2013). Bullies,victim, Impact on health profile. *Educacao*, *sociedade and culturas*,38, 53-75.

Senn, D. (2007). *Bullying in the girl’s world: A school-wide approach to girl bullying (grades 3- 8).* Chapin, SC: YouthLight, Inc.

Smith, P.K.,& Sharp, S.(1994). *School bullying: Insights and perspectives*. London: Routledge. ED 387223

Solberg, M.E., &Olweus, D. (2003).*Prevalence EstimationofSchool BullyingwiththeOlweusbully/VictimQuestionnaire,Aggressive Behaviour,* 29, 239- 268

Sreeja, M.S. (2009). *Relationship of Maternal behaviour with bullying and victimization of adolescents*.Unpublished M.Ed dissertation, Farook Training College.

Suvitha, E.V. (2007). *Interaction effect of gender, social motivation and academic self efficacy in academic achievement of secondary school pupils*.Unpublished M.Ed dissertation, Farook Training College.

Thorp, D. (2004).*Cyberbullies on the prowl in schoolyard.* http://www.australianit.news.com.au/

U.S. Department of Education. (2002). No child left behind the act of 2001: Executive summary.

Vanhorn,Z., & Sara,M. (2013).*Does self reported bullying and victimization related to social, emotional problems in adolescents with and without criminal history*. Dissertation.ED-553711.

Veenstra, R., Lindenberg, S., Oldehinkel, A.J., De Winter, A.F., Verhulst, F.C., &Ormel, J.(2005). Bullying and victimization in elementary schools: A comparison of bullies, victims, and uninvolved preadolescents. *Developmental Psychology, 41*(4), 672-682.

Willard, N. (2004). An educators guide to cyber bullying and cyber threads. http://cyberbully.org/

Wright, S.L., Perrone, K.M. (2010). *An examination of the role of attachment and efficacy in life situation.* EJ889590.

Yoon, J.S., &Kerber,K. (2015). Bullying - elementary teachers attitudes and intervention strategies. *Research in Education*, 69, 27 -35.

Zou, M., Ganguli,N., &Shahnawaz,M.G. (2014).Personality and connectedness as predictors of school bullying among adolescent boys.*Journal of Indian Association Child Adolescents mental health,* 10(4), 249- 270.

**APPENDICES**

**APPENDIX I**

**FAROOK TRAINING COLLEGE**

Dr. VIJAYAKUMARI .K MUFEEDA .T

Associate professor M. Ed Student

Farook Training College FarookTraining College

**PERSONAL DATA**

hnZymÀ°nbpsS t]cv: B¬ s]¬

kvIqfnsâ t]cv : ¢mkv:

AÑ³ tPmensN¿p¶ Øew : tIc-f-¯nÂ tIc-f-¯n\p]pd¯v hntZ-i¯v

A½tPmensN¿p¶ Øew : tIc-f-¯nÂ tIc-f-¯n\p]pd¯v hntZ-i¯v

\n§Äho«nseF{Xm-as¯ Ip«n-bmWv : BZys¯ CS-bnÂ Ah-km-\s¯

**BULLYING AND VICTIMIZATION SCALE**

**\nÀt±i§Ä**

XmsgsImSp-¯n-cn-¡p¶ {]kvXm-h-\-IÄIgnªHcpamk-¯nÂhnZym-e-b-¯nÂsh¨v \n§Ä \n§-fpsS kl-]m-Tn-tbmSvsNbvXXpw \n§-fpsS kl-]mTn \n§-tfmSvsNbvX-Xp-amb {]hÀ¯\§fp-ambn \_Ô-s¸-«n-cn-¡p-¶p. Htcm {]kvXm-h-\-IÄ¡pw t\scaq¶v {]Xn-I-c-W-§Ä hoXwc­p `mK¯pambn \ÂIn-bn-cn-¡p-¶p. Ah Htcm¶pw {i²m-]qÀÆwhmbn¨v \n§Ä¡v A\p-tbm-Py-sa¶ptXm¶p¶ Hcp {]Xn-I-c-W-¯n\p t\scicn (✓) NnÓwtcJ-s¸-Sp¯pI.FÃm {]kvXmh-\-IÄ¡pw {]Xn-I-cWwtcJ-s¸-Sp-¯p-¶Xn-Â {]tXyIw {i²n-¡pI. \n§-fpsS {]Xn-I-c-W-§Ä Kth-j-Wm-h-iy-¯n\p am{Xta D]-tbm-Kn-¡p-I-bp-Åq.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rm³ Fsâ  kl-]m-Tnsb/  kl-]m-Tn-Isf/ | | | IgnªHcpamk-¯nÂ | Fsâ kl-]m-Tn-IÄ  Fs¶/ Fsâ/ F\n¡v | | |
| Hcn-¡-ep-anÃ | Ht¶mct­mXhW | c­nÂIqSpXÂXhW | Hcn-¡-ep-anÃ | Ht¶mct­mXhW | c­nÂIqSpXÂXhW |
|  |  |  | 1. imco-cn-I-ambn D]-{Z-hn-¨n-«p-­v. |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1. Cc-«-t¸cvhnfn-¨n-«p-­v. |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1. Ipä-s¸-Sp-¯n-bn-«p-­v. |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1. km[\§Ä A\p-hmZwIqSmsXFSp-¯n-«p-­v. |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1. aäp-Å-h-cpsSap¶nÂsh¨vIfn-bm-¡n-bn«p­v. |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1. X½nÂ ]nW¡nbn«p-­v. |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1. sN¿m¯ IpäwBtcm-]n-¨n-«p-­v. |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1. km[-\-§Ä a\¸qÀÆw \in¸n¡m³ {ian-¨n-«p-­v. |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1. Ipä-§fpwIpd-hp-Ifpwaäp-Å-h-tcmSv ]d-ªn-«p-­v. |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1. tami-ambsatÊPp-IÄAb-¨n-«p-­v. |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1. shÃphnfn-¨n-«p-­v. |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1. A]-hmZ {]N-cWw \S-¯n-bn-«p-­v. |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1. Ip¯phm¡p-IÄ ]dªvhnj-an-¸n-¨n-«p-­v. |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1. aäp-Å-h-cpsS CS-bnÂsh¨v ]cn-l-kn-¨n-«p-­v. |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1. aäp-Å-hsc D]-tbm-Kn¨v D]-{Z-hn-¨n-«p-­v. |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1. kwL-§-fnÂ \n¶pwHäs¸Sp-¯n-bn-«p-­v. |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1. `ojWns¸Sp-¯n-bn-«p-­v. |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1. A`n-{]m-b-§Ä a\¸qÀÆwFXnÀ¯n-«p-­v. |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1. CjvS-an-Ãm¯ Imcy-§Ä sN¿m³ \nÀ\_Ôn¨n-«p-­v. |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1. hyàn-]-c-ambImcy-§-fnÂ A\m-h-iy-ambn CS-s¸-«n«p-­v. |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1. ]än-¨n-«p­v. |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1. ]c-Zq-jWw ]d-ªn-«p-­v. |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1. A\m-h-iy-ambnhg¡pIqSn-bn-«p-­v. |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1. \nkmcImcy-§Ä¡p t]mepwtZjy-s¸-«n-«p-­v. |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1. am\-knIambnhnj-an-¸n-¨n-«p-­v. |  |  |  |

**APPENDIX II**

**FAROOK TRAINING COLLEGE**

**SELF EFFICACY QUESTIONNAIRE**

Dr. VIJAYAKUMARI .K MUFEEDA .T

Associate professor M. Ed Student

Farook Training College FarookTraining College

**\nÀt±i§Ä**

\n§Ä-¡v H-cpImcyw F-{X-t¯m-fwsN-¿m³ I-gnbpw F-¶-Xp-am-bn \_-Ô-s¸« tNm-Zy-§-fm-WvXm-sg X-¶n-cn-¡p-¶Xv. HmtcmtNm-Zy-¯n\pw t\scXosc-bnÃ, hf-scIp-d¨v, Ip-d¨v, \-¶mbn, hf-sc\-¶m-bn F-¶n§-s\ A-©v {]Xn-I-c-W-§Ä ho-Xw \Â-In-bn-cn-¡p¶p. Hm-tcmtNm-Zyhpw {i-²m-]qÀ-Æw- hm-bn-¨v A-h \n-§Ä-¡v F-{X-t¯m-fwsN-¿m³ I-gnbpw F-¶-Xn-sâ A-Sn-Øm-\-¯nÂ G-sX-¦nepw H-cp {]-Xn-I-c-W-¯n-\v t\-sc i-cn (✓) Nn-ÓwCSpI. FÃmtNm-Zy-§Ä¡pw {]-Xn-Ic-Wwtc-J-s¸-Sp-¯p-hm³ {]-tXy-Iw {i-²n-¡pI.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Xosc-bnÃ** | **hf-scIp-d¨v** | **Ip-d¨v** | **\-¶mbn** | **hf-sc \-¶m-bn** |
| 1 | ]T-\-{]-hÀ-¯-\-§-fnÂ X-S-Ê-§fp-­m-Ip-t¼mÄ \n-§Ä-¡v So-¨-dp-sS k-lm-bw tX-Sm³ F-{X-t¯m-fw km-[n-¡p-¶p­v? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | k-l-]mTn-I-fp-sS F-XnÀ-¸n-s\ a-dn-IS-¶v \n-§-fp-sS A-`n-{]m-b-§Ä {]-I-Sn-¸n-¡m³ \n-§Ä-¡v F-{X-t¯m-fw I-gn-bpw? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Zpx-J-I-cam-b Im-cy-§Ä D-­m-Ip-t¼mÄ A-Xn-s\ a-dn-I-S-¡m³ \n-§Ä-¡v F-{X-t¯m-fw- I-gn-bm-dp­v? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | XmÂ-]-cy-P-\-Iam-b Im-cy-§Ä-¡n-S-bnÂ \-¶m-bn ]Tn-¡m³ \n-§-Ä-¡v F-{X-t¯m-fw I-gnbpw? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | h-f-sc-b-[n-Iw ]-cn-{`-aw t\-cn-Sp-t¼mgpw im-´-\m-hm³ \n-§Ä-¡v F-{X-t¯m-fw I-gnbpw? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | a-äpIp-«n-I-fp-am-bn N-§m-¯w Iq-Sp-hm³ \n-§Ä-¡v F-{X-t¯m-fw I-gn-bm-dp-­v? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | ]-co-£-bv-¡v th-­n H-cp ]mT-`m-Kw ]Tn-¡p-hm³ \n-§Ä-¡v F-{X-t¯m-fwI-gn-bm-dp­v. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | ]-cn-N-b-anÃm-¯-h-cp-am-bnXam-i ]-d-bm³ \n-§Ä-¡v F-{X-t¯m-fwI-gn-bm-dp­v? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | ]-cn-{`-a-anÃm-sX-bn-cn-¡p-hm³ \n-§Ä-¡v F-{X-t¯m-fw km-[y-amWv? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | tlmw-hÀ-¡p-IÄ ]qÀ-¯o-I-cn-¡p-¶-XnÂ \n-§Ä- F-{X-t¯m-fwhn-P-bn-¡m-dp­v? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | \n-§-fp-sS k-l-]mTn-I-fp-am-bn k-l-I-cn-¨v {]-hÀ-¯n-¡p-hm³ \n-§Ä-¡v F-{X-t¯m-fw km-[y-amWv? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | \n-§-fp-sShn-Im-c§-sf \n-b-{´n-¡p-hm³ \n-§Ä-¡v F-{X-t¯m-fwI-gn-bm-dp­v? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | FÃm ¢m-kp-I-fnepw {i-²n-¡p-hm³ \n-§Ä-¡v F-{X-t¯m-fwI-gn-bm-dp­v? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 | Iq-«p-ImÀ C-ã-anÃm-¯ Im-cy-§Ä sN-¿p-t¼mÄ A-Xv A-h-tcm-Sv ]-d-bm³ \n-§Ä-¡v F-{X-t¯m-fwI-gn-bm-dp­v? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | D-t·-jw \-ã-s¸-Sp-¶p-sh-¶v tXm-¶n-bmÂkz-bw D-t·-j-hm-\m-Im³ \n-§Ä-¡v F-{X-t¯m-fwI-gn-bm-dp­v? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | FÃmhn-j-b-§fpw a-\-Ên-em-¡p-¶-XnÂ \n-§Ä-v F-{X-t¯m-fwhn-P-bn-¡p-¶p­v? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 | kp-lr-¯p-¡-tfm-SvXam-i ]-d-bm³ \n-§Ä-¡v F-{X \-¶m-bn km-[n¡pw? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 | \n-§Ä-¡v \Ã kp-JwtXm-¶p-¶n-sÃ-¶v \n-§Ä \n-§-fp-sSkp-lr-¯n-s\ A-dn-bn¡ptam? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 | am-Xm-]n-Xm-¡Ä¡vXr-]v-Xn-I-cam-b co-Xn-bnÂ ]Tn-¡m³ \n-§Ä-¡v km-[n-¡p-¶pt­m? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 | kp-lr-Xv-\_-Ô-§Ä \n-e-\nÀ-¯p-¶-XnÂ \n-§Ä F-{X-t¯m-fwhn-P-bn-¡m-dp­v? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21 | tam-iam-bNn-´-IÄ CÃmbv-a sN-¿m³ \n-§Ä-¡v F-{X-t¯m-fw km-[n-¡m-dp­v? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22 | ]co-£ ]m-Êm-Ip-¶-Xn-\p-Å {]-bXv-\-¯nÂ \n-§Ä F-{X-t¯m-fwhn-P-bn-¨n-«p­v? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 | a-äp-Å-h-cp-am-bn h-g-¡p-Iq-Sm-Xn-cn-¡m³ \n-§Ä-¡v F-{X-t¯m-fwI-gn-bm-dp­v? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24 | h-cm³ t]m-Ip-¶ Im-cy-§-sf¸-änth-h-em-Xn-s¸-Sm-Xn-cn-¡p-hm³ \n-§Ä-¡v F-{X-t¯m-fw km-[n-¡m-dp­v? |  |  |  |  |  |

**APPENDIX - III**

**LIST OF SCHOOL SELECTED FOR DATA COLLECTION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sl. No. | Name of school | Type of Management | Gender | |
| Male | Female |
| 1. | GVHSS, Cheruvannur | Govt. | 20 | 19 |
| 2. | Kannur City GHSS | Govt. | 17 | 10 |
| 3. | Kondotty GVHSS | Govt. | 15 | 20 |
| 4. | Kottappuram GHSS | Govt. | 18 | 22 |
| 5. | GVHSS Meenchanda | Govt. | 22 | 23 |
| 6. | Pallikkunnu GHSS | Govt. | 8 | 22 |
| 7. | Calicut Girls VHSS | Aided | 0 | 31 |
| 8. | DISGHSS Kannur | Aided | 13 | 20 |
| 9. | Korjan UP School | Aided | 24 | 13 |
| 10. | MMETHSS, Melmuri | Aided | 24 | 24 |
| 11. | MMVHSS, Calicut | Aided | 41 | 0 |
| 12. | MSPHSS, Malappuram | Aided | 29 | 22 |
| 13. | Puzhathi North UP School | Aided | 26 | 22 |
| 14. | Ramanattukara HSS | Aided | 16 | 27 |
| 15. | R.K.M.H.S.S Meenchanda | Aided | 7 | 26 |
| 16. | C.I.R.H.S.S Mathara | Unaided | 20 | 18 |
| 17. | D.I.S.E.H.S.S Kannur | Unaided | 12 | 11 |
| 18. | Islahiya EHSS Warangode | Unaided | 12 | 17 |