

## **Adolescents and Preadolescents' Roles on Bullying, and Its Relation with Social Climate and Parenting Styles**

Fuensanta Cerezo, Consuelo Sánchez, Cecilia Ruiz, and Julián-Jesús Areñe  
University of Murcia

### Abstract

This study analyzes the relation among bullying, some family and school context variables, and parenting styles, and investigates the differences by role in bullying. The sample was composed by 847 pupils (450 male and 397 female) from 9 to 18 years old ( $M = 12.73$ ;  $SD = 2.338$ ), from Primary (426) and Secondary (421) schools, from 38 intact groups of 5 schools randomly selected from different Spanish Regions. Results show that those involved in bullying are more rejected, and victims are the most rejected and have lower relationships among pupils. Family context is positively scored. The authoritative parental style is the most frequent. Not involved pupils perceive an indulgent style more frequently than involved ones; bullies perceive more negligent and victims more authoritarian or authoritative. The unsteadiness on parental styles between both parents plus been rejected by peers is pointed out as victimization support.

*Keywords:* Bullying, family climate, school climate, parenting styles, rejection.

### Resumen

En este estudio se analiza la relación entre la dinámica bullying y variables del contexto escolar y familiar y estilos educativos familiares, e indaga en las diferencias según el rol en bullying. La muestra estuvo constituida por 847 estudiantes (450 chicos y 397 chicas), entre 9 y 18 años de edad ( $M = 12.73$ ;  $DT = 2.34$ ), de Educación Primaria (426) y Secundaria (421), de 38 grupos intactos de 5 centros escolares de diferentes regiones españolas. Los resultados indican que los implicados en bullying son más rechazados que los no implicados, siendo las víctimas las más excluidas y con menor nivel de relaciones escolares. El contexto familiar es valorado positivamente. El estilo autoritativo es el más frecuente, entre los no implicados predomina el indulgente, negligente en los agresores y autoritario o autoritativo en las víctimas. La inconsistencia en los estilos entre ambos progenitores unida al rechazo de los iguales está relacionada con la victimización.

*Palabras clave:* Bullying, clima familiar, estilos educativos, clima escolar, rechazo.

Correspondence concerning this article should addressed to Fuensanta Cerezo. Department of Psychology and Education. School of Psychology. University of Murcia, Campus de Espinardo 30.100, Murcia, Spain. E-mail: fcerezo@um.es

## Introduction

There is a widely held definition of school bullying as an aggressive, intentional behaviour that is carried out by a group or an individual repeatedly and over time against a classmate who become a habitual victim (Olweus, 1993). Today's explanatory models propose analysis from an ecological perspective (Hong & Espelage, 2012; Postigo, González, Montoya, & Ordoñez, 2013) that consider characteristics from the family and school social climate.

Studies that relate family social climate and aggressive behaviours in adolescents highlight as risk factors homes with high conflict levels, hardly any affective relationships between the members, and little emotional support (Lösel & Farrington, 2012). There are aspects that distinguish the environments of the bullies and the victims, but the findings are not yet conclusive. Some studies highlight that among bullies there is often a high degree of conflict and exposure to violence (Benítez & Justicia, 2006) and low levels of participation and support, especially from the father (Aguilar-Cárceles, 2012; Perren & Hornung, 2005), while others report that bullies and victims alike experience high levels of conflict and low levels of cohesion and relationships within the family group (Pepler, Jiang, Craig, & Connolly, 2008). The relation between parental educational patterns and maladaptive

behaviours is also somewhat controversial, with some studies claiming that an authoritative style leads to better social adaptation (Parra & Oliva, 2006), while others suggest that Spanish teenagers from indulgent homes achieve similar or better results than those brought up in authoritative households (Martínez & García, 2007). Other research claims that it is more common to find authoritarian styles amongst young bullies (Baldry & Farrington, 2000) as well as incoherent (inconsistent) or inappropriate educational practices (Estévez, Murgui, Moreno, & Musitu, 2007); while among those who are bullied a high permissivity and maternal overprotection (Georgiou, 2008) or an authoritarian style is observed, particularly on the part of the mother (Sánchez, 2009). So there is no specific family educational style for those involved in bullying is confirmed, although there seems to be some consensus in associating authoritarian and inconsistent styles with aggressive behaviours, and overprotective and authoritative styles with been bullied in school.

In terms of school climate and bullying roles, studies point in general to Spanish pupils relating satisfactorily with their teachers (Pérez & Gázquez, 2010), except for those involved in bullying, who perceive more conflictive social climate (Sánchez, 2009), with victims who perceive lower stability (Sánchez & Cerezo, 2010).

The relation between social reputation in the peer group and the role in bullying has been broached in recent years, with research indicating that not involved students are better positioned in the network of relationships than those involved (García-Bacete, Sureda, & Monjas, 2010), and, among the latter, it is the bullies who are better situated, since they receive some support and greater acceptance by their peers than do victims (Salmivalli, 2010; Van Der Schoot, Van Der Velden, Boomb, & Brugman, 2010), who are rejected by a large part of the group, or simply ignored (Cerezo & Ato, 2010; Sánchez & Cerezo, 2011), which, without doubt, contributes to their isolation and defencelessness (Cerezo, 2014; Díaz-Aguado, Martínez, & Babarro, 2013).

While there are studies on the relationship between bullying and family and school climate factors, there are none relating the different contexts, parental styles, and bullying dynamics in youngsters and teenagers. We believe that a global ecological perspective should be applied in order to understand this phenomenon better. The main aim of this study was, therefore, to ascertain how adolescents perceive their school and family climate and parenting styles, and to examine the differences in terms of bullying roles. This overall aim can be broken down: (a) to analyze the differences in the perception of school social climate and social reputation in according to bullying roles (not

involved, bully, victim, bully-Victim) (Olweus, 1993); (b) to analyze the differences in the perception of family social climate according to bullying roles; (c) to ascertain whether the different participants in bullying perceive different parental socialization styles according to their role; and, (d) analyze the association between the characteristics of the social contexts and parenting styles with bully and victim profiles. Learning more about these variables will provide greater contextualization of the problem of school violence and will help develop preventive strategies aimed at improving coexistence.

## Method

### Participants

The study was conducted with 847 youngsters and adolescents (450 males) aged between 9 and 18 years ( $M = 12.73$ ;  $SD = 2.34$ ), belonging to 34 intact class-groups (426 from Primary Education and 421 from Secondary) in state schools and of medium to medium-low socio-economic level in two areas of Spain (Murcia and Valencia). Most of the subjects were of Spanish origin (12 % from abroad).

The selection of the groups was incidental. Directors and Heads of Studies were contacted and informed about the aims of the study. Their authorization was sought, as was informed consent from the

parents. Prior to carrying out the tests, the students were informed about the aims of the studies and were told that it was of a voluntary nature. Emphasis was laid on the importance of sincerity when answering the questions and on the confidential nature of the information provided. Tools were applied collectively in the students' own classrooms by people who had been trained, in two 50-minute sessions.

### Instruments

The roles associated with bullying (no involved, bully, victim and bully-victim), and the variables relating to social reputation (Acceptance, Rejection and Exclusion) were measured using the Bull-S test, a sociometric assessment test for violence among schoolchildren (Cerezo, 2012) in the form of a nominative questionnaire with 15 items. The tests collect scores from each subject on the peer group and covers four dimensions: (1) Sociometric position or *Social Reputation*, (4 items) using nominative responses (e.g. "Who would you choose as group mate?"); (2) *Aggression and victimization dynamic*, (6 items), with nominative responses (e.g. "Who usually begin(s) fights?"). This facilitates ascribing subjects to different roles, with importance given to subjects who obtain at least 25% of nominations as a bully, a victim or a bully-victim (when they appear as bully and victim simultaneously), with the rest making up

the group of no involved or others. The test also gathers information about *situational* aspects like *subjective perception* of situations. The overall validity of the test has a Cronbach alpha of .73, and .82 for the items related to aggressive behaviours and .83 for victimization behaviours. The study uses data on Bullying as related to Social Reputation.

School social climate was evaluated using the Spanish version of the School Social Climate Scale of Moos, Moos and Trickett adapted by Fernández-Ballesteros and Sierra (1989). The test assesses subjects' perceptions of the student-teacher relationship and of the organizational structure of the class. It has 90 True/False items, grouped in 4 scales: *Relations* (CES-RE), with 3 subscales: Involvement, Affiliation and Help; *Self-fulfilment*, with 2 subscales: Tasks and Competitiveness; *Stability*, with 3 subscales: Organization, Clarity and Control; and *Change*, with a single subscale, Innovation (e.g. "In this class, students really get to know each other"). The original scale returns "test-retest" reliability coefficients between .73 and .90. To interpret these, the direct scores have been transformed, according to the criteria in the guidelines, into standard scores.

The family social climate was evaluated using the Spanish version of the Family Social Climate Scale of Moos, Moos and Trickett adapted by Seisdedos, de la Cruz and Cor-

dero (1989). The test evaluates the interpersonal relationships between family members, the most important developmental aspects therein and the basic structure. It has 90 True/False items, grouped in 3 scales: *Relationships*, with 3 subscales: Cohesion, Expressiveness and Conflict; *Development (FES-DE)*, with 5 subscales: Autonomy, Performance, Intellectual-Cultural, Social-Recreational and Morality-Religiousness, and *Stability*, with 2 subscales: Organization and Control (e.g. "In my family there is a strong sense of unity"). It's  $\alpha$  reliability coefficients are between .68 and .86. In this study the complete scales of Relationships and Stability were used and from the Development scale, the subscale Autonomy ( $\alpha = .68$ ) was chosen. For interpretation, the direct scores were transformed into standard scores, following the guidelines in the manuals.

Parenting styles were evaluated according to the Scale of Parental Socialization Styles in adolescents (ESPA29) by Musitu and García (2001). The test has 29 items and 4-point scaled responses (Never, Sometimes, Often and Always). It provides an overall score for each parent in 2 dimensions: *Acceptance/Involvement (AI)* ( $\alpha = .97$ ), (e.g. "If I do what my mother/father tells me: they show affection; they are indifferent"), and *Coercion/Imposition (CI)* ( $\alpha = .96$ ) (e.g. "If I break or ruin something in my house, my mother/father: tells me off; hits me; deprives me of something; speaks to

me; doesn't care"). From the scores in these two dimensions each parent's socialization style is classified as *Authoritative, Indulgent, Authoritarian or Neglectful*. In our study, the style of the mother and the father were considered separately and in combination. The interpretation of scores was established from the dichotomization of the responses using the median value ( $M_e$ ) as the cut-off point in each dimension (Martínez & García, 2007).

### Data analysis

This is a cross-sectional study using scores measurements of the variables included. In order to determine the association between types of education and the various roles in bullying, the  $\chi^2$  statistic was employed along with an analysis of corrected standardized residuals (*CSR*) to help understand the relationship and the size of the effect was calculated with the Cramer *V* coefficient. In the case of the quantitative, or Likert type, variables used to measure the dimensions of social reputation or family social climate, and for the analysis of the possible differences in these between each of the roles in bullying, together with the subsequent two-by-two comparisons, non-parametric test were used (Kruskal-Wallis and the Mann-Whitney *U*, respectively) after verification of lack of normality using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. Finally, to analyze differences in the perception of the parental socializa-

Table 1

*Differences in Social Reputation and Social School Climate according to the Role in Bullying*

Variable-Roll	Statistics		Differences among groups <sup>a</sup>		Pairwise comparisons <sup>b</sup>			
	<i>M</i>	<i>M<sub>e</sub></i>	<i>X(gl)</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>	
<b>Acceptance</b>								
No involved	4.94	4.00	21.90 (3)	.000	NI/B	24324.50	.939	.00
Bully	4.97	4.00			NI/V	14727.00	.000	.13
Victim	3.03	2.50			NI/BV	1805.50	.002	.11
Bully-Victim	1.55	1.00			B/V	1451.50	.007	.24
					B/BV	179.00	.005	.32
			V/BV	239.50	.181	.16		
<b>Rejection</b>								
No involved	2.67	1.00	125.49 (3)	.000	NI/B	12534.50	.000	.25
Bully	7.00	6.00			NI/V	8338.50	.000	.28
Victim	12.48	10.00			NI/BV	423.50	.000	.20
Bully-Victim	27.82	31.00			B/V	1504.00	.016	.21
					B/BV	95.00	.000	.45
			V/BV	129.50	.002	.37		
<b>Exclusion</b>								
No involved	2.07	0.00	124.51(3)	.000	NI/B	18602.50	.000	.14
Bully	3.68	1.00			NI/V	5893.50	.000	.37
Victim	20.97	10.00			NI/BV	1423.00	.000	.16
Bully-Victim	15.36	3.00			B/V	826.50	.000	.51
					B/BV	182.00	.004	.32
			V/BV	286.50	.593	.06		
<b>CES-RE<sup>c</sup></b>								
No involved	49.94	50.00	14.57(3)	.002	NI/B	18200.00	.830	.01
Bully	49.81	49.80			NI/V	11570.00	.000	.14
Victim	45.64	44.66			NI/BV	2380.50	.215	.05
Bully-Victim	52.93	53.00			B/V	1115.50	.006	.26
					B/BV	219.50	.177	.16
			V/BV	125.50	.009	.33		

Note. NI = No Involved; B = Bully; V = Victim; BV = Bully-Victim.

<sup>a</sup> Kruskal-Wallis test.

<sup>b</sup> *U* Mann-Whitney test.

<sup>c</sup> CER-RE = School Social Climate Scale. Relationships. Rating 0-100.

tion style of the father and mother, we used the Wilcoxon rank test. The size of the effect was estimated using the expression  $r = Z/\sqrt{n}$ . Analyses were made with the SPSS 19.0 statistical package.

### Results

The descriptive analysis of the sample reveals a 16.2% incidence of bullying, which breaks down as: 8.1% bullies, 6.8% victims and 1.3% victims-bullies. The variable age showed no significant differences in involvement in bullying, but gender did: most of those involved were males [ $\chi^2(3, N = 847) = 39.35, p < .001$ ], both as bullies (87.0%), as victims (63.8%) and as victims-bullies (54.5%).

The results of the analysis of the differences in *social reputation* and *school social climate* according to the role in bullying are given in Table 1. Differences were found in the relationships scale (CES-RE). The *post hoc* analyses show the direction of these differences, with victims scoring the lowest ( $M_e = 44.66$ ), scoring lower than not involved ( $M_e = 50.00; p < .001$ ), than bullies ( $M_e = 48.80; p < .01$ ), and victims-bullies ( $M_e = 52.93; p < .01$ ).

In *social reputation*, Kruskal-Wallis test revealed differences in the scores obtained in *acceptance*, *rejection* and *exclusion*. The *post hoc* analyses confirmed that bully-victims scored lower in *acceptance* compared to the no involved group

( $p < .003$ ) and bullies ( $p < .005$ ). Victims were also less accepted than the no involved ( $p < .001$ ) and bullies ( $p < .01$ ). In *rejection*, those no involved were significantly less rejected than bullies ( $p < .001$ ), victims ( $p < .001$ ) or bully-victims ( $p < .001$ ). On analyzing the roles involved in bullying, victims are seen to be more rejected than bullies ( $p < .03$ ) and bully-victims ( $p < .003$ ), who are the most rejected ( $p < .001$ ). The findings show that victims are the most excluded group, with significant differences with respect to bullies ( $p < .001$ ) and no involved ( $p < .001$ ). Bully-victims are also more excluded than bullies ( $p < .005$ ) and no involved ( $p < .001$ ), but no differences were found between victim and bully-victim. Finally, no involved students were found to be less excluded than bullies ( $p < .001$ ).

Analyses of the relation between the role in *bullying*, *perception of family social climate* and *parental socialization styles*, the main findings of which are in Table 2, show a very similar perception of *family social climate* in all the participants except in *development* (FES-DE), where bullies scored significantly lower than those not involved ( $p < .03$ ), and than victims ( $p < .03$ ).

With respect to the *parenting styles* of the father and the mother, the findings indicate that there were no differences in acceptance and involvement with either parent in each of the roles in

Table 2

*Differences in Family Social Climate and in Parental Styles by Roll in Bullying*

Variable-Rol	Statistics		Diferencies among groups <sup>a</sup>		Pairwise comparisons <sup>b</sup>			
FES-DE <sup>c</sup>								
No involved	46.50	46.80	6.98(3)	.073	NI/B	11267.00	.014	.10
Bully	43.98	44.90			NI/V	13030.00	.472	.03
Victim	47.41	46.20			NI/BV	1921.50	.692	.02
Bully- Victim	43.37	46.10			B/V	1059.00	.020	.22
					B/BV	194.00	.643	.06
			V/BV	190.00	.638	.06		
MOTHER-CI <sup>d</sup>								
No involved	45.28	40.00	12.77(3)	.005	NI/B	14108.00	.121	.06
Bully	40.22	30.00			NI/V	11485.00	.011	.10
Victim	57.35	60.00			NI/BV	1661.00	.056	.08
Bully- Victim	26.00	15.00			B/V	985.00	.012	.24
					B/BV	193.00	.292	.13
			V/BV	109.00	.014	.32		
FATHER-CI <sup>e</sup>								
No involved	44.25	40.00	11.03(3)	.012	NI/B	14634.50	.793	.01
Bully	43.62	40.00			NI/V	10213.50	.008	.11
Victim	58.14	65.00			NI/BV	1341.50	.055	.08
Bully- Victim	22.00	22.50			B/V	1004.50	.049	.19
					B/BV	146.50	.144	.19
			V/BV	79.00	.008	.35		

Note. NI = No Involved; B = Bully; V = Victim; BV = Bully-Victim.

<sup>a</sup> Proof Kruskal-Wallis.

<sup>b</sup> Proof *U* Mann-Whitney.

<sup>c</sup> FES-DE = Family Social Climate Scale. Development. Rating 0-100.

<sup>d</sup> MOTHER-CI = Coercion / imposition by the mother. Rating 0-100.

<sup>e</sup> FATHER-CI = Coercion / imposition by the father. Rating 0-100.

bullying, but there were for coercion and imposition. Specifically, victims perceived a higher level of maternal coercion and imposition ( $M_e = 60.00$ ) than other roles: no involved ( $M_e = 40.00$ ;  $p < .03$ ), bullies ( $M_e = 40.00$ ;  $p < .03$ ) and bully-vic-

tim ( $M_e = 22.50$ ;  $p < .03$ ). The level of paternal coercion and imposition perceived was also significantly higher in victims ( $M_e = 65.00$ ) versus no involved ( $M_e = 40.00$ ;  $p < .01$ ), bullies ( $M_e = 40.00$ ;  $p < .05$ ) and bully-victims ( $M_e = 22.50$ ;  $p < .01$ ).



Table 3

*Differences in Parenting Styles by Role in Bullying*

	Role in Bullying								Total n (%)
	No involved		Bully		Victim		Bully-Victim		
	n (%)	RTC	n (%)	RTC	n (%)	RTC	n (%)	RTC	
Neglectful	84 (74.3)	-2.96**	16 (14.2)	2.73**	10 (8.8)		3 (2.7)		113 (16.1)
Authoritative	101 (80.2)		11 (8.7)		13 (10.3)		1 (0.8)		126 (18.0)
Indulgent	106 (87.6)		10 (8.3)		3 (2.5)	-2.19*	2 (1.7)		121 (17.3)
Authoritarian	97 (82.2)		8 (6.8)		13 (11.0)		0 (0.0)		118 (16.8)
Inconsistent	199 (89.2)	2.70**	10 (4.5)	-2.26*	11 (4.9)		3 (1.3)		223 (31.8)
Total	587 (83.7)		55 (7.8)		50 (7.1)		9 (1.3)		701 (100.0)

Note. Test Chi-cuadrado:  $\chi^2 (N = 701, 12) = 25.20, p = .014$ . Effect size:  $V = .19, p = .014$   
RTC = \* $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

The analyses of the *parenting socialization styles*, the main findings of which are reported in Table 3, indicate that the styles of parental socialization present a fairly homogeneous distribution, with authoritative families accounting for 18.0%, indulgent ones 17.3%, authoritarian 16.8% and neglectful ones 16.1%. It is significant that in 31.8% of families there is a style that does not fit in specifically with anything, which we have labelled inconsistent.

When considering parenting style, both parents together and its

relation with the role in bullying, the analysis of corrected standardized residuals indicates that the percentage of not involved students is higher in families with an inconsistent style (89.2%,  $CSR = 2.70$ ), while it is lower in families of a neglectful style (74.3%,  $CSR = -2.96$ ).

If the parenting styles of the father and the mother are considered separately (Table 4), the not involved students perceive a greater involvement and acceptance in their mothers ( $M_e = 75.00$ ) over fathers ( $M_e = 70.00$ )  $Z = -7.52, p < .001, r = .35$ , with no differences found

Table 4

*Parenting Style Mother/Father. Differences by Role in Bullying*

Role	Parenting Style <sup>a</sup>	<i>M</i>	<i>M<sub>e</sub></i>	<i>Z</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>
No involved	Mother-AI	66.95	75.00	-7.52	.000	.32
	Father-AI	59.37	70.00			
	Mother-CI	45.22	40.00	-0.63	.531	.03
	Father-CI	44.22	40.00			
Bully	Mother-AI	63.51	65.00	-1.41	.158	.19
	Father-AI	63.43	70.00			
	Mother-CI	39.09	30.00	-0.68	.496	.09
	Father-CI	43.09	40.00			
Victim	Mother-AI	63.04	70.00	-2.19	.028	.32
	Father-AI	54.42	65.00			
	Mother-CI	57.16	60.00	-0.70	.483	.10
	Father-CI	58.15	65.00			
Bully-Victim	Mother-AI	61.56	60.00	-2.02	.043	.72
	Father-AI	71.25	82.50			
	Mother-CI	26.00	15.00	-1.59	.112	.56
	Father-CI	22.00	22.50			

Note. Differences were analyzed by Test de los Rangos de Wilcoxon.

<sup>a</sup> MOTHER-AI = Acceptance/Implication by mother. Rating 0-100.  
 FATHER-AI = Acceptance/Implication by father. Rating 0-100.  
 MOTHER-CI = Coercion/Imposition by mother. Rating 0-100.  
 FATHER-CI = Coercion/Imposition by father. Rating 0-100.

between the two for coercion and imposition.

Among bullies we find that the percentage of individuals with this role is highest (14.2%) in those whose parents have a neglectful style ( $CSR = 2.73$ ), and is significantly lower (4.5%) when the parents have an inconsistent style ( $CSR = -2.26$ ). In support of this, no significant differences

were found in terms of the father and mother's upbringing style in this subgroup. Among victims a lower percentage was found (2.5%) when parents had an indulgent style ( $CSR = -2.19$ ). Furthermore, they perceive more acceptance and involvement on the part of their mothers ( $M_e = 70.00$ ) than their fathers ( $M_e = 65.00$ ;  $p < .03$ ), with no differences found in coercion

and imposition between the parents. Finally, among bully-victims, although no association was found between this role and the family upbringing style, the results show that these, in contrast to the no involved or victims groups, perceive greater acceptance and involvement of the fathers ( $M_e = 82.50$ ) than the mothers ( $M_e = 60.00$ ;  $p < .05$ ).

### Discussion

The analysis of the incidence of bullying shows its prevalence in the class-groups studied. Every proportion of bullies and victims is slightly higher than those reported by Olweus (1993) or those in the first studies made in Spain (Ortega, 1994), although our findings are in line with more recent ones (Cerezo, 2009; Garaigordobil & Oñederra, 2008). A higher proportion of males are involved both as bullies and victims (Cerezo, 2009; Cerezo & Ato, 2010).

The perception of school social climate is similar in all the sub-groups in the sample and only Relations shows differences between those not involved and victims, with the latter holding the worst perception of themselves (Díaz-Aguado et al., 2013; Perren & Hornung, 2005), which may be a consequence of serious problems of emotional competence (Sánchez, Ortega, & Mensini, 2012).

As regards social reputation, measured sociometrically,

the subjects involved in bullying are, in general, more rejected than those not involved (Cerezo, 2014; Sánchez & Cerezo, 2011), with victims being the lowest scored. Exclusion is associated more with victims and bully-victims than with bullies (Cerezo & Ato, 2010; García-Bacete et al., 2010; Salmivalli, 2010). All the above leads us to state that bullies are better placed in the web of interpersonal relationships than victims. In this sense, the findings of Inglés, Delgado, García-Fernández, Ruiz-Esteban and Díaz (2010) indicate that it is the prosocial behaviour of the individual and not the role played in bullying which determines the sociometric standing of students in the classroom-group. This, points to a high percentage of adolescents who have a high risk of being rejected or isolated by their classmates and who should receive psychosocial help. Future studies should continue to examine the relationship between prosocial behaviour, sociometric types and school social climate.

In terms of family social climate perception, adolescents show average levels in development, stability and relationships. This may indicate that they are satisfied with their family context. It is noteworthy that the only difference between roles in bullying is observed in the level of autonomy, which is especially low in bullies, which is in contrast to other studies (Pepler et al., 2008; Spriggs, Iannotti, Nasel, & Hayne, 2007) who reported family environ-

ments with a high degree of conflict and low cohesion.

As for perception of family education styles, there is a predominance of inconsistent styles with adolescents perceiving, moreover, differences between the styles of the father and the mother. Although they perceive similar levels of acceptance and involvement, they see differences according to their involvement in bullying with a predominance among the no involved group of the indulgent and authoritarian parents (Martínez & García, 2007); among bullies it is the neglectful parents, in contrast with Georgiou (2008), who reports that they are authoritarian, thus supporting the idea that weak family supervision and control may foster a lower social adaptation. Among the victims, there is a similar predominance towards the authoritarian and authoritative parents and discrepancies between the two parents are again found, with mothers showing more acceptance and involvement than fathers. This leads to the consideration that there is high level of overprotection in the mother (Sánchez, 2009; Tur-Porcar, Mestre, Samper, & Malonda, 2012) versus the high strictness of the father. Finally, among the bully-victims there is a predominance of negligence and clear discrepancies between the parents, with high acceptance and parental involvement together with low coercion and imposition by either parent. The behaviour of this subgroup is charac-

terized by aggressive behaviours and victimization behaviours and may be interpreted as reactive sustained by permissive and inconsistent family norms in upbringing.

To summarize the main findings of this paper on the profile of bullies: no difficulties were observed in the interpersonal relationships in the school context, which facilitates continuation of the behaviour (García-Bacete et al., 2010). As regards family climate, students perceive low autonomy, a lack of clear norms and a medium level of acceptance/involvement on the part of either parent. The predominant styles of upbringing are indulgent and on the part of both parents, elements that while favouring the expressiveness of adolescents deny them basic norms of socialization. These findings are different from those of other authors who report a close association between a negative family climate and a child's violent behaviour at school (Aguilar-Cárceles, 2012; Lösel & Farrington, 2012; Perren & Hornung, 2005), and also from those who report a close link between low quality family relationships and involvement in violent behaviours (Estévez et al., 2007; Moreno, Estévez, Murgui, & Musitu, 2009).

In terms of the profiles associated with victims, in the school context these find few friends and are excluded, leading to their perceiving themselves as rejected (Díaz-Aguado et al., 2013) and to problems of social adjustment (Rodríguez-Hidalgo, Ortega-Ruiz, &

Zych, 2014). Their family relationships are rated positively. The norms of upbringing reflect high maternal control and overprotection, along with a paternal authoritarian style. Consequently, they may perceive little acceptance from their father, and controlled and overprotected by their mother, so making it difficult for them to assimilate coping mechanisms (Pepler et al., 2008), which will make them especially vulnerable when faced with adverse interpersonal relationships. These findings lead us to ask whether an inconsistent family upbringing style (high paternal control and maternal overprotection) together with low social peer reputation might be elements that support school victimization behaviour.

Thus, school relational aspects may partly explain the prevalence of bullying behaviours and confirm that bullying is a group phenomena influenced by the network of relationships (Ortega & Mora-Merchán, 2008). However, a type of parental socialization style that favours maternal overprotection in victims and a lack of educational norms in bullies will also foster bullying and victimization in adolescents. According to Mestre, Tur, Samper, Náchter and Cortés (2007), in general terms, it can be concluded that prosocial and aggressive behaviour are the extremes of a dimension that is modelled by opposing cognitive and emotional processes in which the types of upbringing contribute to their development. Al-

though this study does not involve a common pattern in parental socialization style to the different roles in bullying, we can state that there is high inconsistency between styles in both parents, especially in the case of victims, and this may be at the root of the problem since it does not lead to authoritative practices, which in many studies are put forward as being the most efficient (López, Calvo, & Caro, 2008).

As a further contribution, this paper fosters a reconsideration of the orientation of traditional analyses of bullying, since it shows that should carry out studies with an ecological perspective contextualized. Thus involves not only individuals, but also school and family social contexts, highlighting the styles of parental socialization (Hong & Espelage, 2012). Moreover, the paper emphasizes the need to consider victims as risk subjects from the family and school perspective as there is a clear social vulnerability that is difficult to overcome other than by interventions aimed at enhancing social skills and self-confidence (Cerezo, Calvo, & Sánchez, 2011; Garaigordobil & Martínez-Valderrey, 2014).

An important limitation of the study is to emphasize the need to obtain information from the parents and teachers perspective and expand the study sample. Besides, it should be noted that the use a two-dimensional model — coercion and affect— in parental socialization does not allow a more detailed analysis

of the differences that might appear between styles than would have appeared with other models (Musitu & García, 2004). One possibility worth considering is the convenience of looking more deeply into the differences between males and females when perceiving school and family

social climate and its implication in aggression and victimization behaviours (Mestre et al., 2007), as well as longitudinal studies which show the evolution of the phenomenon bullying and its relation to different educational contexts through the various stages of education.

### References

- Aguilar-Cárceles, M. M. (2012). La influencia del contexto familiar en el desarrollo de conductas violentas durante la adolescencia: Factores de riesgo y de protección. *Revista de Criminología*, 54(2), 27-46.
- Baldry, A. C., & Farrington, D. P. (2000). Bullies and delinquents: personal characteristics and parental styles. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 10, 17-31. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1099
- Benítez, J. L., & Justicia, F. (2006). El maltrato entre iguales: Descripción y análisis del fenómeno. *Revista Electrónica de Investigación Psicoeducativa*, 4(9), 151-170.
- Cerezo, F. (2009). Bullying. Análisis de la situación en las aulas. *International Journal of Psychology and Psychological Therapy*, 9(3), 383-389.
- Cerezo, F. (2012). *Bull-S. Test de evaluación sociométrica de la violencia entre escolares*. Madrid: Albor-Cohs.
- Cerezo, F. (2014). Diferencias en estatus social entre roles en *bullying*: Un análisis sociométrico. *Bordón*, 66(2), 33-46.
- Cerezo, F., & Ato, M. (2010). Social status, gender, classroom climate and bullying among adolescents pupils. *Anales de Psicología*, 26(1), 137-144.
- Cerezo, F., Calvo, A., & Sánchez, C. (2011). *Programa CIP: Concienciar, informar y prevenir, para la intervención psicoeducativa y tratamiento diferenciado de bullying*. Madrid: Pirámide.
- Díaz-Aguado, M. J., Martínez, R., & Babarro, J. M. (2013). El acoso entre adolescentes en España. Prevalencia, papeles adoptados por todo el grupo y características a las que atribuyen la victimización. *Revista de Educación*, 362, 348-379. doi: 0.4438/1988-592X-RE-2011-362-164
- Estévez, E., Murgui, S., Moreno, D., & Musitu, G. (2007). Estilos de comunicación familiar, actitud hacia la autoridad institucional y conducta violenta del adolescente en la escuela. *Psicothema*, 19(1), 108-113.
- Fernández-Ballesteros, R., & Sierra, B. (1989). *Escalas de Clima Social CES*. Madrid: TEA.

- García-Bacete, F. J., Sureda, I., & Monjas, I. (2010). El rechazo entre iguales en la educación primaria: Una panorámica general. *Anales de Psicología*, 26(1), 123-136.
- Garaigordobil, M., & Martínez-Valderrrey, V. (2014). Efecto del Ciberprogram 2.0 sobre la reducción de la victimización y la mejora de la competencia social en la adolescencia. *Revista de Psicodidáctica*, 19(2), 289-205. doi: 10.1387/RevPsicodidact.10239
- Garaigordobil, M., & Oñederra, J. A. (2008). Estudios epidemiológicos sobre la incidencia del acoso escolar e implicaciones educativas. *Revista de Información Psicológica*, 94, 14-35.
- Georgiou, S. N. (2008). Parental style and child bullying and victimization experiences at school. *Social Psychology of Education*, 11(3), 213-227. doi: 10.1007/s11218-007-9048-5
- Hong, J. S., & Espelage, D. L. (2012). A review of research on bullying and peer victimization in school: An ecological system analysis. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 17, 311-322. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2012.03.003
- Inglés, C. J., Delgado, B., García-Fernández, J. M., Ruiz-Esteban, C., & Díaz-Herrero, Á. (2010). Sociometric types and social interaction styles in a sample of Spanish adolescents. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 13(2), 730-740.
- López, S. T., Calvo, J. V. P., & Caro, M. I. (2008). Estilos de educación familiar. *Psicothema*, 20(1), 62-70.
- Lösel, F., & Farrington, D. P. (2012). Direct protective and buffering protective factors in the development of youth violence. *American Journal of Preventing Medicine*, 43(2), 8-23.
- Martínez, I., & García, J. F. (2007). Impact of parenting styles on adolescents' self-esteem and internalization of values in Spain. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 10(2), 338-348.
- Mestre, M. V., Tur, A. M., Samper, P., Nacher, M. J., & Cortés, M. T. (2007). Estilos de crianza en la adolescencia y su relación con el comportamiento prosocial. *Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología*, 39(2), 211-225.
- Moreno, D., Estévez, E., Murgui, S., & Musitu, G. (2009) Relación entre el clima familiar y el clima escolar: El rol de la empatía, la actitud hacia la autoridad y la conducta violenta en la adolescencia. *International Journal of Psychology and Psychological Therapy*, 9(1), 123-136.
- Musitu, G., & García, J. F. (2001). *Escala de estilos de socialización parental en la adolescencia (ESPA 29)*. Madrid: TEA.
- Musitu, G., & García, J. F. (2004). Consecuencias de la socialización familiar en la cultura española. *Psicothema*, 16(2), 288-293.
- Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school*. Oxford: Blackwell. Trad. cast. de A. Gallardo: *Conductas de acoso y amenaza entre escolares*. Madrid: Morata (1998).
- Ortega, R. (1994). Violencia interpersonal en los centros educativos de enseñanza secundaria. Un estudio sobre el maltrato y la intimidación entre compañeros. *Revista de Educación*, 304, 55-67.
- Ortega, R., & Mora-Merchán, J. (2008). Las redes de iguales y el fenómeno del acoso escolar: explorando el esquema dominio-sumisión. *Infancia y Aprendizaje*, 31(4), 515-528.
- Parra, A., & Oliva, A. (2006). Un análisis longitudinal sobre las dimensiones relevantes del estilo parental

- durante la adolescencia. *Infancia y Aprendizaje*, 29(4), 453-470.
- Pérez, M. C., & Gázquez, J. J. (2010). Variables relacionadas con la conducta violenta en la escuela según los estudiantes. *International Journal of Psychology and Psychological Therapy*, 10(3), 427-437.
- Perren, S., & Hornung, R. (2005). Bullying and delinquency in adolescence: Victims' and perpetrators' family and peer relations. *Swiss Journal of Psychology*, 64(1), 51-64. doi: 10.1024/1421-0185.64.4.51
- Pepler, D., Jiang, D., Craig, W., & Connolly, J. (2008). Developmental trajectories of bullying and associated factors. *Child Development*, 79(2), 325-338. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2007.01128.x
- Postigo, S., González, R., Montoya, I., & Ordoñez, A. (2013). Theoretical proposals in bullying research: A review. *Anales de Psicología*, 29(2), 413-425. doi: 10.6018/analesps.29.2.148251
- Rodríguez-Hidalgo, A. J., Ortega-Ruiz, R., & Zych, I. (2014). Victimización étnico-cultural entre iguales: Autoestima y relaciones en la escuela entre diferentes grupos culturales de estudiantes de Andalucía (España). *Revista de Psicodidáctica*, 9(1), 191-210. doi: 10.1387/Rev Psicodidact.7909
- Salmivalli, C. (2010). Bullying and the peer group. A review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 15, 112-120. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2009.08.007
- Sánchez, C. (2009). Nivel de implicación en bullying entre escolares de educación primaria. Relación con el estatus sociométrico y la percepción del clima social familiar y escolar. *Tesis doctoral. Universidad de Murcia*. <http://www.tesisenred.net/TDR-0723109-132251/indexcs.html>
- Sánchez, C., & Cerezo, F. (2010). Variables personales y sociales relacionadas con la dinámica bullying en escolares de Educación Primaria. *Revista de Investigación Psicoeducativa*, 8(3), 299-312.
- Sánchez, C., & Cerezo, F. (2011). Estatus social de los sujetos implicados en bullying. Elementos para la mejora de la convivencia en el aula. *Revista Española de Orientación y Psicopedagogía*, 22(2), 137-149.
- Sánchez, V., Ortega, R., & Menesini, E. (2012). La competencia emocional de agresores y víctimas del bullying. *Anales de Psicología*, 28(1), 71-82.
- Seisdedos, N., de la Cruz, M. V., & Cordero, A. (1989). *Escalas de clima social familiar (FES)*. Madrid: TEA Ediciones.
- Spriggs, A., Iannotti, R., Nansel, T., & Haynie, D. (2007). Adolescent bullying involvement and perceived family peer and school relations: Commonalities and differences across race/ethnicity. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 41, 283-293. doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2007.04.009
- Tur-Porcar, A., Mestre, V., Samper, P., & Malonda, E. (2012). Crianza y agresividad de los menores: ¿Es diferente la influencia del padre y de la madre? *Psicothema*, 24(2), 284-288.
- Van Der Schoot, R., Van Der Velden, F., Boomb, J., & Brugman, D. (2010). Can at-risk young adolescents be popular and anti-social? Sociometric status groups, anti-social behaviour, gender and ethnic background. *Journal of Adolescence*, 33, 583-592. doi: 10.1016/j.adolescence.2009.12.004



Fuensanta Cerezo Ramírez, Lecturer in the area of Educational Psychology in the University of Murcia (Spain) (UMU), in his scientific management emphasizes three doctoral theses and publications on subjects related to bullying. She is the author of Bull-S Test for bullying and psychometric evaluation of the CIP program director for prevention and intervention.

Consuelo Sánchez Lacasa, Associate Professor in the area of Educational Psychology in the University of Murcia (Spain) (UMU). She teaches Elementary Education Specialist in Therapeutic Pedagogy. His scientific production is part of the line of school violence and improving the coexistence. She is coauthor of the CIP program.

Cecilia Ruiz Esteban, Lecturer in the area of Educational Psychology in the University of Murcia (Spain) (UMU). She has made several publications in high impact journals on social skills in secondary school students.

Julián Jesús Arese, Associate Professor in the area of Partner Health Sciences, Faculty of Medicine, University of Murcia-Spain (UMU). Regular contributor to research in the field of public health and educational psychology. Expert in biostatistics and epidemiology.

Received date: 28-03-2014

Review date: 29-09-2014

Accepted date: 10-11-2014

