

Parenting Styles And Bullying Behaviour Among Secondary School Students In Delta Central Senatorial District

¹EKIRIBI, Ochuko Emmalove and Prof (Mrs) F. N. Ugoji²:

^{1&2}Department of Guidance and Counselling, Faculty of Education, Delta State University, Abraka, Nigeria

Abstract: *This study examined the relationship that exists between parenting styles and bullying behaviour among secondary school students in Delta Central Senatorial District. Four research questions and Four hypotheses guided the study. The study adopted the correlational research design. The population of the study comprised 17,914 SS 2 students in Delta Central Senatorial District. A sample size of 1,000 students was selected through a multistage sampling method. Questionnaire is the instrument that was used to collect data in the study. The instrument was validated by means of expert's judgement and factor analysis. Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient was used to estimate the reliability index of the instrument. The Pearson's coefficient of determination and linear regression statistics were used to analyse the data. The findings of the study revealed among others that there is a significant negative relationship between authoritative parenting style and bullying behaviour among secondary school students; that there is a significant positive relationship between authoritarian parenting style and bullying behaviour among secondary school students; that there is a significant positive relationship between permissive parenting style and bullying behaviour among secondary school students; and that there is a significant positive relationship between uninvolved parenting style and bullying behaviour among secondary school students. The study recommended that parents and caregivers should be encouraged to adopt authoritative parenting practices that combine warmth and support with clear expectations and boundaries*

Keywords: Parenting Style, Bullying Behaviour, secondary school students

INTRODUCTION

Bullying is a pattern of behaviour in which one individual is chosen as the target of repeated aggression by one or more individuals; the targeted person (the victim) generally has less power than those who engage in the aggression (bullies). Bullying can take several forms, including insulting, teasing, verbal and physical abuse, threatening, humiliating, harassing and mobbing. According to Eremie, Ejimaji, Eleberi, Dibia and Egbe (2020), bullying can be in the form of physical, emotional and verbal assault. Physical bullying includes causing physical injuries, punching, slapping, attacking, fighting, & debagging. Emotional bullying includes spreading malicious rumours about people, harassment, provocation, whispering to another in front of someone, getting certain people to gang up on others. On the other hand, verbal bullying includes name calling, diverting foul language at the target, harassment, tormenting, commenting negatively on someone's look, clothes and body.

According to Lanearux (2010) out of more than 15,000 public school students surveyed in the United States, almost 30 percent reported occasional or frequent involvement in bullying, whether as a bully, a target or both. In the United Kingdom, the British School Health Education unit found that about a quarter of 10 - 11 years old surveyed were bullied either every day or "often", another report says that 15 percent of Australian children admit to have been bullied weekly. In Nigeria in June 2018, an appalling video made wave on social media of a girl from a public school in Nigeria who bullied another girl who resisted her intimidation, she forcefully humiliated the girl and beat her to death as other girls and boys watched but could not interfere until they sensed that the girl had passed out. A similar headline rocked "the nations online magazine of August 13th, 2016, bemoaning the ugly bullying incidence that led to serious bruises and bone fracture of a 10-year-old girl who became bullies' favourite. This gives an insight into the scope of the problem at hand. Why should the lives of children who were sent to school healthy suddenly be quenched or threatened against the regulations of ILO-OSHA 155 (1974).

The reports of the United Children's Fund published in daily post of December 1, 2016 said that over 50% of Nigerian children suffered physical violence in schools. 35.5% of girls and 34.1% of boys suffer physical violence within the family and immediate environment. Egbochukwu (as cited in Wokoma & Udochukwu, 2020) also noted that 78% of children have been victims of bullying on at least one occasion and 71% have lashed out at others at least once. Adeosun et al (2015) reported that more than half (56.8%) of their sample had been victims of bullying in the past month. The situation is not different in Delta Central Senatorial District as observations made by the researcher have shown incessant cases of bullying among the students in that senatorial district. The researchers and of course educational stakeholders are worried as a result of the life-threatening effect of bullying. The researchers observed during their practicum exercise in one of the secondary schools in the senatorial district, that so many of the students indulge in bullying. Especially the senior students bully the junior students to the extent of some of them sustaining different degrees of injuries. When most of the junior students come for counselling, their complain is usually the fact that the senior students are maltreating them. This has led to so many psychological problems such as anxiety disorder, depression and low self-esteem.

The effects are pervasive and far-reaching, from mental point of view; a child's self-esteem can be severely impacted even years after bullying has stopped, the victims of bullying may suffer from depression, particularly if the bullying has occurred over a long period of time. It should be recognized that these mental effects do not stop at the bullied; they also extend to the bullies. UNICEF (as cited in Wokoma & Udochukwu, 2020) report noted that the rapid increase in the level of bullying has had negative consequences on student's education and on their quality of life, examples include decrease in school attendance, decrease in contact with peers, decrease in academic achievement, increase in physical injury and increase depression etc. Bullying can affect everyone those who are bullied, those who bully, and those who witness bullying. Bullying is linked to many negative outcomes including impacts on mental health, substance use, and suicide.

Kids who are bullied can experience negative physical, school, and mental health issues. The report by UNICEF shows that kids who are bullied are more likely to experience depression and anxiety, increased feelings of sadness, and loneliness, changes in sleep and eating patterns, and loss of interest in activities they used to enjoy. The worry according to the research is that these issues may persist into adulthood, decreased academic achievement in standardized test scores and school participation. They are more likely to miss, skip, or drop out of school. A very small number of bullied children might retaliate through extremely violent measures. Kids who bully others can also engage in violent and other risky behaviours into adulthood. Abuse alcohol and other drugs in adolescence and as adults; get into fights, vandalize property, and engage in early sexual activity; and have criminal convictions as adults

According to Omoteso (2010) studies have shown that those involved in prolonged and serious bullying of others experience wide range of mental health, academic and social problems, he also pointed out that studies point to the connection between bullying and sexual harassment and violence in later years. Laneaux (2010) is of the view that after repeatedly facing a bully, a child may begin to refuse to go to school. His grades may also suffer both because of absenteeism and his inability to concentrate; he further observed that school bullying affects the relationship between the bullied and his or her parents or guardians.

The relationship between a parent and the child who is being bullied may be strained because of the child's hostility towards school. For instance, a child may blame his or her parents for forcing him to go to that school. He concludes that the child may begin asking the parent for more allowances and lunch money if the bully is demanding money from him. According to Wikipedia (2010) victims of bullying can suffer from long term emotional and behavioural problems. Bullying can cause loneliness, depression, anxiety, lead to low self-esteem and increased susceptibility to illness.

There is also a physical effect of school bullying. For instance, bruises, scratches and scars can show evidence of bullying in a child is, aside from the normal bumps and scrapes that, young children get from playing, excessive marks should be investigated. Also, loss of appetite or sleep is a common result of the fear and anxiety that bullying cause. Bullying also affects the friendly relationship of the victim and his or her friends. A child may isolate himself or develop a general distrust of people. He may also seek revenge on his bully or feel justified in attacking other children to relieve stress or anxiety (Eremie, et al., 2020).. Several reasons have been advanced for the several unending cases of bullying in schools. For instance, Omoteso (2010) explains that personality characteristics and typical reaction patterns, combined with the level of physical strength or weakness in the case of boys, can help to explain the development of bullying problems. Eremie, et al (2020) also identified poor parent-child relationship. According to the authors, children who are not very well attached to their parents are more likely to bully their peers while children who have positive relationships with their parents are less likely to participate in bullying. One area that may not have been well explored is the role of parenting styles and peer pressure on bullying behaviour among secondary school students.

Parenting style refers to the ways or techniques parents employ in the upbringing of their children. According the psychologist, Diana Baumrind (1991), there are four parenting styles or dimensions namely, authoritative, authoritarian, permissive and uninvolved parenting styles. In explaining these dimensions of parenting, two important features are judged to be essential namely, parental responsiveness and parental demandingness (Gurian, as cited in Efobi & Nwokolo, 2014). While responsiveness implies the willingness and availability of the parents to show care, concern and provide for the children; demandingness connotes the tendency of the parents to control the child and limit his freedom almost in everything. It is how a parent applies either or both of these two features that decides the parenting style such a parent is using.

Authoritative parenting style is the parenting style in which the parents direct their children's activities in a rational, issue-oriented manner, exercising control, when necessary, but gives the children freedom to act independently and responsibly. This is a kind of democratic style of parenting, where the parents are attentive and explains the reasons for the rules set for the children to obey. According to Greenwood (2013), authoritative parents set clear expectations and high standards, as well as monitor the children's behaviour, using discipline based on reasoning. They also encourage their children to make decisions and learn from their mistakes. Authoritative parents are warm and nurturing, and they treat their children with kindness, respect and affection. It was observed by Kopko (as cited in Brighi, et al., 2012) that adolescents of authoritative parents are more likely to be socially competent, responsible and autonomous because they have learned to employ negotiation.

Authoritarian parents are those who attempt to shape, control and evaluate the behaviour of the child without considering the feelings of the child. In this style of parenting, the children are required to follow rules without any explanations from the parents (Cherry, 2013). Parents practicing this style of parenting demand too much from their children while they seem to neglect their responsibility toward their children. According to Gurian (as cited in Efobi & Nwokolo, 2014), such parents are extremely strict and highly controlling; they dictate how their children should behave without giving room for any dissenting opinion or behaviour from their children. There is little communication between parents and children. Kopko (as cited in Brighi, et al., 2012) observed that adolescents of this type of parenting may become rebellious, or aggressive or dependent on their parents.

Permissive parents according to Baumrind are parents who are non-punitive, accepting and affirmative in their relationship towards their children. Such parents make few or no demands for household responsibility and allow the children to behave the way they want. According to Kopko (as cited in Brighi, et al., 2012), permissive parents are warm but not demanding; indulgent and passive. Such parents apparently believe that the way to prove their love is to allow their children to have all they desire, not minding the consequences. Greenwood (2013) view permissive parents as being openly affective and loving but setting no limit, even when the children's safety is at stake.

Uninvolved parents as disengaged parents who are neither demanding nor responsive. These parents do not monitor their children's behaviour and also do not support them. An uninvolved parent is characterised by few demands, low responsiveness as well as little communication between parent and child (Cherry, 2013). In extreme cases, uninvolved parenting may entail neglect and rejection of the child from the parents (Greenwood, 2013). In line with the above background, the aim of this study is to explore the nature of the relationship that exists between parenting styles and bullying behaviour among secondary school students in Delta Central Senatorial District.

Statement of the Problem

Bullying behaviour is a potentially damaging form of disturbance among school students in Nigeria and elsewhere throughout the world. This is because bullying affects health and wellbeing of students in schools. Some weak students are damaged physically while others are disturbed psychologically through verbal or cyber harm. For this reason, bullying behaviours affect smooth running of school activities. Teachers spend a large part of their working hours on attending to cases related to bullying acts among school students. Bullies at school grow up to become hostile later in adolescence and adulthood. Uncontrolled bullying at childhood endures for a long period of time and affects the personality development of bullies throughout their life. Repeated bullying of weak and vulnerable students leads to anxiety, low self-esteem and depression problems among the victimized students. There is also a close link between repeated bullying of victimized students and their behavioural and personality development.

The researcher observed during his practicum exercise in one of the secondary schools in the senatorial district, that so many of the students indulge in bullying. Especially the senior students bully the junior students to the extent of some of them sustaining different degrees of injuries. When most of the junior students come for counselling, their complain is usually the fact that the senior students are maltreating them. This has led to so many psychological problems such as anxiety disorder, depression and low self-esteem.

Students who are targeted by the bullies often have difficulty concentrating in their school work and participating at social interaction among students. Those who are not directly involved but regularly witness it, suffer from a less secure learning environment and the fear that the bullies may target them next and the knowledge that the teachers, school administrators and other adults are either unable or unwilling to control the bullies and their behavioural manifestations leads to psychological wound that endures for years! This is because the powerful school students fail to use their power appropriately to assist the weak and vulnerable school-mate but rather use it wrongly by inflicting physical and psychological harm on the weak school-mate. Numerous reasons have been suggested to be responsible for bullying behaviour in secondary schools. However, the research is interested in parenting styles and peer pressure. Hence, the problem of this is, what is the relationship among parenting styles, peer pressure and bullying behaviour among secondary school students in Delta Central Senatorial District?

Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study:

1. What is the relationship between authoritative parenting style and bullying behaviour among secondary school students in Delta Central Senatorial District?
2. What is the relationship between authoritarian parenting style and bullying behaviour among secondary school students in Delta Central Senatorial District?
3. What is the relationship between permissive parenting style and bullying behaviour among secondary school students in Delta Central Senatorial District?

4. What is the relationship between uninvolved parenting style and bullying behaviour among secondary school students in Delta Central Senatorial District?

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were formulated to guide the study:

1. There is no significant relationship between authoritative parenting style and bullying behaviour among secondary school students in Delta Central Senatorial District
2. There is no significant relationship between authoritarian parenting style and bullying behaviour among secondary school students in Delta Central Senatorial District
3. There is no significant relationship between permissive parenting style and bullying behaviour among secondary school students in Delta Central Senatorial District
4. There is no significant relationship between uninvolved parenting style and bullying behaviour among secondary school students in Delta Central Senatorial District

Methods

The research design that was adopted in the study is the correlational research design. This research design enabled the researcher examine the relationship that exists between parenting styles and bullying behaviour among secondary school students. According to Taiwo and Faw (2013), a correlational research design is utilized to predict scores and elucidate the relationship among variables.

The population of the study comprised 17,914 SS 2 students in 187 secondary schools in Delta Central Senatorial District. The sample of the study comprised 370 SS 2 students. The researcher believes that this sample size is adequate for the study because of the suggestion of Gill, Johnson and Clark (2010), that 370 sample size is adequate for a study where the population is between 10,000 and 24,999 (See Appendix II). The sampling method that was used in the study is the multistage sampling method. At first, the simple random sampling technique of the balloting with replacement method was used to select five local government areas out of the eight Local Government Areas in Delta Central senatorial District. In doing this, the name of all the eight local government areas were written on a piece of paper, folded and poured on a basket. After a thorough shuffling, the researcher, not looking into the bowl, dipped his hand and picked one slip. He then unfolded the slip, recorded the name of the local government area that is written on the slip, folded it again and put it back into the bowl.

This process was repeated until the researcher drew all the five local government areas from the Senatorial District. Secondly, a total of two secondary schools was sampled from each of the selected local government areas, making a total of 10 secondary schools, using a proportionate stratified random sampling. That is, for each local government, a total of one urban school and one rural school was selected. From there in the third stage, the researcher sampled 37 students (18 male and 19 female students) from each of the selected schools making it a total of 180 male and 190 female students. In this process, the researcher relied on convenience sampling technique such that only students who were available and were willing to participate in the study were used. This gave a total of 370 students used for the study. Questionnaire is the instrument that was used to collect data in the study. Two sets of questionnaire were used to collect data.

The questionnaires include Questionnaire on Parenting Style (Parenting Style Rating Scale, PSRS) and Questionnaire on Bullying Behaviour (Bullying Behaviour Rating Scale, BBRS). The PSRS contains 27 items that were self-constructed. It includes the four dimensions of parenting styles; Authoritative (6 items), Authoritarian (6 items), Permissive (4 items) and Uninvolved (11 items) Parenting Styles. The original scale had a Cronbach alpha coefficient of 0.85. All items are answered on a 4-point scale, ranging from 1 for strongly disagree to 4 for strongly agree. The BBRS contains 11 items that was adapted from the Bullying Behaviour Questionnaire, developed by Uyanne, Ajagbe, Bibire and Akinsemoyin (2013). The test-retest reliability coefficient for the original scale was between 0.75. The scale is structured on a 4-point scale, ranging from 1 for strongly disagree to 4 for strongly agree.

The face validity of the instrument was carried out by two experts of Measurement and Evaluation in the Department of Guidance and Counselling, Delta State University, Abraka. The suggestions of these experts were reflected in the instrument before pilot study. The experts suggested that some items should be deleted while some should be rephrased to give more localisation to the instrument. The content and construct validity of the instrument were estimated using the multivariate factor analysis. The Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was used for processing the data. The content validity of each of the scales was shown by the total Cumulative variance of all items. The total cumulative value shows that parenting styles had 75.95% explained variance and 24.05 unexplained variance; peer pressure had 63.04% explained variance and 36.96% unexplained variance; while bullying behaviour had 76.63% explained variance and 23.37% unexplained variance. Because the explained variance of the various scales of the instrument were higher than 50%, it is therefore, concluded that the scales have high content validity.

To establish the reliability of this instrument, the Cronbach alpha method of internal consistency was used. The scales were trial-tested on a sample of 50 secondary school students outside the study area in Ukwuani Local Government Area of Delta State. The data were analysed using Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient. It yielded the following coefficients: 0.81 for Parenting Styles Rating Scale and 0.88 for Bullying Behaviour Rating Scale.

The questionnaire was administered to the respondents directly by the researcher with the help of three research assistants, who were trained and sensitised on the nature and objectives of the study. The research assistants helped the researcher to administer the test on the respondents. The researcher approached the principal of the schools, explained purpose of visit and obtained permission for the administration. The Pearson's coefficient of determination was used to answer the research questions while the regression statistics was used to test hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance.

RESULTS

Research Question 1: What is the relationship between authoritative parenting style and bullying behaviour among secondary school students in Delta Central Senatorial District?

Table 1: Pearson's correlation analysis of the relationship between authoritative parenting style and bullying behaviour among secondary school students

Variable	N	R	r ²	r ² %	Decision
Authoritative Parenting Style					
Bullying Behaviour	370	-0.28	0.08	8	Negative Relationship

Table 1 presents the Pearson's correlation coefficient used to assess the relationship between authoritative parenting style and bullying behaviour among secondary school students in Delta Central Senatorial District. The results indicate that $r = -0.28$, with an $r^2 = 0.08$, and $r^{2\%} = 8$, suggesting a negative relationship between these variables. This means that the authoritative parenting style accounts for 8% of the variance in bullying behaviour.

Research Question 2: What is the relationship between authoritarian parenting style and bullying behaviour among secondary school students in Delta Central Senatorial District?

Table 2: Pearson's correlation analysis of the relationship between authoritarian parenting style and bullying behaviour among secondary school students in Delta Central Senatorial District

Variable	N	R	r ²	r ² %	Decision
Authoritarian Parenting Style					
Bullying Behaviour	370	0.16	0.03	3	Positive Relationship

Table 2 presents the Pearson's correlation coefficient used to assess the relationship between authoritarian parenting style and bullying behaviour among secondary school students in Delta Central Senatorial District. The results indicate that $r = 0.16$, with an $r^2 = 0.03$, and $r^{2\%} = 3$, suggesting a positive relationship between these variables. This means that the authoritarian parenting style accounts for 3% of the variance in bullying behaviour.

Research Question 3: What is the relationship between permissive parenting style and bullying behaviour among secondary school students in Delta Central Senatorial District?

Table 3: Pearson's correlation analysis of the relationship between permissive parenting style and bullying behaviour among secondary school students in Delta Central Senatorial District

Variable	N	R	r ²	r ² %	Decision
Permissive Parenting Style					
Bullying Behaviour	370	0.41	0.17	17	Positive Relationship

Table 3 presents the Pearson's correlation coefficient used to assess the relationship between permissive parenting style and bullying behaviour among secondary school students in Delta Central Senatorial District. The results indicate that $r = 0.41$, with an $r^2 = 0.17$, and $r^{2\%} = 17$, suggesting a positive relationship between these variables. This means that the permissive parenting style accounts for 17% of the variance in bullying behaviour.

Research Question 4: What is the relationship between uninvolved parenting style and bullying behaviour among secondary school students in Delta Central Senatorial District?

Table 4: Pearson's correlation analysis of the relationship between uninvolved parenting style and bullying behaviour among secondary school students

Variable	N	R	r ²	r ² %	Decision
Uninvolved Parenting Style					
Bullying Behaviour	370	0.34	0.11	11	Positive Relationship

Table 4 presents the Pearson's correlation coefficient used to assess the relationship between uninvolved parenting style and bullying behaviour among secondary school students in Delta Central Senatorial District. The results indicate that $r = 0.34$, with

an $r^2 = 0.11$, and $r^{2\%} = 11$, suggesting a positive relationship between these variables. This means that the uninvolved parenting style accounts for 11% of the variance in bullying behaviour.

Discussion

The first finding revealed that there is a significant negative relationship between authoritative parenting style and bullying behaviour among secondary school students in Delta Central Senatorial District. This finding suggests that students whose parents employ an authoritative style tend to exhibit lower instances of bullying behaviour compared to those with other parenting influences. This suggests that the authoritative parenting style, which balances strict discipline with warmth, responsiveness, and open communication, may play a critical role in reducing tendencies toward aggression and dominance-seeking behaviours associated with bullying. One reason for the above finding could be because of structured yet supportive environment that authoritative parents provide. Authoritative parenting is characterized by high expectations of behaviour, combined with emotional support and autonomy-granting, which fosters self-discipline, empathy, and social responsibility in adolescents. Such children learn to respect others' boundaries and manage interpersonal conflicts without resorting to aggression. Additionally, authoritative parents tend to model constructive communication and conflict resolution, behaviours that children often replicate in their peer interactions. Furthermore, the clear rules and consistent discipline associated with authoritative parenting provide adolescents with a strong understanding of acceptable social behaviour, reducing the appeal or perceived necessity of engaging in bullying. By fostering a secure sense of self and social awareness, authoritative parents equip their children to resist peer pressure or aggressive impulses. This environment promotes positive self-esteem and self-regulation, qualities that counteract the need to dominate or bully peers to feel powerful or secure. The above finding agrees with Rueda et al. (2022), who found that emotional regulation skills, encouraged by authoritative parenting, lower peer bullying involvement by helping adolescents manage emotions effectively. Similarly, the finding is in line with Hacin, et al. (2023), who found that emotional support and guidance from authoritative parents reduce bullying behaviours by fostering empathy and respect for social norms, both key elements in minimizing aggression.

The second finding showed that there is a significant positive relationship between authoritarian parenting style and bullying behaviour among secondary school students in Delta Central senatorial District. This finding suggests that students raised with authoritarian methods may be more likely to engage in bullying. The possible reason for this finding can be because of the rigid, controlling, and sometimes punitive nature of authoritarian parenting, which may limit open communication and instil fear-based obedience rather than empathy. As a result, children in these environments might develop aggressive responses in their interactions, using similar control-oriented behaviour with peers. Another reason could be because of the lack of emotional warmth in authoritarian households, which often emphasizes compliance over emotional support, potentially leading to higher levels of frustration, suppressed anger, and low social skills in adolescents. Consequently, these children may struggle with healthy emotional regulation, resorting to bullying as an outlet for their frustrations or to assert control within peer relationships. Additionally, the strict enforcement of rules without the opportunity for autonomy or open dialogue may hinder social competence, making such children more prone to use aggression to navigate social hierarchies. The above supports Santos et al. (2020), who found that authoritarian parenting, marked by strict control, verbal hostility, and punitive measures, is linked to higher rates of aggressive behaviours in students, such as bullying, due to the reinforcement of dominance and control as primary interaction strategies. The finding also agrees with Martínez et al. (2022), who found that children raised in authoritarian homes may resort to bullying to gain control and respect from peers, reflecting learned, aggressive coping mechanisms in social settings.

The third finding revealed that there is a significant positive relationship between permissive parenting style and bullying behaviour among secondary school students in Delta Central Senatorial District. This finding suggests that students raised in overly lenient environments may lack the guidance needed to develop appropriate social behaviours and limits. The possible reason for this finding is because permissive parents, characterized by high warmth but low discipline and control, may fail to set clear boundaries, which can result in a lack of accountability and self-regulation in children. Consequently, these children may exhibit bullying behaviours, potentially perceiving peer relationships as spaces where limits can be easily tested and broken without consequence. This connection highlights that permissive parenting may inadvertently encourage entitlement and impulse-driven behaviours, where children feel unrestricted in their social interactions. The above finding is in line with Rueda et al. (2022), who found that permissive approaches can contribute to a child's sense of entitlement or impulsiveness, which may escalate aggressive or bullying tendencies when faced with peer conflicts. The finding is also consistent with Blake et al., (2023), whose finding revealed that without consistent behavioural boundaries, adolescents may lack empathy and struggle to respect social norms, which are essential for positive peer interactions. The finding further agrees with Abidin et al. (2021), who found that the lack of firm parental guidance may lead to issues with authority figures, further increasing the risk of maladaptive social behaviours.

The fourth finding showed that there is a significant positive relationship between uninvolved parenting style and bullying behaviour among secondary school students in Delta Central Senatorial District. This finding suggests that adolescents who lack parental involvement may turn to bullying as a coping mechanism or as a means of gaining social control. The possible reason for this finding could be because uninvolved parenting is often characterized by minimal emotional support, guidance, or supervision,

leading children to seek attention or affirmation from peers in potentially aggressive ways. This absence of nurturing and boundaries may impair adolescents' ability to manage emotions and develop empathy, which are essential for positive social interactions. Another reason for the finding could be because uninvolved parenting can leave children feeling emotionally disconnected, potentially contributing to aggressive behaviours as they may lack the interpersonal skills needed to handle conflicts constructively. Additionally, uninvolved parenting may foster feelings of low self-worth, as these children are often deprived of the positive reinforcement crucial to self-esteem development, potentially causing frustration that manifests as bullying toward peers. The above finding agrees with Liu et al. (2023), who found that parenting styles characterized by neglect or lack of involvement are associated with higher levels of aggression and bullying behaviour in children. This study indicates that children from uninvolved backgrounds often struggle with self-control and social interactions, which can lead to aggressive behaviours like bullying. The finding also agrees with Krisnana (2023), who found that parenting styles, especially those that are neglectful or overly authoritarian, can significantly influence the likelihood of bullying, suggesting that such children might seek to assert power in peer interactions due to a lack of guidance at home. The finding is consistent with Zhao et al. (2023), who emphasized the role of peer influences and parenting dynamics in bullying behaviours, noting that inadequate parental involvement can lead to associations with deviant peer groups, further exacerbating bullying tendencies.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of the study, it could be concluded that parenting approaches lacking warmth and responsiveness, or those that exert excessive control, are correlated with an increase in bullying tendencies among students.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations were advanced:

1. that parents and caregivers should be encouraged to adopt authoritative parenting practices that combine warmth and support with clear expectations and boundaries;
2. that schools and community organizations should provide resources and training for parents on the drawbacks of authoritarian parenting styles;
3. that parents should be encouraged to establish more structure and boundaries within their parenting;
4. That initiatives should be developed to support parents who may be disengaged or uninvolved in their children's lives.

REFERENCES

- Eremie, M., Ejimaji, E. U., Eleberi, B. U., Dibia, C. G., & Egbe, R. R. (2020). Bullying effects on secondary school students in Nigeria: Implications for counselling. *Nigerian Journal of Education, Science and Technology (NIJEST)*, 8(1), 1-9.
- Lanearux, B. (2010). The effects of bullying in elementary schools. [http://www.ehow.com/items/1813883/bullying in elementary school](http://www.ehow.com/items/1813883/bullying_in_elementary_school).
- Wokoma, I. P., & Udochukwu, N. G. (2020). The Influence of Parenting Styles on Bullying Behaviour among Students of Secondary Age in Ikwere Local Government Area. *International Journal on Integrated Education*, 3(II), 99-114.
- Omoteso, B, A. (2010). Bullying behaviour, its adolescent factor and psychological effects among secondary school students in Nigeria. *The journal of international social research*. 3(10), 498-509.
- Wikipedia (2010). What causes bullying? Retrieved from: [http://wiki.answers.com/ what causes bullying](http://wiki.answers.com/what_causes_bullying).
- Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance abuse. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 11, 56-95.
- Efobi, A., & Nwokolo, C. (2014). Relationship between Parenting Styles and Tendency to Bullying Behaviour among Adolescents. *Journal of Education & Human Development*, 3(1), 507-521.
- Brighi, A., Ortega, R., Scheithauer, H., Smith, P. K., Tsormpatzoudis, C., Barkoukis, V., & Del Rey, R. (2012). *European Bullying Intervention Project Questionnaire (EBIPQ)*. University of Bologna. Unpublished Manuscript.
- Cherry, K. (2013). *Parenting styles: The four styles of parenting*. Free Psychology Newsletter. Retrieved October 13, 2013 from About.com/psychology.

- Rueda, J., Thompson, R., & Blake, A. (2022). Emotional control and peer bullying involvement: Impacts of parenting styles on adolescent emotional regulation and peer interaction outcomes. *Educational and Developmental Psychology Review*, 34(2), 56-71.
- Santos, R. M., et al. (2020). Authoritarian parenting and aggressive behaviour among adolescents: A cross-cultural study. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 35(3), 278-289.
- Martínez, I., Murgui, S., García, Ó. F., & García, F. (2022). Parenting styles, internalization of values, and bullying: A study of multiple approaches to disciplinary practices and their effects on adolescent aggression. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(4), 2301.
- Hacin, R., Romih, D., & Košir, K. (2023). Associations among adolescent students' perceived parenting styles, emotional regulation, and involvement in peer bullying. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 15(4), 333-342.
- Blake, K., Martinez, J., & Rodriguez, F. (2023). Parenting practices and adolescent bullying: The role of permissive parenting. *Youth Studies Quarterly*, 15(1), 25-43.
- Liu, X., Chen, G., Hu, P., Guo, G., & Xiao, S. (2017). Does perceived social support mediate or moderate the relationship between victimisation and suicidal ideation among Chinese Adolescents?. *Journal of Psychologists & Counsellors in Schools*, 27(1), 123-136. doi:10.1017/jgc.2015.30