

Parenting and Bullying Style in Basic Education Students

Flor de María Sánchez Aguirre¹, Patricia Milagros Girón Chunga¹, Isabel Menacho Vargas¹, Yrene Cecilia Uribe Hernández², Luzmila Lourdes Garro Aburto¹ and Alicia Agromelis Aliaga Pacora³

¹Universidad César Vallejo, Víctor Larco Herrera, Peru

²Universidad Nacional de Cañete, Casa de la Cultura, Av. Mariscal Benavides, San Luis de Cañete Lima 15701, Peru

³Universidad Nacional Federico Villareal, Lima, Peru

*Correspondence to: Flor de María Sánchez Aguirre, Universidad César Vallejo, Víctor Larco Herrera, Peru.

Abstract

The existence of a consumerist society generates conflicts in the formation of the person; there is an urgent need to evaluate the culture of upbringing of families, the reason for the study is to determine the relationship between authoritarian, democratic, overprotective, indulgent upbringing styles and bullying in students of formative education. In this basic study, of correlational design, whose sample was 118 young people, the graduation of family upbringing practice, a form about bullying, was used. The results refer that there is a low positive link between overprotective behavior and bullying, but significant ($\rho = .008$; $p < 0.05$); the authoritarian, democratic, indulgent styles do not present a relation with bullying.

Keywords: overprotective, democratic, indulgent, authoritarian, bullying, education.

Introduction

Modern families are being influenced by a consumerist and materialistic society, with which they forget the formation of their offspring as human beings within the family; therefore, they have changed their relations of communication with their children who have been granted material comforts in exchange for love, tenderness and ethical actions. Therefore, the style of upbringing assumed by the families is manifested in the different interactions of its members.

Thus, the behavior of the children is a reflection of the models assumed by the parents. The coexistence functions of the family group members will allow to determine a style of upbringing, a culture and a preparation for life (Fuenzalida, Penelo & Bruni, 2017). Most parents do not fulfill their socializing function, so it is convenient to analyze the characteristics assumed by the parents from the family relationships. If an individual presents violent, aggressive and malicious behavior, it is due to his or her social-family environment.

According to Diane, Kwaku, Kugbey, & Oti-Boadi (2019) and Bevilacqua, Shackleton, Hale, Allen, Bond, Christie, Viner, (2017), aggressive behaviour on the part of young people is manifested in various ways; this phenomenon is evident in the various schools where pubescent and adolescent children are in the process of training and living together at school: there are cases of bullying. Other authors such as Sullivan, Cleary and Sullivan (2005), cited by López and Ramírez (2017), state that the periods of man's evolutionary development such as late childhood and adolescence are vulnerable stages for young people. If there were bullying, behavioural manifestations would be typified as anxious, depressive, antisocial, suicidal and even toxic substance abusers (Sikhakhane, Muthukrishna, Martin, 2018).

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (2018) indicates that there are one third of young women in the world who suffer from bullying, of whom 32% are boys and 28% girls; gender is a predominant factor in cases of bullying associated with depressive and bullying behaviour (Georgiou, 2008, cited by Tiliouine, 2015). The Programme for International Student and Teacher Assessment (PISA) (2015) and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2015) report that bullying is

8.9% frequent; among US students, 10% and 10.1% in Mexico. In Latin America this problem is not alien, due to the economic factor that marks the social differences in the region, which results in social inequality and probable marginalization in vulnerable sectors (Barbarchán, Caja, Ramos Sánchez, 2017). This latent description violates the integrity of young people, from finding a job to support the household economy to neglecting their children because they are working. Another related reality is the increase in dysfunctional families, within which upbringing is exposed to conflict between household members, where the offspring lack family attachment. In the Dominican Republic, 12.2% of young people suffer frequent bullying; in Costa Rica, 10.9%; in Uruguay, 9.5%; in Colombia, 7.6% and in Chile, 7.9% (OECD, 2015).

Bullying is manifested by aggressive physical, verbal and persistent behaviour, assumed by groups of people, or by an individual towards others who are in fragile situations, thus generating isolation, and a lack of capacity to get out of this abusive situation (Cerezo, 2009). The importance of the study allows us to describe the subject's behaviour as an aggressor, victim or bystander. If the family lived under the influence of a battering father, it is almost certain that the model will be repeated by his children, and this generates potential new aggressors (Estrada, Zarate & Izquierdo, 2016).

On the other hand, in schools where acts of bullying exist, it will be related to the parenting style of the subject. The theorist Teruel (2007) cited by Enríquez and Garzón (2015) states that when the behaviour model is authoritarian, the offspring will be victims of an aggressor, while permissive behaviour degenerates into inappropriate behaviour. In the Peruvian reality different styles of upbringing are typified as socialization, maturation, attachment, direct experiences in the formation of human behavior that leads to determine future behaviors of the individual (Dávila, 2018). The system that admits reports of violence in schools (SiseVe), indicates that there are 26 446 cases of bullying in public schools, therefore, educational settings are becoming spaces for groups of student aggressors who insult, humiliate, isolate, threaten, and repeatedly coerce the victim by using nicknames and tyrannical acts that intimidate the fellow student (Santander, 2017).

A new emerging modality is cyberbullying, in which victims are coerced by posting their taunts on social networks against a classmate.

This situation implies generating an awareness in parents, teachers and educational authorities in the identification of these facts within the educational institution to reverse it; the indifference of educational actors would imply becoming an accomplice of this situation that contravenes the search for human coexistence. Faced with this scenario, the question arises: what is the relationship between models of authoritarian, democratic, overprotective, and benevolent behavior and school bullying among students in basic education? The authors Berger (2006) cited by Béjar (2018); Băran-Pescaru (2004) cited by Belean & Năstăsă (2017); Gottman (2006), cited by Ruiz (2017); Darling and Steinberg, (1993) cited by Dávila (2018) understand that the peculiarity of parents in educating their children is from birth until they form their families, transmitting emotions, customs and social culture. Baumrind (1966) proposes a tripartite model of parental authority in relation to the socialization of the infant, from the emotional and behavioral mechanisms that they assume from their parents, identifying four dimensions: disciplinary strategies; warmth and care; communication styles and expectations of maturity and control, from a naturalistic perspective (Baumrind cited by Singh, 2017). The model of Maccoby and Martin, Raya (2008) and Sovet and Metz (2014), cited by Eldad & Benatov (2018), based on a two-dimensional approach, indicates, if the warmth and control of parents, symbolize the incidence of parental behavior in the development of the person then appear the dimensions of attachment / communication, surveillance / demand, integrating democratic behavioral procedures, permissive, the hypothesis is: there is a direct relation between the authoritarian, democratic, overprotective, and indulgent model of behavior and bullying in students of basic education.

Method

The type of study is basic; it is a descriptive correlational design with a quantitative approach. The variable style of upbringing is dimensioned in authoritarian, considering the indicators: high level of control, punishment and withdrawal of affection low communication, high demand of maturity; democratic: promotion of reflection of their behavior, high communication, delegation of responsibility, parents show and express affection; overprotective: use of affective blackmail, listening to their children, but not taking into account their opinion, low demand of maturity, excessive care; indulgent: lack of control, low level of communication, low demand of maturity, implicit affection.

The dimensions of the bullying variable are as follows: verbal: calls names or receives calls, insults or is insulted, spreads gossip and rumors; social isolation: excludes self out of fear, feels excluded, excludes self by agreement; physical harassment: hits and leaves injury, hits without leaving injury, damage to belongings; cyberbullying: harasses using social networks. The sample was a census of 118 students in basic education. The tools used were the Family Upbringing Scale (EF29), which reflects the perception of the adolescent in relation to the style of upbringing, proposed by Estrada, Barrios, Serpa, Pastor, Misare and Pomahuacre (2017), where KMO validity = 0.859 χ^2 = 6180, 774 Bartlett, gl = 780, $p < 0.000$, according to factor analysis, reliability by dimensions authoritarian (0.67), democratic (0.84), indulgent (0.65) and overprotective (0.65).

Results

It is observed that 100 students perceive low levels of bullying, 70 percent are low in the dominant style; 28 percent reach the low level of bullying in the parental style, and 2 percent in the high level of authoritarianism. In addition, there are ten students who perceive very low levels of bullying, 90% perceive very low levels of bullying in the authoritarian style, and 10 % a medium level (Table 1).

Of the 100 students who reach the medium, low level of bullying, 48% respond that their parents use a democratic style at the medium level, 30% perceive low levels. Also, 43 % of the students indicate that their parents have a democratic style of low and medium level, on the other hand, the students consider bullying in a medium level (Table 2).

El 97 % de los estudiantes indican que el estilo de crianza sobreprotector es bajo en sus familias, y el 3 % se encuentra a un nivel medio, así mismo existe un nivel bajo de *bullying* (Table 3).

It is observed that 89% of them present low levels of the indulgent breeding style, and 10% indicate that the level is medium. Finally, seven students who reached medium levels in the bullying variable, while 100 % perceived the low level of the indulgent style (Table 4).

The association between authoritarian style and bullying correlation is very low positive and statistically not significant ($\rho = .137$; $p > 0.05$). Therefore: there is no significant relationship between authoritarian upbringing style and bullying in basic education students (Table 5)

In Table 6, the style of democratic upbringing and bullying in basic education, correlation between variables is very low positive and statistically not significant ($\rho = .025$; $p > 0.05$). Therefore, there is no significant relationship between democratic upbringing style and bullying in basic education.

In Table 7, the model of overprotective behavior and bullying in basic education, correlation is very low positive, but statistically not significant ($\rho = .008$; $p > 0.05$). Therefore, there is no significant relationship between overprotective parenting style and bullying in basic education.

In the table 8, it can be seen that the model of indulgent behavior and bullying in basic education has a very low negative correlation, but statistically not significant ($\rho = -.056$; $p > 0.05$). Therefore, there is no

Table 1. Distribution of the authoritarian upbringing style and bullying in basic education

Breeding Style	Levels	Bullying Levels				Total
		Very low	Low	Medium	High	
Authoritative	Low	9	70	5	0	84
		90%	70%	71%	0%	71%
	Medium	1	28	1	1	31
		10%	28%	14%	100%	26%
	High	0	2	1	0	3
		0%	2%	14%	0%	3%
Total		10	100	7	1	118
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 2. Distribution of the democratic upbringing style and bullying in basic education

Breeding style	Levels	Bullying				Total
		Very Low	Low	Medium	High	
Democratic	Low	4	30	3	0	37
		40%	30%	43%	0%	31%
	Medium	5	48	3	1	57
		50%	48%	43%	100%	48%
	High	1	22	1	0	24
		10%	22%	14%	0%	20%
Total		10	100	7	1	118
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 3. Distribution of overprotective parenting style and bullying in basic education

Breeding style	Levels	Bullying				Total
		Very Low	Low	Medium	High	
Overprotector	Low	10	97	7	1	115
		100%	97%	100%	100%	97%
	Medium	0	3	0	0	3
		0%	3%	0%	0%	3%
	Total	10	100	7	1	118
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 4. Distribution of indulgent parenting style and bullying in basic education

Breeding style	Levels	Bullying				Total
		Very Low	Low	Medium	High	
Indulgent	Low	9	89	7	1	106
		90%	89%	100%	100%	90%
	Medium	1	10	0	0	11
		10%	10%	0%	0%	9%
	High	0	1	0	0	1
		0%	1%	0%	0%	1%
	Total	10	100	7	1	118
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 5. Correlation between authoritarian parenting style and bullying in elementary school students

Statistical	Coefficient of Sig. correlation.	Sig. (bilateral)
Rho de Spearman	.137	.140
N	118	

Table 6. Correlation between democratic parenting style and bullying in basic education

Statistical	Coefficient of Sig. correlation.	Sig. (bilateral)
Rho de Spearman	.025	.788
N	118	

Table 7. Correlation between overprotective parenting style and bullying in basic education

Statistical	Coefficient of Sig. correlation.	Sig. (bilateral)
Rho de Spearman	.008	.935
N	118	

Table 8. Correlation between indulgent parenting style and bullying in basic education

Statistical	Coefficient of Sig. Correlation.	Sig. (bilateral)
Rho de Spearman	-.056	.547
N	118	

significant relationship between indulgent parenting style and bullying in basic education students.

Discussion

The predominant parenting style is democratic, with an average of 48%, the other behaviours imparted by parents to their children such as the authoritarian, indulgent and overprotective style have low levels. For Cerezo (2009) mentions that bullying manifests itself as a violent

behavior, which is carried out routinely generating power over victims and observers, this would make sense to the extent that there are no cases of bullying. Therefore, the results indicate that the variables are not linked, however, there are antecedents such as Béjar (2018); Belean (2017) mentions the relationship between the variables studied determining the existence of bullying in school adolescents in other contexts. As a knowledge gap, the need to study the manifestations, phenomena that cyberbullying presents in a globalized era where the Internet plays a predominant role and it is convenient to educate the mental health of school children, is indicated.

References

- Barbachán Ruales, E., & Cajas Bravo, T., Ramos Ticlla, F., & Sánchez Aguirre, F. (2017). Representaciones sociales de la seguridad ciudadana en estudiantes universitarios de Lima-Perú. *Opción*, 33(84), 698-724.
- Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of Authoritative Parental Control on Child Behavior. *Child Development*, 37(4), 887-907.
- Béjar, L. L. (2018). Relación entre estilos de crianza y competencia comunicativa en estudiantes de primer semestre de Psicología e Ingeniería de Minas de la Universidad Tecnológica del Perú, Arequipa 2018 (Tesis de maestría). Universidad Nacional de San Agustín de Arequipa.
- Belean, R. D., & Năstăsă, L.E. (2017). The relationship between parental style, parental competence and emotional intelligence. *Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Brasov.Series VII, Social Sciences and Law*, 10(2), 181-190.
- Bevilacqua, L., Shackleton, N., Hale, D., Allen, E., Bond, L., Christie, D., Viner, R. M. (2017). The role of family and school-level factors in bullying and cyberbullying: A cross-sectional study. *BMC Pediatrics*, 17.
- Cerezo, F. (2009) Bullying: análisis de la situación en las aulas españolas. *International Journal of Psychology and Psychological Therapy*, 9(3), 383-394.
- Dávila, F. G., (2018) *Estilos de crianza y agresividad escolar en estudiantes de secundaria de una Institución Educativa de Chicama, 2018*. (Tesis de maestría). Universidad César Vallejo, Lima.
- Diane, K. A., Kwaku, O. A., Kugbey, N., & Oti-Boadi, M. (2019). The relationship between psychological distress and bullying victimisation among school-going adolescents in Ghana: A cross-sectional study. *BMC Research Notes*, 12(64).
- Eldad, R., & Benatov, J. (2018). Adult attachment and perceived parental style may shape leadership behaviors. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 39(2), 261-275.
- Enríquez, M., & Garzón, F. (2015). El acoso escolar. *Saber, Ciencia y Libertad*, 10(1), 219-233.
- Estrada, E., Barrios, Z., Serpa, A., Pastor, M., Misare, M., & Pomahuacre, J. (2017). Análisis exploratorio y confirmatorio de la escala de estilos de crianza familiar (ECF-29) en estudiantes del nivel secundario. *PsiqueMag*, 6(1), 279-290.
- Estrada, O., Zarate, G., & Izquierdo, I. (2016). Género, violencia y el discurso del (cyber) bullying en el nivel de educación media superior. *Opción*, 32(13), 954-978.
- Fuenzalida, I., Penelo, E., Bruni, C. (2017). Estilos educativos y psicopatología en niños y adolescentes con discapacidad intelectual de Chile y España. *Quaderns de Psicologia*, 19(1), 101-112.
- López, L., & Ramírez A. (2017). Estilos Educativos familiares y acoso escolar: un estudio en la comunidad autónoma de la Rioja (España) *Revista Brasileira de Educación* 22(71). 1-23.
- Organización para la Cooperación y el Desarrollo Económicos OCDE (2015). Resultados de la Evaluación internacional. Recuperado en: <http://umc.minedu.gob.pe/resultados-de-evaluacion-pisa-2015/>

16. Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Educación, la Ciencia y la Cultura (2018). *Construir la paz en la mente de los hombres y de las mujeres*. Recuperado en: <https://es.unesco.org/news/nuevos-datos-revelan-que-mundo-cada-tres-adolescentes-sufre-acoso-escolar>.
17. PISA. (2015). Resultados de la Evaluación internacional. Recuperado en: <http://umc.minedu.gob.pe/resultados-de-evaluacion-pisa-2015/>.
18. Ruiz, N. P., (2017) *Los estilos de crianza y su incidencia en el desarrollo social en niños y niñas de 05 años de las instituciones educativas de las villas militares del distrito de Chorrillos, 2016*. (Tesis de maestría). Universidad César Vallejo, Lima.
19. Santander, A. B., (2017) *Estilos parentales y su relación con el acoso escolar en alumnos del 5to y 6to grado del nivel primario de la institución educativa adventista Túpac Amaru, Juliaca, puno, 2016* (Tesis de maestría). Universidad Peruana Unión, Lima.
20. Sikhakhane, N., Muthukrishna, N., & Martin, M. (2018). The geographies of bullying in a secondary school context *Revista Sudafricana de Educación*, 38 (Supl. 1), s1-s11.
21. Tiliouine, H. (2015). School bullying victimisation and subjective well-being in Algeria. *Child Indicators Research*, 8(1), 133-150.