

¹Willemien M. Roodt & ²Prof. Marie Ubbink

¹Community Psychosocial Research (COMPRES), School of Psychosocial Health, North-West University, Potchefstroom, South Africa

²Community Psychosocial Research (COMPRES), Senior Lecturer, School of Psychosocial Health, North-West University, Potchefstroom, South Africa

Abstract

Bullying is a major issue with severe short- and long-term effects on children globally. However, social group work methods and parent involvement in programmes to address bullying among primary school learners has been limited (Roodt, 2021; Salehi et al. 2016). This study focused on content elements viewed as significant for bully prevention by parents ($N=132$), to promote the development of a 3D-bullying programme for parents, learners, and educators. A quantitative approach and a descriptive and randomized cross-sectional survey design were utilized. Through an online survey for data collection, the most applicable content elements were determined. Findings provided clarity on content elements with highest and lowest levels of applicability. Furthermore an open-ended question obtained additional content recommendations, i.e., responsible cell phone usage; educator bullying; counselling and therapy; and objective and consistent programme implementation.

Background

A need was identified for a social group work programme based on social work principals, to provide transparent and equal information to all involved in the bullying phenomenon by promoting three-dimensional cooperation between parents, educators, and learners. This programme is to be grounded on the social group work intervention method (Nicholas et al., 2010; Toseland & Rivas, 2014). The current study stemmed from a previous project that obtained funding and endorsement in 2018 i.e., the three-dimension (children, parents, and teachers STOP bullying social groupwork project) by Prof. Ubbink and Dr. Simeon. In 2019 we applied for funding and endorsement from the International Association for Social Work with Groups (IASWG) SPARC programme. With endorsement from the SPARC programme, it was a privilege to conduct research stemming from the previously funded STOP bullying social groupwork project. The current study was conducted in collaboration with a local welfare organization, i.e., FAMSA. In this poster the results of this study is illustrated.

Aim

The aim of this study was to determine, by means of a cross-sectional survey, the preferences of parents regarding the content elements that should be included in a potential 3D-bullying programme for parents, educators, and learners (Roodt, 2021).

Methods

Methodology

A quantitative approach and a descriptive survey design were utilized (De Vos et al., 2011), to obtain information regarding parents' views on how to address bullying. And a randomized cross-sectional survey design was used for data collection as this study acts as a need's assessment research phase for the developing a 3D-bullying programme (De Vos et al., 2011). This design is ideal for gathering opinions or views of respondents on behaviors, feelings, opinions, or expectations of such a programme at a certain stage in time (Bhattacharjee, 2012).

Questionnaire Development

Literature revealed no suitable measurement and a measurement was developed. Literature was consulted and a list of possible content was compiled. This list was reviewed and adjusted in accordance with various steps of measurement development (Cabrera-Nguyen, 2010). The developed questionnaire met all the standards of Young (2016) in terms of questionnaire content. Face validity, content validity and construct validity was determined (Sürücü & Maslaçi, 2020; Ellis, 2019; Foxcroft & Roodt, 2013).

Sample

After ethical approval from the North West University (NWU) Health Research Ethics Committee (HREC), a total of 5 primary schools (located in Potchefstroom) were recruited to participate in this study. An advertisement with a link to the survey was distributed among parents by school appointed mediators. It took approximately 7 minutes to completed the questionnaire. All ethical procedures were followed for obtaining informed consent, voluntary participation and ensuring complete anonymity. A total of 132 respondents completed the entire online questionnaire, from a total of 295 responses.

Data analysis

Data analysis was conducted by the NWU statistical services utilizing IBM SPSS v26 (Arbuckle, 2017). The analysis comprised of descriptive (i.e. frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations) and inferential statistics (i.e. explanatory factor analysis) (Table 1 and 2). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test (KMO) and the Bartlett test of Sphericity were utilized for determining the item correlation matrix adequacy in which the factor analysis was grounded. T-tests and ANOVA was conducted to determine whether answers on constructs differ between different groups. p-values were reported for completeness sake ($\alpha = 0.05$). Cohen's d effect sizes were reported following the provided guideline values (Cohen, 1992). Emerging themes was identified from a transcription of the open-ended question (Table 3). From this question additional content recommendations was obtained, i.e., responsible cell phone usage; educator bullying; counselling and therapy; objective and consistent programme implementation. Table 4 highlights the least and most favorably rated items as rated in table 1. Only the most significant results are illustrated.

Results

Table 1: Descriptive statistics on the content elements (Roodt, 2021).

Item	Item description	Frequency				Missing	Mean (X)	Standard deviation (SD)
		1. Not applicable	2. Somewhat applicable	3. Applicable	4. Highly applicable			
Q1	Signs of bullying	3,0	4,5	32,6	59,8	0	3,49	0,73
Q2	What motivates bullying behaviour	3,0	4,5	47,7	44,7	0	3,34	0,71
Q3	How to prevent bullying at school	0	3,0	26,5	70,5	0	3,67	0,53
Q4	How to address bullying at school	0	3,0	23,5	73,5	0	3,70	0,52
Q5	Tips for dealing with children being bullied	0	3,1	22,9	74,0	1	3,71	0,52
Q6	Tips for dealing with children that bully	0	0,8	19,7	79,5	0	3,79	0,43
Q7	Tips for bystanders of bullying	0,8	2,3	28	68,9	0	3,65	0,57
Q8	How to deal with children with behavioural problems	1,5	4,5	36,4	57,6	0	3,50	0,66
Q9	How to deal with conflict	0	7,6	32,6	59,8	0	3,52	0,64
Q10	Positive discipline methods	3,0	5,3	33,3	58,3	0	3,47	0,74
Q11	How to improve a child's self-esteem	1,5	5,3	30,3	62,9	0	3,55	0,67
Q12	How to demonstrate empathy	0	0,8	8,3	33,3	0	3,48	0,68
Q13	Healthy relationships with children/peers	0,8	6,1	39,4	53,8	0	3,46	0,65
Q14	Developmental needs of children in primary schools	2,3	12,1	28,8	56,8	0	3,40	0,79
Q15	Parenting that prevents bullying behaviour	1,5	3,8	31,1	63,6	0	3,57	0,64
Q16	Bullying prevention techniques for parents	0	3,8	25,0	71,2	0	3,67	0,55
Q17	Emotional intelligence for parents	1,5	6,1	34,1	58,3	0	3,49	0,68
Q18	Emotional intelligence for educators	1,5	6,1	29,5	62,9	0	3,54	0,68
Q19	Emotional intelligence for children	1,5	6,8	28,0	63,6	0	3,54	0,69
Q20	Dealing with substance abuse	9,8	21,2	26,5	42,4	0	3,02	1,02
Q21	Dealing with cyber bullying	1,5	8,3	25,8	64,4	0	3,53	0,71
Q22	How to deal with emotional problems in children	0	3,8	39,4	56,8	0	3,53	0,57
Q23	Personality aspects that affect bullying behaviour	0	6,8	37,1	56,1	0	3,49	0,62
Q24	How to model anti-bullying behaviour	0	4,5	34,8	60,6	0	3,56	0,58
Q25	How to raise a resilient child	0,8	6,8	31,1	61,4	0	3,53	0,66
Q26	How to report bullying	0	1,5	28,2	70,2	1	3,69	0,50
Q27	Developing good morals and values in a child	2,3	6,1	28,2	63,4	1	3,53	0,72

Table 2: Pattern Matrix^a for content elements of a bullying prevention programme (Roodt, 2021).

Item	Content elements (items) of a three-dimensional bullying prevention programme					Communalities
	1. Preventative measures	2. Responsive measures	3. Protective factors	4. General guidelines	5. Risk factors	
Q14	0,822					0,702
Q13	0,797					0,736
Q11	0,691					0,557
Q12	0,542					0,487
Q20		0,857				0,693
Q23		0,712				0,709
Q24		0,709				0,597
Q19		0,691				0,644
Q37		0,573				0,488
Q18		0,523				0,607
Q22		0,484				0,627
Q21		0,418				0,628
Q36		0,325				0,490
Q27			-0,941			0,849
Q28			-0,912			0,789
Q29			-0,801			0,690
Q35			-0,305			0,441
Q15				-0,438		0,670
Q17				-0,393		0,582
Q26				0,544		0,680
Q25				0,518		0,689
Q16				-0,429		0,628
Q31					0,866	0,631
Q33					0,659	0,655
Q32					0,607	0,631
Q34					0,566	0,572
Q30					0,477	0,503

Table 3: Themes and subthemes from the open-ended question (Roodt, 2021).

Main Theme	Subthemes
THEME 1: CYBER-BULLYING	1. What is cyber-bullying? 2. Preventing cyber-bullying
THEME 2: ORIGIN OF BULLYING	1. Home circumstances 2. Community 3. Culture
THEME 3: RECOMMENDATIONS	1. School 2. Educators 3. Parents 4. Learners
THEME 4: COUNSELLING AND THERAPY	1. Victims 2. Bullies 3. Origin of behaviour
THEME 5: SYSTEM FAILURES	1. Schools 2. Programmes 3. Reporting

Table 4: Highest and lowest rated items (Roodt, 2021).

	Highest rated items	Mean	Lowest rated items	Mean
1	Q6: Tips for dealing with children that bully.	3,79	Q20: Dealing with substance abuse.	3,02
2	Q5: Tips for dealing with children being bullied.	3,71	Q2: What motivates bullying behaviour.	3,34
3	Q4: How to address bullying at school.	3,70	Q14: Developmental needs of children in primary school.	3,40
4	Q26: How to report bullying.	3,69	Q13: Healthy relationships with children/peers.	3,69
5	Q16 Bullying prevention techniques for parents.	3,67	Q10: Positive discipline methods.	3,69

Conclusion

This study provided useful insight into parents' perceptions of the necessary content of a 3D-bullying programme. Furthermore, the 27 survey items can be compacted into five broad factors (i.e., responsive measures, preventative measures, protective factors, general guidelines, and risk factors) by means of an EFA. The measurement utilized was determined to be reliable, with a reliability value higher than 0,7. Therefore, it could be used in future research. Additional elements that need to be covered in the potential programme, include responsible and appropriate cell phone use; educator bullying; therapy and counselling; consistent, and objective programme implementation; and the termination of unsuccessful strategies currently utilized by schools. The results of the study can only be contextually generalized due to a small sample size and lacking representation of different population groups. However, this could be due to the type of sampling method utilized. The outcome of this study could lay the foundation for future research aimed at developing a context specific three-dimensional programme based on the social group work method for parents, educators, and learners in a school environment.

References

- Arbuckle, J. L. (2017). *IBM SPSS AMOS 25 User's Guide*. US: Amos development corporation.
- Bhattacharjee, A. (2012). *Social science research: Principles, methods, and practices*. University of South Florida: Textbooks collection, book 3. Retrieved from <http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/textbooks/3>
- Cabrera-Nguyen, P. (2010). Author guidelines for reporting scale development and validation results in the *Journal of the Society for Social Work and Research*. *Journal of the Society for Social Work and Research*, 1(2), 99-103. doi: 10.5243/jsswr.2010.8.
- Cohen, J. (1992). *Quantitative methods in Psychology: A power primer*. *Psychological bulletin*, 112(1), 155-159. New York University: American Psychological Association.
- De Vos, A. S., Strydom, H., Fouché, C. B., & Delpont, C. S. L. (2011). *Research at grass roots: For the social sciences and human service professions*. (4th ed.). Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers, ISBN 9780627027727
- Ellis, S. (2019). (personal communication, August 29, 2019). Professor at the North West University in Potchefstroom.
- Foxcroft, C., & Roodt, G. (2013). *Introduction to psychological assessment in the South African context*. (4th ed.). Cape Town, South Africa: Oxford University Press (Pty) Ltd. ISBN: 9780 19 904473 3
- International Association for Social Work with Groups, Inc. (IASWG). (n.d.). SPARC Program. Retrieved from <https://www.iaswg.org/SPARC-program>
- Nicholas, L., Rautenbach, J., & Maistry, M. (2010). *Introduction to social work*. Claremont: Juta & Company Ltd. ISBN 978-0-70217-768-2
- Roodt, W. M. (2021). *Parents' preferences on the content of a school bullying programme*. Potchefstroom: North West University (Mini-dissertation - M.Sc.).
- Salehi, S., Patel, A., Taghavi, M., & Pooravari, M. (2016). Primary school teachers and parents' perception of peer bullying among children in Iran: A qualitative study. *Iran Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences*, 10(3):1-8. doi: 10.17795/ijpbs-1865
- Sürücü, L., & Maslaçi, A. (2020). Validity and Reliability in Quantitative Research. *Business and Management Studies: An International Journal*, 8(3):2694-2726. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15295/bmij.v8i3.1540>
- Toseland, R. W., & Rivas, R. F. (2014). *An introduction to group work practice*. (7th ed). UK, London: Pearson Education Limited.