

Adolescents' Attitudes to Bullying and its Relationship to Perceived Family Social Climate

María de la Villa Moral¹ and Anastasio Ovejero²

¹ Universidad de Oviedo and ² Universidad de Valladolid

Abstract

Background: Adolescent attitudes towards bullying are determined by the interaction between individual characteristics and psychosocial development contexts such as the family environment. Our objective was to perform a psychosocial analysis of the differences in reported attitudes towards school bullying between peers according to a series of indicators of family social climate, such as perceived parental support and understanding, punishment and rejection, and disapproval. **Method:** 665 students (50.4% girls) aged 12-18 ($M = 14.59$, $SD = 1.691$) from Asturias (Spain) participated in the study. Participants were selected by intentional sampling with simple random two-stage subsampling of secondary-school groups. **Results:** The hypothesized positive relationship between the perception of parental support and increased resistance attitudes towards school bullying in the three attitudinal dimensions explored (cognitive, affective, and behavioural) was supported by our results. Notably, favourable attitudes towards bullying were associated to negative family climate perceptions. Adolescents with permissive attitudes towards bullying reported higher use of physical and psychological violence, as well as corporal punishment by their parents. **Conclusions:** This study supports the importance of family socialization practices in the construction of attitudes towards bullying.

Keywords: Bullying, attitudes, family climate, parental support, adolescents.

Resumen

Actitudes de los Adolescentes Hacia el Bullying y su Relación con el Clima Social Familiar Percibido. Antecedentes: las actitudes de los adolescentes hacia el bullying están determinadas por la interacción entre las características individuales y diversos contextos de desarrollo, como el familiar. El objetivo de este estudio es realizar un análisis psicosocial de las diferencias reportadas según las actitudes percibidas frente al bullying en indicadores como apoyo y comprensión, castigo y rechazo, así como reprobación paterna. **Método:** participaron en el estudio 665 estudiantes (50,4% chicas) de 12 a 18 años ($M = 14.59$; $DT = 1.691$) del Principado de Asturias (España) que han sido seleccionados mediante un muestreo intencional con submuestreo bietápico aleatorio simple de los grupos escolares. **Resultados:** se ha hallado una relación positiva entre la percepción de apoyo de los padres y las actitudes de rechazo ante el bullying en las tres dimensiones actitudinales exploradas (cognitiva, afectiva y conductual). A su vez, las percepciones del clima familiar son más negativas en quienes presentan actitudes más favorables. Los adolescentes con actitudes permisivas reportan un mayor uso de violencia física, castigo corporal y violencia psicológica por parte de sus padres. **Conclusiones:** se apoya la relevancia de las prácticas de socialización familiar en la construcción de las actitudes hacia el bullying.

Palabras clave: bullying, actitudes, clima familiar, apoyo paterno, adolescentes.

School bullying is a very complex phenomenon. Not only are bullies and those they bully involved but also the rest of their classmates. In addition, school bullying is influenced by cultural, family, group, and social and community factors, both for conventional and cyberbullying (Álvarez-García et al., 2018; Cerezo et al., 2018). Considering all these factors, the application of an ecological model (Bronfenbrenner, 1976), with a comprehensive approach, is necessary to adequately explain this phenomenon (Chen et al., 2020; Espelage & Swearer, 2010; Feijóo et al., 2021). Specifically, Chen et al. (2021) found a relationship between the protective effect of the family social

climate and bullying victimization in adolescents, mediated by psychosocial mechanisms such as their relationships with teachers and peers.

There is a certain overlap between the different family factors associated with bullying and those involved with bullying victimization (Ding et al., 2020; Rodríguez-Hidalgo et al., 2019). According to Tucker et al. (2020), the family social climate is a protective factor against bullying victimization in adolescents. Adequate communication between parents and adolescent children favours a greater psychosocial well-being of the latter (Gutiérrez & Gonçalves, 2013), while the lack of perceived support is related to a potential manifestation of violent behaviours. Martínez et al. (2021) showed the beneficial effect of the mediation of family self-esteem on psychosocial adjustment in adolescents. In this way, adolescents' adaptation was positively influenced by parental acceptance and participation practices while it was negatively affected by parental practises focused on rigour and imposition. Likewise, Cañas et al. (2020) analysed online bullying behaviour

in children and highlighted the importance of protective factors, such as family communication, on victimization in cyberbullying. In addition, parental control has been shown to have a protective effect on the probability of becoming a victim of cyberaggression (Álvarez-García et al., 2019). In general, a good family climate and a good parent-child communication have been shown to reduce the likelihood that children and adolescents will be involved in violent acts (Ortega et al., 2019). This protective effect of the family climate requires not only good communication between parents and children (Lester et al., 2017) but also that parents are able to provide their children with enough social support so that they feel safe (Bradbury et al., 2018; Ho et al., 2018). In this sense, positive parenting styles with indicators related to parental warmth and acceptance act as protective factors (Ding et al., 2020; Zych et al., 2020).

Regarding the negative impacts of the family environment, it has been found that victims of bullying can be predicted by conflicts between parents, so that low parental acceptance is related to a greater risk of children being involved in episodes of both traditional and cyberbullying and victimization (Gómez-Ortiz et al., 2015). This also applies to cases of maladaptive communication mechanisms between the family members. In addition, a higher degree of family conflict and a lower level of family cohesion and expressiveness have been observed in cases of cybervictimization during adolescence, which suggests family climate, among other variables, as a predictor of that sort of victimization (Ayu, 2020; Charalampous et al., 2018). Furthermore, some family factors, such as partner violence and conflicts as well as adversities of the adults in the family, greatly contribute to children frustration, predisposing them to getting involved in school bullying cases (Lee et al., 2020). More specifically, families with bullying children usually show a combination of inadequate parent supervision and a harsh, unpredictable discipline, as well as an authoritarian and punitive parent style, and an inadequate communication between parents and children. In addition, the status of victim is associated to participating in violent acts during adulthood, either as aggressors – reproducing the domination relationships they observed with their peers – or as victims – repeating past experiences (Coyne & Monks, 2011). The first seems to be more frequent in boys, whereas the latter is more frequent in girls.

Exposure to bullying in students affects both sexes and occurs at all ages, with derived detrimental effects on the perception of well-being and on interactive processes with peers having been observed (Chen & Chen, 2020). Boys and younger students show more permissive attitudes towards bullying as compared to girls and older students (Moral, 2005), although there is no consensus regarding the generality of these results. When analyzing the differences attributable to sex in attitudes towards bullying and authority figures, Carrascosa et al. (2015) concluded that boys had a greater positive attitude towards the transgression of norms and towards direct and indirect violence, while girls reported positive attitudes towards authority, being negatively related to the manifestation of explicit behaviours of social aggression. Chen et al. (2021) underscored the influences of school relationships on attitudes towards bullying and the effects of such relationships on the likelihood of becoming bullies, with girls obtaining higher protective scores. However, the differential profiles by sex of higher attitudinal tolerance towards peer aggression, gratuitous violence, as well as that linked to self-protection and general violence in boys are confirmed (Zeladita-Huaman et al., 2021). Usually,

boys make greater use of physical and sexual harassment and intimidation behaviours as compared to girls who tend, instead, to practice social exclusion more often (Ramos-Rodríguez & Aranda-Beltrán, 2020). As regards the perception of family variables of a psychosocial nature, differences were shown in an analysis of perceived parental competence, where girls recognized greater parental involvement and a better family social climate (Solar et al., 2019). However, it is generally agreed that sex does not explain the interrelationships between the family factors and school factors that determine the problem (Chen et al., 2020).

It is widely recognised within social psychology that changing attitudes is easier than changing behaviours (Ajzen & Fishbein, 2005), and, therefore, this discipline has traditionally focused on trying to change attitudes in order to facilitate behavioural change. The main contribution of this line of research is the study of attitudes towards bullying under a three-dimensional model including the analysis of perceptions, beliefs and awareness (cognitive dimension), of social sensitivity towards potential victims of bullying (affective-motivational dimension) and previous intentions and experiences of abuse (behavioural dimension) (see Moral, 2005; Moral & Ovejero, 2013). This model provides greater explanatory power than alternative one-dimensional models in attitudinal evaluation. Based on this strategy, this study intends to analyse the relationship between perceived family climate and children attitudes towards bullying, under the assumption that those who have positive attitudes towards bullying will be more likely to get involved in school bullying conducts. Consequently, the main objective of this study is to analyse how students perceive family social climate based on their attitudes of greater or lesser permissiveness towards bullying. Three hypotheses were established: 1) Girls and younger students present more resistant attitudes towards bullying; 2) adolescents who are more aware of bullying perceive more understanding and support in their family environment, and 3) students that present more favourable attitudes toward bullying perceive greater conflict in the relationship with their parents and report increased use of violence, punishments, and rejection, while those that show more unfavourable attitudes towards bullying perceive a good emotional family atmosphere.

Method

Participants

The sample selection was carried out by means of an intentional sampling of four Secondary Education schools of the central area of Asturias (Spain), with simple randomized two-stage sub-sampling of the school groups and by conglomerates of students from the first to fourth year. A total of 665 students participated in the study (336 girls, 50.5%), with ages between 12 and 18 years ($M = 14.59$, $SD = 1.691$). Of the sampled students, 144 (22.5%) were in their first year, 151 (23.6%) in their second year, 156 (24.4%) in their third year and 189 (29.5%) in their fourth year of E.S.O. The students fell within medium-medium (52.6%), medium-high (11.8%), and medium-low (11.1%) perceived socioeconomic status. With regards to paternal and maternal highest educational level, most had completed primary education (32.3 % and 35.5%, respectively), secondary education (23.1% and 21.9%, respectively) and university studies (26.2% and 24.4%, respectively), mainly.

Instruments

The study presented here is part of a larger research. Specifically, in this study several items on family socialization were selected from the updated version of the *Family Education Questionnaire* EMBU-89 (Herrero et al., 1991). The EMBU is a 81-item scale written in present tense and rated in a five-point Likert scale, from 1 (*always*) to 5 (*never*). Students' perceptions about parental *Understanding and Support* (perception of attachment and affection that adolescents receive from their parents), *Punishment* (use of repressive educational practices) and *Reprobation* (filial perception of parental incomprehension) were collected. We specifically evaluated the perception of parental affection ("Do you feel loved by your parents?") and the perception of parental respect for the children's opinions that differ from their own ("Do your parents respect the fact that you have opinions that differ from theirs?"). We also evaluated adolescents reports on the use of corporal punishment by their parents ("Do your parents beat you?"; "Do your parents impose more corporal punishment than you think you deserve?"), the use of punishment and psychological violence ("Do your parents punish you harshly even for things that are not important?"), the perception of receiving poor treatment in a discriminatory way ("Do you feel treated as the "black sheep" of the family?"), the use of control mechanisms with emotional blackmail by parents ("Do your parents use expressions like this: *Is this how you thank us for all the efforts and sacrifices we have made for your good?*"), as well as the difficulty in communicating with parents and the undue imputation of a responsibility ("Do you get the feeling that your parents hinder everything you try to do"). This selection of items of the EMBU-89 was made in accordance with the results of a previous study carried out by the same research group in adolescents and were considered to be of greater interest for the three aforementioned factors (Comprehension and support, Punishment and Reprobation). The Cronbach's α reliability coefficient was .90 for the full scale and .81 for the items selected here.

The evaluation of perceptions of bullying violence was carried out through the *Scale of attitudes towards social aggression* (Moral, 2005), which has 48 items measured with a true or false dichotomous response. According to the three-dimensional theoretical model, this scale is based on student's attitudes explored by addressing the following factors: a) a *Cognitive factor* that measures students' perceptions of the use of physical, verbal and psychosocial violence against their peers and in general (14 items), an example item is "I believe that people can only understand each other through fighting"; b) an *Affective factor* assessed with questions related to the degree of identification with or rejection of

victims of harassment and aggression among peers (15 items), for instance "I suffer when I see weak ones are being laughed at"; and, c) a *Behavioural factor* that explores the behavioural dispositions and previous experiences of abuse (19 items), for instance "I avoid being present when I know there is going to be a fight". A value of .961 was obtained for the Cronbach's α reliability coefficient. The Cronbach's α values obtained for the factors explored ranged between .801 for the Behavioural factor, .760 for the Cognitive factor, and .709 for the Affective one.

Procedure

Data confidentiality and anonymity was ensured to the centres that collaborated in this study. The permissions of the corresponding orientation departments were previously obtained. The participation was voluntary and the participants expressed their consent at the beginning of the questionnaire. Questionnaires were administered to participants in groups.

Data Analysis

A non-experimental cross-descriptive design was used at the descriptive level to assess social attitudes towards bullying and at the correlational level to establish the relationships between the variables of interest. The data fulfilled the assumptions of normality and homoscedasticity. The relationship between gender and attitudes towards bullying was tested by a means comparison t-test, and ANOVAs were used to test for the relationships between attitudes towards bullying and age group and indicators of family climate. We calculated both descriptive statistics as well as effect sizes of the predictors (Cohen, 1988). The statistical package SPSS/WIN version 21.0 was used.

Results

Sex, age, and attitudes towards bullying

A general indicator of attitudes towards bullying was assessed: "As a whole, what attitudes do you have towards school violence between classmates (bullying)?", measured with three possible response levels (*Opposite*, *Favourable* and *Very Favourable*). 77.5% (n = 515) of the students manifested having attitudes contrary to violence bullying. However, 17.5% of the adolescents (n = 116) that participated in the study reported having favourable, and 5.0% (n = 33) very favourable attitudes towards bullying (see sample distribution according to sex and age range in Table 1).

Table 1
Sample distribution according to Sex * Age range * Attitudes towards bullying (N = 665)

Attitudes towards bullying	Age range					
	12-14		15-16		> 16	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Unfavorable	46.5 (135)	37.5 (109)	36.1 (95)	32.3 (85)	43.7 (38)	39.1 (34)
Favorable	4.1 (12)	9.3 (27)	11.4 (30)	12.2 (32)	4.6 (4)	8.0 (7)
Very favorable	0.7 (2)	1.7 (5)	3.4 (9)	4.6 (12)	1.1 (1)	3.4 (3)

Hence, most of the students showed attitudes contrary to social aggression among peers, with significant differences according to sex ($t_{(665)} = -2.853, p < .001, d = .20$) and age range ($F_{(3,665)} = 11.293, p < .001, \eta^2 = .32$), where girls and students in the lower (12 to 14) and higher (over 16 years) age ranges had attitudes of greater awareness as compared to those of boys and to students in the intermediate age range (15 to 16 years), respectively.

Cognitive, affective, and behavioural attitudes towards bullying and perceived family environment

The analysis is based on the link between perception of social family climate and differential attitudes of permissiveness towards bullying. As a whole, there is a general acceptance of the patterns of parental control and concern, as well as of the pressure towards achievement. However, one difficulty seems to lie in the filial perception of lack of parental understanding and in the imbalances manifested around the communicative process, with 13.7% of the adolescents surveyed reporting great difficulty in communicating with their parents. Likewise, regarding the indicator related to the perception of rejection, which was assessed by the use of unfair and discriminatory comparative criteria with respect to other family members, 9.8% of the students acknowledged being treated as the “black sheep” of the family. Another indicator of interest is the one related to the use of repressive educational practices, with 3.6% of adolescents having reported being subject to parental punishment.

We specifically analysed the differences in attitudes towards bullying according to the family climate perceived by adolescents

(see Table 2) following the aforementioned three-dimensional model of evaluation of attitudes towards bullying violence: the Cognitive factor (beliefs, expectations, etc.; $M = 0.354, SD = 0.178$), the Affective factor (feelings, assessments, awareness, etc.; $M = 0.335, SD = 0.194$) and the Behavioural factor (personal disposition; $M = 0.276, SD = 0.170$). Statistically significant differences were found in the students’ perceptions of the family social climate based on attitudes towards the bullying problem according to the three dimensions explored. Thus, those students that showed a greater degree of identification with the victims of bullying (the Affective factor) perceived more understanding and parental support and reported less rejection and disapproval. This is also applicable to students who presented a perception of rejection of violence, both physical, verbal and psychosocial (the Cognitive factor) and showed a behavioural disposition of rejection of bullying (the Behavioural factor). However, the effect sizes were small.

Global attitude towards bullying and parental disciplinary practices

Favourable global attitudes towards bullying were positively related to negative perception of family climate, explicit behaviours of parental disobedience, bad parental-filial communication, and negative differential treatment by parents.

Adolescents with permissive attitudes (favourable and very favourable global attitudes) to social violence among peers reported the use of more physical violence and corporal punishment by their

Table 2
Perceived differences in attitudes to bullying (affective, cognitive and behavioural factors) according family environment

Perceptions of social family climate	Attitudes Bullying		F	η^2
	Levels	M (SD)		
Perception of feeling treated like the “black sheep” of the family	Affective	4.55 (.999)	2.094*	.022
	Cognitive	4.57 (.852)	2.430*	.048
	Behavioural	4.92 (.777)	3.745**	.120
Difficulty communicating with parents	Affective	4.27 (1.149)	2.310*	.013
	Cognitive	4.71 (.726)	5.863**	.100
	Behavioural	4.62 (.650)	5.129**	.154
Use of psychological violence by parents	Affective	4.39 (.970)	7.143**	.073
	Cognitive	4.64 (.745)	4.514**	.072
	Behavioural	4.38 (.680)	3.664**	.113
Use of physical violence	Affective	4.86 (.347)	3.510*	.036
	Cognitive	4.90 (.390)	7.066**	.119
	Behavioural	4.85 (.376)	4.988**	.150
Use of corporal punishment by parents	Affective	4.64 (.485)	4.588**	.046
	Cognitive	4.87 (.406)	5.296**	.089
	Behavioural	4.82 (.405)	3.181**	.102
Perception of reprobation and undue responsibility	Affective	4.29 (1.006)	3.417*	.055
	Cognitive	4.21 (.802)	3.267**	.078
	Behavioural	4.75 (.866)	3.789*	.117
Perception of paternal affection	Affective	1.14 (.347)	11.842**	.115
	Cognitive	1.11 (.415)	5.416**	.094
	Behavioural	1.19 (.450)	4.561**	.120
Perception of parental respect before different opinions	Affective	1.45 (.951)	7.971**	.079
	Cognitive	1.14 (.363)	3.709**	.064
	Behavioural	1.31 (.480)	3.438**	.111

* p<.05, ** p<.01

parents. In addition, and according to the indicators of perceived repressive and disapproving socializing practices, on the one hand, and of understanding and support, on the other, such adolescents also suffered more psychological violence, they were more aware of their difficulty in communicating with their parents, and felt less loved and respected by them (see Table 3).

Discussion

Adolescents' closest psychosocial environment, and especially their family context, represents a highly important factor in determining attitudes towards social aggression amongst peers (Ding et al., 2020; Romero-Abrio et al., 2019; Zych et al., 2020). Indeed, from a psychosocial perspective, the social and family dynamics themselves (parent-child relationships, emotional detachment, rejection and disapproval, etc.), as well as the potential deficits in family communication and parent-child conflicts arising from the enforcement of rules and values (among other indicators), have an impact on such power dynamics. The presence of conflicts within the family core, the lack of parental support, and violent generational conflict resolution models are highly important factors in the development of favourable attitudes towards the occurrence of bullying (Nocentini et al., 2019). Such factors regulate adolescents' aggressive conducts and their own vital satisfaction (Valdés et al., 2018).

According to our findings when assessing adolescent attitudes towards bullying, overall, one third of adolescents admit using bullying violence in various situations, even though they demonstrate awareness attitudes at the behavioural level, with a scarce use of verbal and psychosocial violence modalities. When analysing the distribution of opposite, favourable and very favourable attitudes to bullying violence, girls, as well as younger adolescents (aged 12-14) and adolescents over 16, present higher rejection attitudes towards bullying and greater support to the victims than boys and those in the intermediate age group (15-16), respectively (see also Moral & Ovejero, 2013).

Regarding the analysis of the relationship between family climate and attitudes towards bullying violence, perceived family dysfunction is linked to school intimidation processes (Semenova et al., 2017). In this respect, our study evaluates the perception of parental disciplinary strategies with *Understanding*

and *Support*, and *Punishment* indicators, as well as through the perception of parent-child communicative processes and through the use of a *Rejection* indicator of children's perception of parent incomprehension. In this regard, differences have been found in such indicators according to the degree of permissiveness towards bullying (Romero-Abrio et al., 2019). This supports the existing tendency to consider the importance of social and family dynamics (parent-child relationships with lack of intimacy, increased detachment, distance and rejection, etc.), family communication deficits, and problems arising from the enforcement of rules and values (see Neufeld, 2002) regarding the perception of aggression-related attitudes and conducts. Our results support the relationship between the perception of family cohesion issues and use of severe disciplinary methods and differential attitudes towards school bullying among peers. On the contrary, family educational styles which generate a good emotional climate, evaluated through the *Understanding* indicators in our study, have been suggested as a protective and preventive factor for violence among peers (Yubero et al., 2018) since more unfavourable attitudes towards such abuses have been found in this case.

It is undeniable that families can be either a risk or a protective factor regarding violence among peers. In fact, according to Garaigordobil and Machimbarrena (2017), parents of both victims and aggressors in bullying conducts use further authoritarian practices (low affection, coercive discipline, high control) and permissive educational practices (high affection/overprotection, low standards/control). Moreover, parents of the aggressors present a lower level of parent skills. We believe that the study of socio-cognitive and emotional variables (among which attitudes stand out due to the interrelation of such processes) and their link to the family social climate is of interest for any comprehensive attempt to analyze bullying (Larrañaga et al., 2018; Ovejero & Moral, 2018; Pina et al., 2021). In our study adolescents with more favourable attitudes towards bullying behaviour reported the use of repressive educational practices by parents, parent-child communication issues, and the perception of a negative differential parent treatment, which is in line with previous studies (see Chen et al., 2020; Yubero et al., 2018). These results support a relationship between attitudes towards bullying conducts and certain risk components of family climate (Lee et al., 2020; Gómez-Ortiz et al., 2015).

Table 3
Perceived differences global attitudes towards bullying in terms of family environment

Perceptions of social family climate	Global Attitudes Bullying Mean			F	η^2	Contrast Tukey b
	a	b	c			
Perception of feeling treated like the "black sheep" of the family	4.41	4.19	4.03	5.536**	.018	a > b > c
Difficulty communicating with parents	4.04	3.63	3.47	10.342**	.028	a > b > c
Use of psychological violence	3.86	3.57	3.34	6.090**	.018	a > b > c
Use of physical violence	4.67	4.34	4.16	12.405**	.037	a > b > c
Use of corporal punishment by parents	4.55	4.34	4.31	3.270**	.012	a > b, c
Undue responsibility	3.80	3.54	3.50	2.401**	.007	n.s.
Perception of paternal affection	1.31	1.54	2.06	17.381**	.051	a < b < c
Perception of parental respect before different opinions	1.94	2.35	2.56	7.579**	.022	a < b < c

a: Unfavorable, b: Favorable, c: Very Favorable
* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

The influence of parent educational styles on bullying dynamics has been well documented. In agreement with Machimbarrena et al. (2019), our findings highlight the importance of promoting protective factors, such as easy parent-child communication, family cohesion and support, as well as the promotion of secure attachment. There is a positive impact of parental warmth even with aggressive adolescents (Pérez-Gramaje, 2019). According to Moon and Lee (2020), parenting styles and resilience are important socio-ecological factors that influence attitudes towards bullying, and it has been shown that the prevention of bullying at school is influenced by social support (Ubudiyah et al., 2020). In this sense, successful interventions on bullying victimization require the strengthening of protective factors to be promoted (Sullivan et al., 2021; Zych et al., 2020), in addition to the reduction of the impacts of risk factors, among which family factors stand out.

Limitations and suggestions for future studies

This study presents a series of limitations that should be mentioned. It is important to point out its transversal nature, which makes it difficult to establish the sense of causality among the variables studied. Another possible limitation is the representativeness of the sample used, and those related to the psychometric qualities of the scales. In addition, social desirability might have occurred, given the topic analysed, and we must, therefore, be cautious when interpreting our results.

We advocate the design and implementation of contextualized studies from a social and educational perspective involving all psychosocial contexts impacting the origin and maintenance of bullying. Because the problem is a multi-dimensional one, it is extremely important to leave single-mode action strategies behind and enrolling family and school agents according to an ecologic perspective (Hong & Espelage, 2012; Moon & Lee, 2020; Núñez-Fadda et al., 2020). Therefore, our study places a special emphasis on taking the interrelationship between the most significant interaction contexts for adolescents (family, school, peers, and community) into account in any comprehensive proposal aimed at approaching the problem in full. Given the multi-faceted causes of this problem, coordinated strategies must be offered for its prevention (Sullivan et al., 2021), as well as in the various anti-bullying programs from which multiple impacts are derived, as indicated by Fraguas et al. (2021) in their meta-analysis.

Specifically, we recommend evaluating parent perception regarding community living management strategies (Mendoza & Barrera, 2018), and turning parents into committed agents. Families play a key role in promoting a positive emotional education. Therefore, parents have a responsibility to detect, prevent, and intervene in bullying, as well as promote a positive school climate through family support (Chen et al., 2020, 2021; Llorent et al., 2021).

References

- Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (2005). The influence of attitudes on behaviour. In D. Albarracín, B. T. Johnson, and M. P. Zanna (Eds.), *The handbook of attitudes* (pp. 173-221). Erlbaum.
- Álvarez-García, D., Núñez, J. C., García, T., & Barreiro, A. (2018). Individual, family, and community predictors of cyber-agresion among adolescents. *The European Journal of Psychology Applied to Legal Context*, 10(2), 79-88. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5093/10.5093/ejpalc2018a8>
- Álvarez-García, D., Núñez, J. C., González-Castro, P., Rodríguez, C., & Cerezo, R. (2019). The effect of parental control on cyber-victimization in adolescence: The mediating role of impulsivity and high-risk behaviors. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1159. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01159>
- Ayu, P. E. S. (2020). The roles of parent and teacher on children attitude development to avoid Bullying behavior in early childhood. *Yavana Bhāshā: Journal of English Language Education*, 3(1), 21-29. <http://dx.doi.org/10.25078/yb.v1i1.1374>
- Bradbury, S. L., Dubow, E. F., & Domoff, S. E. (2018). How do adolescents learn cyber-victimization coping skills? An examination of parent and peer coping socialization. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 47(5), 1866-1879. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-018-0812-y>
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1976). The ecology of human development: History and perspectives. *Psychologia*, 19(5), 537-549.
- Cañas, E., Estévez, E., León-Moreno, C., & Musitu, G. (2020). Loneliness, family communication, and school adjustment in a sample of cyber-victimized adolescents. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(1), 335. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17010335>
- Carrascosa, L., Cava, M. J., & Buelga, S. (2015). Attitudes towards authority and violence among adolescents: Differences according to gender. *Suma Psicológica*, 22(2), 102-109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sumpsi.2015.08.003>
- Cerezo, F., Ruiz-Esteban, C., Lacasa, C. S., & Arense, J. J. (2018). Dimensions of parenting styles, social climate, and bullying victims in primary and secondary education. *Psicothema*, 30(1), 59-65. <https://doi.org/10.7334/psicothema2016.360>
- Charalampous, K., Demetriou, C., Tricha, L., Ioannou, M., Georgiou, S., Nikiforou, M., & Stavrinides, P. (2018). The effect of parental style on bullying and cyberbullying behaviours and the mediating role of peer attachment relationships: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Adolescence*, 64, 109-123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2018.02.003>
- Chen, J. K., & Chen, L. M. (2020). A cross-national examination of school violence and nonattendance due to school violence in Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Mainland China: A Rasch model approach. *Journal of School Violence*, 19(2), 177-191. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2019.1568882>
- Chen, J. K., Wu, C., & Wei, H. S. (2020). Personal, family, school, and community factors associated with student victimization by teachers in Taiwanese junior high schools: A multi-informant and multilevel analysis. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 99(1), 104246. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2019.104246>
- Chen, J. K., Wang, S. C., Chen, Y. W., & Huang, T. H. (2021). Family climate, social relationships with peers and teachers at school, and school bullying victimization among third Grade students in Elementary schools in Taiwan. *School Mental Health*, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12310-020-09404-8>
- Cohen, E., Eshel, J., Kimhi, S., & Kurman, J. (2019). Individual resilience: A major protective factor in peer bullying and victimization of Elementary school children in Israel. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260519863192>
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. Second Edition. LEA.
- Coyne, I., & Monks, C. (2011). *An overview of bullying and abuse across settings*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ding, Y., Li, D., Li, X., Xiao, J., Zhang, H., & Wang, Y. (2020). Profiles of adolescent traditional and cyberbullying and victimization: The role of demographic, individual, family, school, and peer factors. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 111, 106439. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106439>
- Elsaesser, C., Russell, B., Ohannessian, C. M., & Patton, D. (2017). Parenting in a digital age: A review of parents' role in preventing

- adolescent cyberbullying. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, 35, 62-72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2017.06.004>
- Espelage, D. L., & Swearer, S. M. (2010). A social-ecological model for bullying prevention and intervention: Understanding the impact of adults in the social ecology of youngsters. In S. R. Jimerson, S. M. Swearer, and D. L. Espelage (Eds.), *Handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective* (pp. 61-72). Routledge.
- Feijóo, S., Foody, M., O'Higgins, J., Pichel, R., & Rial, A. (2021). Cyberbullies, the cyberbullied, and problematic Internet use: Some reasonable similarities. *Psicothema*, 33(2), 198-205. <https://doi.org/10.7334/psicothema2020.209>
- Fraguas, D., Díaz-Caneja, C. M., Ayora, M., Durán-Cutilla, M., Abregú-Crespo, R., Ezquiaga-Bravo, I., Martín-Babarro, J., & Arango, C. (2021). Assessment of school anti-bullying interventions: A meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials. *JAMA Pediatrics*, 175(1), 44-55. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.3541>
- Garaigordobil, M., & Machimbarrena, J. M. (2017). Stress, competence, and parental educational styles in victims and aggressors of bullying and cyberbullying. *Psicothema*, 29(3), 335-340. <https://doi.org/10.7334/psicothema2016.258>
- Gómez-Ortiz, O., Del Rey, R., & Ortega, R. (2015). Parental and maternal educational styles in adolescence and their relation to resilience, attachment and involvement in bullying. *Anales de Psicología*, 31(3), 979-989. <https://doi.org/10.6018/analesps.31.3.180791>
- Gutiérrez, M., & Gonçalves, T. O. (2013). Activos para el desarrollo, ajuste escolar y bienestar subjetivo de los adolescentes [Assets for the development, school adjustment and subjective well-being of adolescents]. *International Journal of Psychology and Psychological Therapy*, 13(3), 339-355.
- Herrero, J., Musitu, G., García, F., & Gomis, M. J. (1991). The educational practices of parents in adolescence. *Proceedings of the III National Congress of Social Psychology*, 1, 352-361.
- Ho, H. Y., Chen, Y. L., & Yen, C. F. (2018). Moderating effects of friendship and family support on the association between bullying victimization and perpetration in adolescents. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 48, 581-596. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-018-0941-3>
- Hutson, E., Kelly, S., & Militello, L. K. (2018). Systematic review of cyberbullying interventions for youth and parents with implications for evidence-based practice. *Worldviews Evid Based Nursing*, 15, 72-79. <https://doi.org/10.1111/wvn.12257>
- Larrañaga, E., Navarro, R., & Yubero, S. (2020). Factores socio-cognitivos y emocionales en la agresión del ciberacoso [Socio-cognitive and emotional factors on perpetration of cyberbullying]. *Comunicar*, 56(26), 19-28. <https://doi.org/10.3916/C56-2018-02>
- Lee, J. M., Johns, S., Willis, T. M., Hong, J. S., & Voisin, D. R. (2020). Adult family adversities and bullying among Urban African American adolescents. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 29, e2020-09-15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10926771.2020.1806977>
- Lester, L., Pearce, N., Waters, S., Barnes, A., Beatty, S., & Cross, D. (2017). Family involvement in a whole-school intervention: Mothers' and fathers' communication and influence with children. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 26, 2716-2727. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-017-0793-6>
- Llorent, V. J., Farrington, D. P., & Zych, I. (2021). School climate policy and its relations with social and emotional competencies, bullying and cyberbullying in Secondary education. *Revista de Psicodidáctica*, 26(1), 35-44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psicod.2020.11.002>
- Machimbarrena, J. M., González-Cabrera, J., & Garaigordobil, M. (2019). Family variables related to bullying and cyberbullying: A systematic review. *Psychological Thinking*, 17(2), 37-56. <http://dx.doi.org/10.11e144/javerianacali.ppsi17-2.vfrb>
- Martínez, I., Murgu, S., García, O. F., & García, F. (2021). Parenting and adolescent adjustment: The mediational role of family self-esteem. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 30(3), 1-14. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10826-021-01937-z>
- Mendoza, B., & Barrera, A. (2018). Gestión de la convivencia escolar en educación básica: percepción de los padres [Management of school coexistence in basic education: Perception of parents]. *REDIE: Revista Electrónica de Investigación Educativa*, 2(2), 93-102. <https://doi.org/10.24320/redie.2018.20.2.1729>
- Moon, H., & Lee, S. (2020). Moderating effects of socio-ecological factors on the relationship between adolescent exposure to media violence and attitudes towards school bullying. *JAN Leading Global Nursing Research*, 76(11), 2921-2932. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.14478>
- Moral, M. V. (2005). Actitudes socioconstruidas ante la violencia bullying en estudiantes de Secundaria [Socio-constructed attitudes towards bullying violence in secondary school students]. *Anuario de Psicología*, 36(1), 61-81.
- Moral, M. V., & Ovejero, A. (2013). Percepción del clima social familiar y actitudes ante el acoso escolar el adolescentes [Perception of the family social climate and attitudes towards bullying in adolescents]. *EJIHPE: European Journal of Investigation in Health, Psychology and Education*, 3(2), 149-160. <https://doi.org/10.1989/ejihpe.v3i2.32>
- Neufeld, P. J. (2002). School violence. Family responsibility. *Family Journal Counseling and Therapy for Couples and Families*, 10(2), 207-209. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1066480702102011>
- Nocentini, A., Fiorentini, G., Di Paola, L., & Menesini, E. (2019). Parents, family characteristics and bullying behavior: A systematic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 45, 41-50. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2018.07.010>
- Núñez-Fadda, S. M., Castro-Castañeda, R., Vargas-Jiménez, E., Musitu-Ochoa, G., & Callejas-Jerónimo, J. E. (2020). Bullying victimization among Mexican adolescents: Psychosocial differences from an ecological approach. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17, 4831. <https://doi.org/doi:10.3390/ijerph17134831>
- Ortega, J., Postigo, J., Iranzo, B., & Carrascosa, L. (2019). Parental communication and feeling of affiliation in adolescent aggressors and victims of cyberbullying. *Social Sciences*, 8(1), 3. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci8010003>
- Ovejero, A., & Moral, M. V. (2018). Violence and school: Bullying. In A. Ovejero, J. F. Morales, and S. Yubero (Eds.), *Social psychology of education* (pp. 121-162). UOC.
- Pérez-Gramaje, A. F., García, O. F., Reyes, M., Serra, E., & García, F. (2020). Parenting styles and aggressive adolescents: Relationships with self-esteem and personal maladjustment. *The European Journal of Psychology Applied to Legal Context*, 12, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.5093/ejpalc2020a1>
- Pina, D., Llor-Esteban, B., Ruiz-Hernández, J. A., Luna-Maldonado, A., & Puente-López, E. (2021). Attitudes towards school violence: A qualitative study with Spanish children. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 33, 1551-1581. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260520987994>
- Ramos-Rodríguez, I., & Aranda-Beltrán, C. (2020). Violencia y acoso escolar: diferencias por sexo y edad en estudiantes universitarios mexicanos [Violence and bullying: Differences by sex and age in Mexican university students]. *Revista Ciencia UNEMI*, 13(34), 84-93. <https://doi.org/10.29076/issn.2528-7737vol13iss34.2020pp84-93p>
- Rodríguez-Hidalgo, A. J., Calmaestra, J., Casas, J. A., & Ortega-Ruiz, R. (2019). Ethnic-cultural bullying versus personal bullying: Specificity and measurement of discriminatory aggression and victimization among adolescents. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10(46), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00046>
- Romero-Abrio, A., León-Montero, C., Musitu-Ferrer, D., & Villarreal-González, & M. E. (2019). Family functioning, self-concept and cybervictimization: An analysis based on gender. *Social Science*, 8(2), 69. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci8020069>
- Semenova, N., Cárdenas, N., & Berbesi, D. Y. (2017). School climate and family functionality as factors associated with school bullying in Antioquia, Colombia. *Psychological Thought*, 15(1), 63-72. <http://dx.doi.org/10.11144/Javerianacali.PPSI15-1.CEFF>
- Solar, M. A., Gutiérrez, H.F., & Ruiz, R. A. (2019). Factores asociados a la presencia de bullying en estudiantes de educación secundaria de un colegio estatal en el distrito del Porvenir, Perú [Factors associated with the presence of bullying in secondary education students of a state school in the district of El Porvenir, Peru]. *Revista Internacional de Salud Materno Fetal*, 4(1), 10-21.
- Sullivan, T. N., Farrell, A. D., Sutherland, K. S., Behrhorst, K. L., Garthe, R. C., & Greene, A. (2021). Evaluation of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program in US urban middle schools using a multiple baseline experimental design. *Prevention Science*, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11211-021-01244-5>
- Tucker, C. J., Finkelhor, D., & Turner, H. (2020). Family predictors of sibling versus peer victimization. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 34, 186-195. <https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000592>

- Ubudiyah, M., Nursala, N., & Sukartini (2020). Social support and individual support for Bullying prevention among adolescents in the school: A systematic review. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, 24(9), 830-836. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.14478>
- Valdés, A. A., Tánori J., Alonso, E. C., & Wendlandt, T. R. (2018). Challenging behaviour, conflict and community violence in students with aggressive behaviour. *International Journal of Psychological Research*, 11(1), 50-57. <https://doi.org/10.21500/20112084.1777>
- Yübero, S., Larrañaga, E., & Navarro, R. (2018). Los padres ante el ciberacoso: factores de protección [Parents against cyberbullying: Protective factors]. *Bordón. Revista de Pedagogía*, 70(1), 141-157. <https://doi.org/10.13042/Bordon.2018.58169>
- Zeladita-Huaman, J. A., Montes-Iturrizaga, I., Morán-Paredes, G. I., Zegarra-Chapoñan, R., Cuba-Sancho, J. M., & Aparco, J. P. (2021). Factors associated with attitudes towards violence in school children from marginal urban areas of Metropolitan Lima, 2019. *Revista Peruana de Medicina Experimental y Salud Pública*, 37(4), 627-635. <https://doi.org/10.17843/rpmesp.2020.374.5154>
- Zych, I., Gómez-Ortiz, O., Fernández, L., Nasaescu, E., & Llorent, V. J. (2020). Parental moral disengagement induction as a predictor of bullying and cyberbullying: Mediation by children's moral disengagement, moral emotions, and validation of a questionnaire. *Child Indicators Research*, 13, 1065-1083. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12187-019-09670-2>