

**RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERSONALITY FACTORS AND BULLYING
BEHAVIOUR OF LEARNERS IN NGAKA MODIRI MOLEMA DISTRICT**

By

Mmapula Patricia Moalusi

21448744

Mini-dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Social Science in Clinical Psychology at the North-West University (Mafikeng Campus)

Supervisor: Dr P. Erasmus

Co-supervisor: Dr N. A. Matamela

May 2016

DECLARATION

I, Mmapula Patricia Moalusi, declare that this mini-dissertation submitted by me for the degree in Masters of Social Sciences in Clinical Psychology at the North-West University, is my own independent work and has not been submitted by me at another university; all materials within this document have been duly acknowledged.

Moalusi M. P.

Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Above all, I would like to thank my God for His grace, mercy and unmerited favour that He has shown me throughout these years. The strength and endurance you have given me is humbling and I seek to glorify you in all areas of my life.

- My supervisor, Dr Petro Erasmus, thank you for providing a stimulating and welcoming academic environment. I appreciate and value your patience, kindness, support and guidance. Without your support the conclusion of this study would have not been possible. God bless you.
- Dr N. A. Matamela, I thank you for intervening in the study when I needed you most. I appreciate and value your patience, kindness, support, guidance and comments. May God grant you the desires of your heart.
- Dr S. Ellis, thank you very much for helping with the statistical analysis. You were always ready to assist and your inputs helped a lot. May God bless you for that.
- To my parents, Nthole and Ben Moalusi, thank you for believing in me. Thank you for your unconditional love that you have shown me from my birth to this day. You always stood by me no matter what. You are the pillars of my strength. I thank God every day for your lives. May He grant you many more years. I don't have enough words to express my gratitude.
- My fiancé, Osahon, when I needed support, you were always there to provide it. Your kind words of encouragement helped tremendously. You never stopped to show your support and you were always there to listen and provide advice when needed. Thank you for the love you have shown me and for the faith you have in me. The sacrifices you made are never in vain. May God richly bless you and grant you the desires of your heart.

- To my kids, Omolemo and Osagioduwa, your existence alone in this world is enough strength and encouragement for me. Your laughter alone is enough to lighten the burdens of the day. You are my reason to wake up in the morning and face each day.
- To my friends, Nikiwe, Palesa, Keitumetse and Mpho, we have been through a lot together. Thank you for always listening and for your encouragement. There were days when I felt like giving up but you always encouraged me to push forward and never give up. Your presence in my life has truly changed me for the better
- To my mother in faith, Kelebogile, thank you for your prayers, support and encouragement.
- To the learners who participated in this study, thank you. Without you this study would have not been complete.
- To Ms K. Leburu, thank you for your help. Your research expertise really came in handy.
- Finally, my gratitude goes to NSFAS and North-West University (MC) post-graduate bursary for financial assistance towards my study.
- May God bless you all in Jesus name, Amen.

DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to my parents, Nthole and Ben Moalusi. Without your support I would not have made it so far. I know it was not easy for you to put me through university all these years, but I thank you for your endurance. I appreciate your love and guidance as my parents. Your sacrifices are not in vain. May God bless you for me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
DEDICATION	v
LIST OF TABLES	x
LIST OF APPENDICES	xi
ABSTRACT	xii
CHAPTER 1	
1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY	1
1.1. PROBLEM STATEMENT	6
1.2. AIM OF THE STUDY	8
1.3. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY	9
1.4. SCOPE OF THE STUDY	9
1.5. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY	9
CHAPTER 2	
2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND PERSPECTIVES	12
2.1. OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS	12
2.2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY	14
2.2.1. Bio-ecological model	14
2.3. THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES	19
2.3.1. Social learning theory	19
	vi

2.3.2. Eysenck's personality theory	20
2.3.3. Differential susceptibility theory	22
2.4. CONCLUSION	23
CHAPTER 3	
3. LITERATURE REVIEW	24
3.1. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE BULLY AND THE VICTIM	24
3.1.1. The bully	24
3.1.2. The victim	25
3.2. TYPES OF BULLYING	26
3.2.1. Verbal bullying	26
3.2.2. Physical bullying	27
3.2.3. Indirect bullying	28
3.2.4. Cyberbullying	28
3.3. EFFECTS OF BULLYING	29
3.4. PERSONALITY FACTORS AND BULLYING BEHAVIOUR	30
3.4.1. Extraversion (E)	31
3.4.2. Neuroticism (N)	32
3.4.3. Psychoticism (P)	34
3.5. GENDER DIFFERENCES RELATED TO BULLYING BEHAVIOUR	35
3.5.1. Verbal bullying and gender	35
3.5.2. Physical bullying and gender	36
3.5.3. Indirect bullying and gender	36
3.5.4. Gender differences in personality factors	37
3.6. SUMMARY OF LITERATURE REVIEW	38
3.7. HYPOTHESES	39

CHAPTER 4

4. METHODOLOGY	40
4.1. INTRODUCTION	40
4.2. STUDY DESIGN	40
4.3. PARTICIPANTS	40
4.4. INSTRUMENTS	42
4.4.1. The Bullying Questionnaire of the North West University, Psychology Department- Mafikeng Campus (BQPM)	42
4.4.2. Eysenck Personality Questionnaire-Revised (EPQR)	48
4.5. PROCEDURE	48
4.6. STATISTICAL METHOD USED	49
4.7. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS	49
4.8. SUMMARY	49

CHAPTER 5

5. RESULTS	51
5.1. INTRODUCTION	51
5.2. RESULTS	51
5.3. CONCLUSION	54

CHAPTER 6

6. DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	56
6.1. INTRODUCTION	56
6.2. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS	56
6.3. CONCLUSION	61

6.4. STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS	61
6.5. RECOMMENDATIONS	62
6.6. SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	63
REFERENCES (APA 6 TH EDITION)	65
APPENDICES	

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Characteristics of participants.	41
Table 2: Total variance explained in the principal factor analysis for bullying victimization.	44
Table 3: Factor loadings and communalities based on a principal components analysis with oblim rotation for 11 items from bullying victimization (Q7).	44
Table 4: Descriptive statistics for the three bullying victimization (Q7) factors.	45
Table 5: Total variances explained in the principal factor analysis for bullying perpetration.	46
Table 6: Factor loadings and communalities based on a principal components analysis with oblimin rotation for 11 items from bullying perpetration (Q23).	47
Table 7: Descriptive statistics for the two bullying perpetration (Q23) factors.	47
Table 8: A correlation analysis of personality factors and bullying behaviour.	51
Table 9: Independent t-test showing means, standard deviations, degrees of freedom of learners' personality factors according to gender differences.	53

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A: Questionnaires

Appendix B: NWU ethical Approval certificate

Appendix C: Certificate of Language Editing

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERSONALITY FACTORS AND BULLYING BEHAVIOUR OF LEARNERS IN NGAKA MODIRI MOLEMA DISTRICT

Abstract

Aim: This study aimed at investigating the relationship between personality factors and bullying behaviour of learners in the Ngaka Modiri Molema District in the North West Province.

Objectives: (1) To explore the relationship between personality factors (extraversion, neuroticism, and psychoticism) and bullying behaviours; and (2) To determine the differences of bullying behaviour and personality factors (extraversion, neuroticism, and psychoticism) according to gender.

Method: A correlational design was used for the study. Two hundred and thirty four ($n = 234$) learners were sampled from a larger sample of 4394 learners to participate in the study. Data was collected through the use of self-report questionnaire with two scales (Bullying Behaviour Scale and Eysenck Personality Questionnaire). Pearson correlation analysis and independent t-test were used to test the study hypotheses.

Results: The results show a significant positive correlation between psychoticism and verbal bullying (perpetration) $r(234) = .20, p < .01$; psychoticism and physical/indirect bullying (perpetration) $r(234) = .30, p < .01$; extraversion and verbal bullying (perpetration) $r(234) = .21, p < .01$; neuroticism and indirect bullying (victimisation) $r(234) = .26, p < .01$. No correlations were observed for other factors.

Recommendation of the study is that parents and teachers need to work together in order to deal effectively with school bullying problems.

Key Words: Bullying, personality factors, learners.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Bullying has been recognized as a major problem in schools nationally and internationally over the last few years and is the most frequently identified form of violence among learners (Greimel & Kodama, 2011) and it is increasing worldwide (Wang, Iannotti, Tonja, & Nansel, 2009). It is indicated that each year 100-600 million children are directly involved in bullying worldwide (Volk, Craig, Boyce, & King, 2006). According to Carpenter and Ferguson (2014), bullying was not recognised as a serious social problem prior to the 1970's until Olweus conducted the first scientific study of bullying in the early 1970's, and various international authors followed by investigating the nature and prevalence of bullying (Morita, 1985; O'Moore & Hillery, 1989; Rigby, 1996; Bidwell, 1997; Carpenter & Ferguson, 2014).

In the United States, it is said that 282,000 students are bullied every month (Baldry & Farrington, 2000), and according to the UK National Bullying Survey in 2006, 69% of children reported being bullied, 87% of parents reported that their children had been bullied in the past 12 months, 20% of the children reported being perpetrators, while 85% of the children had witnessed bullying. A study by Farrington and Ttofi (2009) in the United States indicates that 30% of grade 6 to grade 10 learners are involved in moderate bullying behaviours as bullies, victims, or as bully-victims.

Bullying is not foreign to South African schools. Memoh (2013) reports that 96.8% of high school learners report that bullying takes place at their school. Burton and Leoschut (2013) reported the results of the 2012 national school violence study which comprised 5,939 learners, 121 principals and 239 educators. This indicated that 12.2% of learners had been

threatened with violence by someone at school, 6.3% had been assaulted, 4.7% had been sexually assaulted or raped, and 4.5% had been robbed at school.

In addition, a study (n=296 primary school learners) by Johnson (2014) conducted in the Western Cape, found that 57.9% reported being victims of bullying. In another study (n=2064), 68% of learners in South Africa were worried about being physically assaulted or being threatened with a weapon at school among both primary and secondary school learners. It was further indicated that 71% of females felt threatened compared to 63% of male learners (Wakefield, 2013). The reports of the studies (Johnson, 2014; Memoh, 2013; Burton & Leoschut, 2013) above indicate that approximately more than half of learners in South Africa experience bullying, which indicates that bullying is a major concern in South African schools, hence the present study which is conducted among learners who are 18 years old and above in Ngaka Modiri Molema District, North West province. These learners were selected for the purpose of this study because of the high prevalence of bullying in schools (Louw, 2015; Johnson, 2014; Memoh, 2013; Barton & Leoshut, 2013; Ramadie, 2013; Idemudia, 2013) without any tentative explanation of its causes.

There are a number of definitions of bullying (e.g., Roland, 1989; Besag, 1989; Tattum & Tattum, 1992). Perhaps the most influential definition of bullying is the one that is given by Olweus (1993). Olweus (1993) defined bullying as an imbalance of power between two individuals where the powerful individual (bully) repeatedly causes harm to the weaker individual (victim). This definition indicates that, for bullying to occur, the behaviour has to be repeated and there has to be an imbalance of power between the perpetrator and the victim. According to StopBullying.gov (2014), for behaviour to be considered bullying it must possess the following characteristics: aggression, imbalance of power where the bully is more powerful than the victim, and repetition of behaviour.

In addition, Roland (1989) indicates that bullying is a persistent physical or psychological act of violence against an individual who is not able to defend himself. Furthermore, according to Besag (1989), bullying can also take on a social or verbal form. These definitions of bullying indicate that bullying is not only physical or direct, but it can take other forms which are indirect, such as social, verbal or psychological bullying.

To concur with the above authors, according to Hong and Espelage (2012), bullying can be direct (hitting, kicking, threatening,) or indirect (spreading rumours, social exclusion). Furthermore, there are three types of bullying that have been identified by Zerillo and Osterman (2011) which are physical, verbal and relational bullying. Physical bullying is characterized by causing harm to someone's body or property. Verbal bullying is characterized by lies, name calling, continuous teasing and starting rumours about the victim. Relational bullying is characterized by shunning, isolating and ignoring the victim.

For the purpose of the current study, three factors of bullying were extracted through the use of factor analysis and were named verbal bullying, physical bullying and indirect bullying (this will be discussed in detail in chapter 4). Verbal bullying includes name calling, making fun of others, and playing jokes on them. Physical bullying includes breaking others things, attacking others, isolating others by not letting them be part of a group, shoving or pushing. Indirect bullying includes threatening to do bad things to others, writing bad things about someone, and saying mean things about someone.

The current study focuses on both bullying perpetration and bullying victimization that occurs in schools. Johnson (2014) describes the bully as an individual who intentionally inflicts harm by their actions, words, and behaviour on others. Furthermore, Johnson (2014) indicates that bullies feel little empathy for their victim, attack others to feel powerful and in control, and are thought to be lacking attention, power and competence. Cohn and Canter

(2003) define a victim as someone who is exposed to repeated aggression by peers. This aggression can be in the form of physical attacks, verbal assaults, or psychological abuse (Cohn & Canter, 2003). According to Klomek, Sourander, and Gould (2011), victims of bullying are often perceived as anxious, shy, insecure, or physically smaller or weaker than their peers. These findings seem to implicate personality factors that are associated with either being a bully or a victim.

Eysenck's personality theory (1947), which is a trait theory, is used in this study to conceptualize personality factors. McKay (2014) defined traits as behavioural characteristics that define who we are (McKay, 2014). According to Eysenck (1978), personality traits are observed consistencies of behaviour in different situations. In the beginning of his theory, Eysenck (1947) used factor analysis and identified that all human personality traits can be broken down into two different factors, namely, neuroticism and introversion-extraversion. People who score high on neuroticism scale are anxious, moody and tend to be vulnerable. Those who score high on the extraversion scale are outgoing, sociable, and crave excitement and the company of others. Later on, Eysenck (1967) realised that there are some traits that do not fit into his two factors leading to the addition of a new factor to his model known as psychoticism. People who are high on psychoticism are characterized by being egocentric, cold, lacking in empathy, unconcerned about others and impulsive.

Added to Eysenck's personality factors (i.e., extraversion, neuroticism and psychoticism) is the lie scale, which according to Francis (1991), is an integral part of Eysenck's personality questionnaire (EPQ). According to Gong (1984), the lie scale in the EPQ is not a direct measure of personality factors. This scale measure dissimulation or lying and it may also be used as a control scale (Gong, 1984; Tiwari, Singh & Singh, 2009; Idemudia, 2013). The current study is aimed at investigating the relationship between personality factors and bullying behaviour of learners. Although the lie scale is part of the EPQ, this scale will not be

discussed further in this study as it is not a direct measure of personality. Therefore, as reflected in other studies (e.g., Cale, 2006; Idemudia, 2013; Ojedokun & Idemudia, 2013) that used the EPQ, the focus of this study will only be on the psychoticism scale, neuroticism scale and the extraversion scale of the EPQ since they measure personality. Eysenck's personality factors will be discussed in details in chapter three.

Personality factors have been associated with bullying (Connolly & O'Moore, 2003; Mynard & Joseph, 1997; Slee & Rigby, 1993). Studies found that there is a relationship between personality factors and bullying (Jolliffe & Farrington, 2011; Olweus, 1993). Connolly and O'Moore (2003); Mynard and Joseph (1997); Slee and Rigby (1993) used Eysenck Personality Inventory- Junior and they reported heightened levels of psychoticism and slight increases in extraversion and neuroticism among bullies. According to Olweus (1993), the personality of bullies is characterized by tolerance of violence, impulsivity, and lack of empathy. A study of the Big Five personality traits (i.e., openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism) and bullying revealed the following characteristics about bullies: low friendliness (agreeableness) and higher emotional instability (neuroticism) (Menesini, Camodeca, & Nocentini, 2010). A study carried by Idemudia (2013) showed that individuals who scored high on psychoticism, neuroticism and extraversion also had high scores on bullying behaviour.

Gender is also implicated in bullying behaviour. Studies by Silva, Pereira, Mandonca, Nunes, & de Oliveira (2013); Beran (2012); James (2010) and Erdur-Baker (2010) indicate that there are gender differences in bullying behaviour. Turkel (2007) suggests that these differences are the results of general socialization of males and females, where females are expected to be gentler and more non-aggressive than males who are taught more direct ways of dealing with their anger. To support this, Card, Stucky, Sawalani and Little (2008) found that males engage more in physical and direct bullying than their female counterparts.

Males usually bully both genders whereas the females tend to bully other females, and can be bullied by both genders. Males are generally more violent and destructive (overtly aggressive) in their bullying behaviour than females are, making greater use of direct physical means of bullying behaviour because males are more concerned about muscle mass which gives them a physical sense of power because boys seek dominance (Garrett, 2003; Nesor, Ladikos & Prinsloo, 2004). Similarly, Sullivan, Cleary and Sullivan (2002) found that physical and verbal bullying is more common in boys than in girls. According to these authors, one reason for this could be that girls are discouraged from a young age from engaging in physical clashes. Rodkin and Berger (2008) found that boys were more likely to be perpetrators and bully/victims, and girls were more likely to be victims.

1.1.PROBLEM STATEMENT

Bullying has become one of the major problems faced by schools around the world and has been the focus of many studies (Russel, 2015, Johnson, 2014; Memoh, 2013; Klomek et al., 2011) and it has been associated with many behavioural problems among learners (Wolke, Woods, Bloomfield, & Karstadt, 2000). According to Farrington (1993), bullying is associated with negative, long-term effects on the mental health of the victim. These negative effects include low self-esteem, poor body image and self-destructive behaviours such as self-mutilation and in extreme cases of suicide. Farrington (1993) further states that not only victims are affected by bullying, but bullies too. Bullies may show aggression and violent personalities which can lead to criminal behaviour in adolescence and in adulthood. This is supported by Veenstra, Lindenberg, Oldenhinkel, De Winter, Verhulst, and Ormel (2005) who maintain that children and adolescents who bully have poorer psychological functioning, they are aggressive, hostile, antisocial, impulsive and are difficult to work with.

Research shows that bullying is also a main concern in South African schools (Memoh, 2013; Mlisa, Ward, Flisher & Lombard, 2008; Townsend, Flisher, Chikobvu, Lombard, & King, 2008; Liang, Flisher, & Lombard, 2007; Taiwo & Goldstein, 2006; Nesor, Ovens, van der Merwe, Morodi, & Ladikos, 2003). According to Kruger (2013), bullying in South Africa has been associated with school violence. Many stories that made national headlines were associated with bullying at schools. Among these stories is the story of a 16 year old boy from Shoshanguve who committed suicide after he was bullied by four of his classmates (Kruger, 2013).

Although an enormous amount of research has been done on bullying from the South African context, the focus has mainly been on bullying prevalence and its impact (e.g., Townsend et al., 2008; Liang et al., 2007). These studies focused on the prevalence of bullying and its association with levels of violence and risk behaviour (Liang et al., 2007) and whether bullying predicted high school dropout (Townsend et al., 2008). These studies did not focus on the personality factors of both the bully and the victim which shows that there is a gap in the literature on personality factors and bullying behaviour of learners.

Furthermore, although there are studies (Jones, Miller, & Lynam, 2011; Mitsopoulou & Giovazolias, 2015; Barlett & Anderson, 2012) that focused on bullying behaviour and personality factors, these studies have used the Big 5 personality traits (i.e., openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism) in their studies which shows a gap in studies that focused on bullying behaviour and Eysenck's personality factors (extraversion, neuroticism and psychoticism). Therefore, the current study hopes to fill this gap by exploring the relationship between Eysenck's personality factors (extraversion, neuroticism and psychoticism) and bullying behaviour of learners. Only one study by

Idemudia (2013) has focused on Eysenck's personality factors scores of learners in Ngaka Modiri Molema District.

Moreover, most of the South African studies on bullying are from Western Cape Province (e.g., Memoh, 2013; Swart & Bradekamp, 2009; Townsend et al., 2008; Mlisa et al., 2008; Liang et al., 2007) making it difficult to generalise the findings to other parts of South Africa. Only limited studies (e.g., Ramadie, 2013; Idemudia, 2013; Kruger, 2010) are from North West Province which indicates the need for further studies on bullying in South Africa generally. Therefore, the current study hopes to fill this gap by adding to the current literature on bullying in North West Province.

Reviewed studies on bullying and personality revealed that there is a lack of literature on personality factors of learners and how they relate to bullying behaviour in South Africa, especially in the North West Province. The current study will attempt to fill this gap by focusing on the relationship between personality factors and the bullying behaviour of learners. Moreover, some of the above mentioned studies (Memoh, 2013; Swart & Bradekamp, 2009; Mlisa et al., 2008) restricted their sample to a certain grade or group of learners. For example, Swart and Bradekamp (2009) restricted their sample to girls in Grade 5 only, while Mlisa and colleagues restricted their sample to Grade 11 learners only. Furthermore, the targeted population of these studies were adolescents. The current study hopes to fill these gaps by focusing on male and female learners from Grade 8 to Grade 12, with age range of 18-23.

1.2. AIM OF THE STUDY

The aim of the current study is to explore the relationship between personality factors (extraversion, neuroticism and psychoticism) and bullying behaviour of learners and make

comparisons according to gender differences in the Ngaka Modiri Molema District in the North West Province.

1.3. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The objectives of the study are as follows:

- To explore the relationship between personality factors (extraversion, neuroticism, and psychoticism) and bullying behaviour; and
- To determine the differences of bullying behaviour and personality factors (extraversion, neuroticism, and psychoticism) according to gender.

1.4. SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The study was conducted in the Ngaka Modiri Molema District, North West Province. The study population was limited to Grade 8 to Grade 12 learners from urban secondary schools. Two hundred and thirty four ($n = 234$) learners were sampled from the larger sample of 4394 learners that participated in the general bullying study by the Psychology Department of the North-West University. Both male ($n = 122$) and female ($n = 111$) learners were sampled to participate in the study. The participants' ages ranged from 18-23. The variables explored in this study are personality factors, bullying behaviour and gender differences.

1.5. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The significance of this study is discussed in three broad areas: 1) theoretical contribution, 2) practical contribution and, 3) methodological contribution.

Theoretical contribution

This study is one of the few studies in South Africa on bullying and personality factors. Therefore, the study hopes to contribute by adding to the literature of personality factors (i.e., extraversion, neuroticism, and psychoticism) and bullying behaviour of learners and can also serve as a guide avenue in terms of other studies. The study will also add to the literature on bullying and gender differences.

Practical relevance

School bullying is a problem in South Africa and requires intensive research in order to plan proper intervention. This study hopes to help clinicians working with learners to develop programmes and intervention strategies that will focus on helping learners who are both victims and perpetrators of bullying as bullying has devastating effects on both the bully and the victim.

The results of this study may also be used to develop awareness programmes on bullying and on developing new policies against bullying in schools. Furthermore, it is hoped that this study will enable clinicians to understand different personalities of learners involved in bullying in schools. This understanding can help in formulating intervention strategies that are tailored to meet the needs of each learner based on their different and unique needs.

Methodology contribution

Because of lack of a comprehensive bullying scales in South Africa, this study utilised the newly developed bullying scale (Bullying Questionnaire of the North West University, Psychology Department – Mafikeng Campus) (this is discussed in detail in chapter 4) that has been standardized for this population (i.e., learners in the Ngaka Modiri Molema District).

This scale can be used in future research on bullying in South Africa therefore adding to our knowledge of methodology. Other researchers may use this scale and expand it to other provinces in South Africa which might lead to the general standardization of the scale based on its reliability and validity.

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND PERSPECTIVES

INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides operational definition of terms used in this study followed by the theoretical framework for the whole study. The theories pertaining to the variables (i.e., personality factors, bullying behaviour and gender differences) are also provided.

2.1. OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS

Bullying behaviour: in this study, refers to repeated aggressive behaviour among adolescents that involves a real or perceived imbalance of power with the more powerful individual or group as perpetrators and those who are less powerful as victims (Olweus, 1993). Bullying behaviour is measured by the scores derived from the Bullying Questionnaire of the North West University, Psychology Department – Mafikeng Campus (BQPM) (see Chapter 4). The following are the different bullying behaviours to be explored in this study:

1. **Verbal bullying:** in this study includes name calling, making fun of others, and playing jokes on others.
2. **Physical bullying:** in this study, includes breaking others things, attacking others, isolating others by not letting them be part of a group, shoving or pushing.
3. **Indirect bullying:** threatening to do bad things to others, writing bad things about someone, saying mean things about someone.

Personality: in this study, refers to a hierarchy of traits that form a sum-total of the actual or potential behavioural-patterns of the organism, as determined by heredity and environment (Eysenck, 1990).

Personality factors: in this study, refers to Hans Eysenck's dimensions of personality (i.e., Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Psychoticism). Personality factors are measured by the scores derived from Eysenck Personality Questionnaire-Revised (EPQ-R) (see Chapter 4).

Learners: in this study, refers to individuals between the ages of 18 and 23 who are still in high school.

Gender: refers to biological sex and state of being male or female (Cardwell, 1996).

THEORETICAL FORMULATIONS

This section of the study covers the theories that have been used to conceptualise the variables (i.e., personality factors, bullying behaviour and gender differences) of the study. Bronfenbrenner's (2005) bio-ecological model was utilised as a guiding framework of this study. The theoretical perspective(s) of the study include Social learning theory (Albert Bandura, 1997) which was used to help the researcher understand bullying behaviour of learners, and Eysenck's personality theory (Hans Eysenck, 1947) was utilized as a guide to help in the understanding of how personality factors of learners influence their bullying behaviour. This is followed by Belsky's (1997) differential susceptibility hypothesis which serves as a guiding theory to understand gender differences in bullying.

2.2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY

2.2.1. Bio-ecological model (Bronfenbrenner, 2005)

The bio-ecological model was developed by Bronfenbrenner (2005) after recognizing that other theories of human development (including his original theory, the socio-ecological model) did not focus on the individual and were largely focused on the context of development or rather the environment. This model is focused on the bidirectional influences between the individual development and the environment in which development is taking place. Bronfenbrenner and Morris (2006) hypothesised that development is a product of the interaction between four concepts namely: process, person, context and time. The interactions between the concepts form the basis for the theory. These concepts will be discussed below.

Process

Process refers to the experiences the developing person has as they interact with their environment through social interactions with others and their engagement in particular

activities with particular materials (Lerner, Bornstein & Leventhal, 2015). Proximal processes are based on two propositions of the bio-ecological model.

Proposition 1: [H]uman development takes place through processes of progressively more complex reciprocal interaction between an active, evolving biopsychological human organism and the persons, objects, and symbols in its immediate external environment. To be effective, the interaction must occur on a fairly regular basis over extended periods of time. Such enduring forms of interaction in the immediate environment are referred to as proximal processes (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1998, p. 996).

Bronfenbrenner used examples such as group or solitary play, reading, learning new skills as types of things that go on in the lives of a developing person on a daily basis (Tudge, Mokrova, Hatfield, & Karnik, 2009). These activities constitutes mechanisms through which development takes place as they provide the basis through which the developing person comes to make sense of their world and understand their part in it. Through these activities, the developing person also gets to play their part in changing and fitting into the existing order (Tudge et al., 2009). As Bronfenbrenner explains in his second proposition, proximal processes differ according to the characteristics of the individual and aspects of the context (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1998).

Proposition 2: The form, power, content, and direction of the proximal processes effecting development vary systematically as a joint function of the characteristics of the developing person; of the environment—both immediate and more remote—in which the processes are taking place; the nature of the developmental outcomes under consideration; and the social continuities and changes occurring over time through the

life course and the historical period during which the person has lived (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1998, p. 996).

According to Swart and Bredekamp (2009, p. 408), process concept refers to “the dynamic interaction one may find in peer groups, families or within schools...” and between the developing person and the context. Research by Dijkstra, Lindenberg and Veenstra (2008) and Cwd1810 (2011) indicate that bullying among learners may emerge as the result of their social interaction with their peers at school and as the consequence of lack of punishment for previous bullying behaviour.

Person

The person concept refers to the personal characteristics that individuals bring with them into the environment (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006; Tudge et al., 2009). According to Tudge et al., (2009), Bronfenbrenner identified three personal characteristics that individuals bring and named them demand, resource, and force. Demand characteristics such as age, gender or physical appearance act as “personal stimulus” in interaction process (Tudge et al., 2009). Resource characteristics include mental and emotional resources such as past experiences, skills, and intelligence and also to social and material resources (such as access to good food, housing, caring parents, educational opportunities appropriate to the needs of the particular society) and are not immediately apparent (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1998). Force characteristics include differences in temperaments/or personalities, motivation, and persistence (Tudge et al., 2009). According to Swart and Bredekamp (2009), person concept includes temperament, emotional, behavioural characteristics or personality of the bully or the victim.

Context

According to Tudge et al., (2009), the context, which is the environment, involves four interrelated systems: the micro-, meso-, exo-, and the macrosystem. The microsystem is made up of the relationship that the person has with his immediate surroundings (Berk, 2000). The microsystem environment includes family, school, or neighbourhood. Bronfenbrenner (1993) points out that there is a bidirectional influence between the person and the microsystem. Since the microsystem includes family and school, for example, changes in any of these environments may prompt learners to start bullying others (Johnson, 2014).

The mesosystem comprises the linkages on how several aspects of the individual's microsystems work together in containing the individual, for example, the interaction between the family, the school and the peers (Johnson, 2014). According to Lee (2009) and Olweus (1992), learners' relationships with their peers and how they perceive their school environment can be influenced by teachers and school officials in a significant way. Johnson (2014) suggests that bullying behaviour may develop as a consequence of the interaction between the home environment and the school environment.

The exosystem comprises those systems that may affect the person indirectly through the interactions of others in the person's environment including the parents' workplace schedule or the neighbourhood (Paquette & Ryan, 2001). For example, the nature and the hours that the parents spend at work may affect the developing person in a sense that if the work is too demanding and keeps the parent away from home most of the time, this will affect the relationship between the parent and the child and the level of involvement of the parent in the life of the child, thus affecting the relationship between the two. Holt, Kaufman, and Finkelhor (2009) report that bullying is associated with lack of parental supervision

Bronfenbrenner (1994, p. 40) defined macrosystem as consisting of "...micro-, meso-, and exosystems characteristic of a given culture or subculture, with particular reference to the belief systems, bodies of knowledge, material resources, customs, life-styles, opportunity structures, hazards, and life course options that are embedded in each of these broader systems". Growing up in a society where learners are exposed to violence may encourage bullying behaviour in learners.

Time

Time is of significant importance in the bio-ecological model. It constitutes micro-time, meso-time and macro-time (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1998). Micro-time refers to "what is occurring during the course of some specific activity or interaction" of proximal process, meso-time refers to "the extent to which activities and interactions occur with some consistency in the developing person's environment", and macro-time refers to "...the fact that developmental processes are likely to vary according to the specific historical events that are occurring as the developing individuals are at one age or another" (Tudge et al., 2009, p. 201). Bronfenbrenner had earlier referred to the concept of time as the chronosystem (Tudge et al., 2009). The chronosystem "encompasses change or consistency over time not only in the characteristics of the person but also of the environment in which that person lives..." (Bronfenbrenner, 1994, p. 40). These consistencies or changes include, for example, changes in family structure, socioeconomic status, employment, or residence. Although these are not the focus of this study, there is documented evidence (Breivik & Olweus, 2006; Lamden, King, & Goldman, 2002) that divorce, which is a life changing event, can result in negative outcomes such as peer aggression.

In summary, the bio-ecological model posits that bullying behaviour among learners must be addressed by taking into consideration the individual aspects and the environment in which

development takes place. This development takes place through bidirectional interaction between four concepts namely process, person, context and time. Because the interaction between the environment and individual is bidirectional, the individual may affect the environment and the environment may also affect the individual. Therefore, formulation and implementation of policies aimed at combating bullying among learners must use the bio-ecological model as a guideline.

2.3. THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

This section provides a brief discussion of the theories of the study. Social learning theory by Albert Bandura (1997) is discussed followed by Eysenck's personality theory (1947). Belsky's (1997) differential susceptibility hypothesis will also be discussed.

2.3.1. Social learning theory (Albert Bandura, 1997)

This theory was developed by Albert Bandura in 1997 (Amarasing, 2013). Social learning theory posits that learning occurs through observation, imitation and modelling (Bandura, 1997). People learn through observing their environment and others and they imitate or model the behaviour that is being observed. This theory is sometimes called social cognitive learning theory because it asserts that environmental factors and cognitions interact to influence social learning and behaviour thereof (Amarasing, 2013). According to O'Connell, Pepler, and Craig (1999), Bandura identified three conditions in which modelling can take place: 1) the model is a powerful figure, 2) the model is rewarded rather than punished for the behaviour, and 3) the model shares similar characteristics with the observer. Bullies are usually more powerful than their victim which may influence the bystanders to imitate or start modelling the bully. According to Dijkstra et al., (2008), learners may start imitating the bully with the hope of increasing their social status and to be liked by others. In case where the bully is not punished for bullying, he/she may continue bullying others in the future (Cwd1810, 2011). Fall (2011) wrote that parents may reinforce bullying behaviour in

children by minimizing or dismissing the behaviour as “just a phase” or by believing that the children (i.e., the bully and the victim) will work out the behaviour among themselves. This is supported by Cohn and Canter (2003) who write that inconsistency or lack of punishment or consequences for bullying reinforces the behaviour.

Families are the closest environment to a developing child and have a great effect on their behaviour. According to Fall (2011), bullying in children may emerge as a consequence of learned behaviour. That is, children from homes where parents use violent ways such as corporal punishment and verbal abuse to solve problems may see bullying as an appropriate way of solving a problem (Fall, 2011; Grille, 2015). To support this, Bullying.org (2015) reported on the myths and facts about bullying and they wrote that bullying is a learned behaviour that can be changed. However, Bandura (1997) highlights that not all observed behaviours are modelled or mimicked. Learning takes cognitive factors into consideration and follows a process called efficacy. According to Kail and Cavanaugh (2013), self-efficacy refers to “people’s beliefs about their own abilities and talents” (p. 14). Efficacy will influence learning whether certain behaviour is rewarding or punishable (Newman & Lewman, 2009) and will also help in determining when behaviour will be imitated (Kail & Cavanaugh, 2013). The theory is relevant in the present study to guide the researcher in understanding the reported bullying behaviour of learners as influenced by what they observed and learned to be rewarding or punishable by observing others in their environment.

2.3.2. Eysenck’s personality theory (Hans Eysenck, 1947)

This theory was framed by Hans Eysenck by using factor analysis. The theory was developed in 1947 and is based on physiology and genetics (Boeree, 2006). Eysenck considered personality as a genetic inheritance. Eysenck’s original research (1947) found two main dimensions of temperament: neuroticism and extraversion-introversion.

The first dimension is Neuroticism (N). Neurotic people tend to be anxious in nature, moody and are vulnerable. Compared to those who are neurotic, people who are low on neuroticism tend to be stable, calm and even-tempered. The second dimension is Extraversion (E). Extroverts are sociable and outgoing, and crave excitement and the company of others. While on the other hand, the introverts are quiet and introspective, tend to prefer time alone and to be cautious in the way they plan their lives. According to Eysenck (1990), people who are high on both Extraversion and Neuroticism tend to be “touchy” and aggressive.

Eysenck later added a further dimension, namely, Psychoticism (P) to the Extraversion and Neuroticism creating the PEN model. According to Eysenck, the three traits are on a spectrum and he believes that everyone exists somewhere on the spectrum of the three traits. People with high scores on psychoticism tend to be egocentric, aggressive, impersonal, cold, lacking in empathy, impulsive, lacking in concern for others and generally unconcerned about the rights and welfare of other people.

The study seeks to explore the influence of personality factors on bullying behaviour of learners. From his theory of personality, Eysenck developed the theory of criminality/criminal personality (Eysenck, 1990). According to Eysenck, there is a relationship between personality factors and criminal behaviour. His theory of criminality saw the socialization process as the link between personality and criminal behaviour. Criminality was viewed as immature in that it is selfish and seeks immediate gratification. According to Eysenck (1990), children are taught to be able to delay gratification and become more socially oriented through the process of socialization, which is achieved mainly through conditioning. The punishment of children’s immature behaviour consequently causes anxiety which is associated with antisocial behaviour. The success of this process is marked by anxiety even when the person is thinking of behaving antisocially which results in the person avoiding his thoughts.

Eysenck perceived people with high extraversion (E) and neuroticism (N) scores to have the nervous system that made them difficult to condition. Consequently, these people would not learn easily to respond to antisocial impulses with anxiety. As a result, they would be more likely to act antisocially in situations where the opportunity presents itself. According to this theory, people with criminal behaviour tendencies have high scores on extraversion (E), neuroticism (N) and psychoticism (P). This hypothesis is supported by the findings of a study by Idemudia (2013) that learners who scored high on E, N and P had high scores on bullying behaviour. Therefore, this theory will help in clarifying what personality structure a bully perpetrator or victim present with.

2.3.3. Differential susceptibility hypothesis (Belsky, 1997)

This theory was developed by Belsky (1997) and posits out that individuals vary in the degree to which they are affected by environmental influences and experiences they are exposed to. Some individuals are more susceptible to such environmental influences than others. According to Ellis, Boyce, Belsky, Bakermans-Kranenburg, and van Ijzendoorn (2011), this theory is based on the hypothesis that some individuals are more susceptible to both negative and positive environmental conditions. In the present study, this theory has been adopted to guide the researcher in understanding gender differences in bullying behaviour. Research shows that there is a difference in bullying behaviour of males and females with males engaging more in bullying behaviour (Turkel, 2007). Broidy and Agnew (1997) used general strain theory to explain delinquency between males and females and they found that males engage more in criminal behaviour than females. The authors also found that females experience more strain (adversity) than males and they engage less in criminal behaviour.

Evidence for differential susceptibility in both boys and girls has been found (Van Zeijl et al., 2007). This theory acknowledges the developmental experiences that play a role in

determining individual differences in neurobiological susceptibility, and genetic susceptibility factors (Ellis et al., 2011). According to Ellis, Shirtcliff, Boyce, Deardorff, and Essex (2011), emotional instability and impulsive behaviours such as bullying behaviour and other forms of violence may be due to dysfunction in serotonin (i.e., a chemical known for regulating impulses, aggression and affect that operate through neurobiological processes).

2.4. CONCLUSION

Theories concerning the variables of the study have been discussed in this chapter. Although Bronfenbrenner's (1979) bio-ecological model is used as a study framework, the theories used in this study to explain bullying behaviour among learners all indicate that bullying behaviour cannot be accounted for by one factor. Gender differences, personality factors, family, social interactions and peer relations can all be associated with bullying behaviour among learners. In the next chapter, current literature on bullying behaviour, personality factors, and gender differences are reviewed. Study hypotheses are also given.

CHAPTER 3

LITERATURE REVIEW

INTRODUCTION

Bullying is a general phenomenon globally, and it can occur in all areas of human social interactions such as families, schools, or workplaces (Lines, 2008). Coloroso (2003) views schools as the starting point where acts of bullying are learned and practiced. Bullying behaviour has damaging consequences on both the victim and the bully. This phenomenon has a negative impact on the social, emotional and academic development of the victim (Ladd & Ladd, 2001).

In South Africa, there have been reports of devastating effects of bullying such as attempted suicides, completed suicides (Kruger, 2013) and school drop-out (Townsend et al., 2008) among school learners. Research indicates that bullying behaviour among learners is influenced by multiple factors and it can never be linked to one factor. Personality factors, environmental factors such as school, families, peers and neighbourhood, age and gender have all been associated with bullying behaviour among learners. This section provides relevant literature on bullying behaviour, the relationship between personality factors and bullying behaviour, and gender differences and bullying behaviour.

3.1. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE BULLY AND THE VICTIM

3.1.1. The Bully

According to Sullivan (2006), it is important for scholars, parents and school authorities to understand the psyche of the bullies for bullying to be addressed effectively. The bully refers to the perpetrator of bullying behaviour at school. James (2010) wrote that perpetrators of bullying are more aggressive than other learners. In a study by Ndebele and Msiza (2014),

bullies were characterised as generally bossy, strong, nasty, crazy and angry, negative and lacking respect. To concur with this description, Protogerou and Flisher (2012) reported that bullies are hot-tempered, impulsive and have a domineering temperament. Furthermore, Kansas State Department of Education (2014) described bullies as physically strong, impulsive, hot-tempered, belligerent, fearless, coercive, confident, and lacking in empathy for their victim. These findings describe some of the personality characteristics possessed by individuals who bully. Personality factors will be discussed later in this chapter. It is important to note that not all learners want to be bullies. Some learners find themselves bullying others as an attempt of “fitting in” with a group that enjoys bullying (Rigby, 1996).

3.1.2. The Victim

Victims of bullying can be classified into two categories, namely the passive victim and the provocative victim (Olweus, 1993). James (2010) reported that majority of learners who experience bullying can be passive victims. This type of victim does nothing to provoke bullying behaviour and they also do nothing to defend themselves (James, 2010; Olweus, 1993). These victims are randomly selected by their oppressor without doing anything to provoke the bullying. Passive victims seem anxious, insecure, lonely, abandoned, are likely to be physically weaker (if boys) than the peers, and are often without friends (Olweus, 1993). Additionally, (Tattum, 1993) described passive victims as physically weaker than the perpetrators; they have body anxiety and are afraid to be hurt; they have poor social skills and find it difficult to make friends; they are sensitive, quiet, withdrawn, cautious and shy; they cry or become angry easily; they are insecure and suffer from low self-esteem; and they are unable to defend themselves.

Provocative victims retaliate when bullied. Sullivan (2006) described these type of victims as hot tempered; hyperactive and restless; have difficulty in concentrating in class; create

tensions in the classrooms; they bully back when bullied; and have irritating habits. According to Scaglione and Scaglione (2006), these type of victims lack social skills as well and tend to irritate and annoy their peers.

3.2. TYPES OF BULLYING

According to Feinberg (2003), bullying behaviour was once dismissed as an ordinary part of growing up. Although this is a common assumption about bullying behaviour (Lawrence, 1998), researchers continue to discover that bullying is a serious social problem among scholars with detrimental problems for learners (Nansel, Overpeck, Pilla, Ruan, Simons-Morton, & Scheidt, 2001; Nansel, Overpeck, Haynie, Ruan, & Scheidt, 2003; Kshirsagar, Agarwal, & Bavdekar, 2007). This behaviour is inclusive of a wide range of aggressive behaviours ranging from overt acts of physical bullying to subtle, but equally destructive patterns of verbal or relational cruelty (Feinberg, 2003). For the current study, three factors were extracted through the use of factor analysis and were named verbal bullying, physical bullying and indirect bullying. These types of bullying have also been identified by researchers across the world (James, 2010; Kowalski & Limber, 2007; Hong & Espelage, 2012). These will be discussed below.

3.2.1. Verbal bullying

According to Culpeper (2011), verbal bullying occurs when a learner is being hurt through the use of language by another learner or a group. Verbal bullying includes name calling, making fun of others, and playing jokes on others. According to Sullivan (2000), verbal bullying includes abusive phone calls, making threats, putdowns, name-calling, racist remarks, and spreading false or malicious rumours about the other person. Since verbal bullying can be heard and witnessed, it is also termed an overt (i.e., the behaviour that is

observable and open to others) form of aggression. This type of bullying is perceived as ostracizing, painful and negative by the victim and bystanders (Sharraf, 2008).

Like any form of bullying, verbal bullying is also harmful. McGrath (2007) wrote that verbal bullying can lead to truancy, a sense of helplessness, and emotional distress. NoBullying.com (2014) states that experiencing verbal bullying on a daily basis may result in lack of confidence and low self-esteem for the victim. Furthermore, McGrath (2007) wrote that victims may turn to substance abuse or in some extreme cases, attempt suicide as an attempt to escape from the depression caused by experiencing verbal bullying. Therefore, it is important for schools to educate learners about verbal bullying and the negative consequences of bullying on learners' social, academic and emotional development.

3.2.2. Physical bullying

Physical bullying is when overt bodily acts (i.e., the behaviour that is observable and open to others) are used by a learner to gain power over another learner, and is characterized by kicking, punching, or hitting (Fraser-Thill, 2015). In this study, physical bullying is characterised by breaking others' things, attacking others, isolating others by not letting them be part of a group, shoving or pushing. Because of its obvious acts of aggression, physical bullying is the most recognised form of bullying in schools (Fraser-Thill, 2015). However, Sharraf (2008) argue that, although physical bullying is observable, it often happens in the absence of adults, teachers and supervisors, therefore, accrediting it to also be termed hidden bullying.

Although physical bullying is the most recognised form of bullying in schools, research show that this type of bullying constitutes only a third of the types of bullying in schools (De Wet, 2005; Coloroso, 2003). Physical bullying is not without consequences. Victims of bullying are likely to suffer from depression, anxiety, somatic complaints (such as headaches,

backache, and stomach-ache), nightmares and social withdrawal (Hanish & Guerra, 2000; Lutzker, 2006; StopBullying.gov, 2015).

3.2.3. Indirect bullying

A person is bullied indirect when stories and rumours are spread about them and when they are excluded from the group (blogs.longwood.edu, 2014). In the current study, indirect bullying includes threatening to do bad things to others, writing bad things about someone, and saying mean things about someone. Indirect bullying is also known as relational bullying because it is aimed at harming someone's social reputation and/or causing humiliation (Malchiodi, 2010). According to Malchiodi (2010), relational bullying includes lying and spreading rumours, negative facial or physical gestures, menacing or contemptuous looks, playing nasty jokes to embarrass and humiliate, mimicking unkindly, encouraging others to socially exclude someone, and damaging someone's social reputation or social acceptance.

Indirect bullying usually happens in the absence of adults, making it harder to identify since there is no physical damage (NoBullying.com, 2014). Idone (2014) writes that even though indirect bullying does not hurt the person physically, it does hurt them mentally. She further writes that the victim of indirect bullying may suffer from anxiety, low self-esteem and depression from the embarrassment caused by the rumours or from feeling worthless caused by being socially excluded from groups.

3.2.4. Cyberbullying

The new and growing form of bullying is cyberbullying. This form of bullying takes place online, mainly through social networks such as facebook, myspace, twitter and many others (Hinduja & Patchin, 2009; Tokunaga, 2010; Schneider, O'Donnell, Stueve & Coulter, 2011). Cyberbullying can happen at any time, but mostly outside school grounds making it even

more threatening for the victim. Although cyberbullying is attracting the attention of many researchers, it is not within the scope of the present study and will not be directly addressed. The current study will only focus on verbal, physical and indirect bullying occurring in schools.

Bullying behaviour can have devastating effects on learner's emotional, physical and social development. This can result in low self-esteem, lack of confidence, development of depression, anxiety, poor academic performance, substance abuse, inability to make and maintain relationships and friendships, self-harm or harm to others (Richards, 2013). The next section focuses on the effects of bullying.

3.3. EFFECTS OF BULLYING

From their study, Hinduja and Patchin (2010) found that suicidal thoughts and attempts were higher in youth who experience either traditional bullying or cyberbullying more, as either an offender or a victim, than those who had not experienced either of them. In a study done in Cape Town, South Africa, by Townsend et al. (2008), the following results were found to be associated with bullying: 52% of boys and 36% of girls, among both in-school and dropouts had been involved in bullying behaviours. Even though none of the differences were statistically significant, Townsend et al. (2008) further reported that the rates of bullying behaviour were higher among boys compared to girls for in-school learners.

Among other factors, victims of bullying may suffer from psychological and physiological consequences of being bullied. Victims have more anxiety, sadness, sleep difficulties, low self-esteem, headaches, stomach pain and general tension than those who do not experience bullying. Bullying can also affect the victim's school performance and attendance. Poor attendance may be due to the fear/anxiety of being bullied again (UNISA, 2012; Canadian Council on Learning, 2008).

Kruger (2013) reports on a 16 year old boy from Shoshanguve, Pretoria, who committed suicide after being bullied by classmates, as well as an attempted suicide of a Grade 11 pupil in KZN after being allegedly bullied. The author further reports that the pupil dropped out of school and was admitted to a hospital for stress as the results of bullying. Five secondary school pupils were expelled from school by the Gauteng Department of Education, of whom four were charged with bullying. In Gauteng, a Grade 11 pupil was arrested after stabbing a fellow pupil he accused of bullying him (Kruger, 2013).

Bullying does not only affect the victim. Bullies are also affected by bullying. According to Rigby (2005), despite their demonstration of good self-esteem, bullies may be at risk of experiencing depression. Research shows that bullies are unable to maintain relationships, have higher chances of dropping out of school, being convicted of a crime, substance abuse and addiction, aggressive behaviour and poor school performance (Canadian Council on Learning, 2008). Among other issues, bullying has been associated with problems with long-term relationships and intimacy (McGuckin, Cummins, & Lewis, 2010), possession of a weapon, vandalism, potential involvement in anti-social and criminal activity (Livesey, McAleavy, Doregan, Duffy, O'Hagan, Adamson, & White, 2007) and having problems with the police (De Wet, 2005). When formulating intervention and prevention programmes in schools aimed at dealing with bullying, it is imperative for policy makers together with teachers to make sure that the policies that are being formulated are not only aimed at helping the victims but also at helping the perpetrators as it is indicated above that bullying not only affects the victim of bullying but the perpetrator too.

3.4. PERSONALITY FACTORS AND BULLYING BEHAVIOUR

Research on bullying has increased over the years. However, little research has been done on the link between personality and bullying behaviour, especially in the South African context. According to Olweus (1993), bullies share the following personality characteristics: being

tolerant of violence, impulsivity and lacking empathy. Low friendliness (agreeableness) and high emotional instability (neuroticism) are prevalent in bullies (Menesini et al., 2010; Tani, Greenman, Schneidre & Fregoso, 2003).

Book, Volk, and Hosker (2012) found that there is a significant negative correlation between bullying behaviour, agreeableness, emotionality and conscientiousness. In support of this finding, Bollmer, Harris, and Milich (2006) found a negative correlation between bullying and agreeableness and a significant negative relationship between bullying and conscientiousness. However, Bollmer et al., (2006) did not find any relationship between bullying and neuroticism. In a study of adolescents aged 13-17 in England, Jolliffe and Farrington (2011) found that bullying behaviour was related to high impulsivity for both males and females, while it was only related to low empathy for male victims.

Eysenck viewed criminal behaviour as selfish and concerned with immediate gratification making it developmentally immature. According to Eysenck (1964), criminality can be determined by the following personality factors: Extraversion (E), Neuroticism (N) and Psychoticism (P). Each factor will be discussed below.

3.4.1. Extraversion (E)

Extraverts are characterised by thriving on social interaction, they like to talk, take charge easily, readily express their opinions and feelings, like to keep busy, have boundless energy, and prefer stimulating and challenging environments (Kail & Cavanaugh, 2013). According to Schultz and Schultz (2013), extraverts are sociable, impulsive, adventurous, assertive, and dominant. Furthermore, people who score high on extraversion have been found to experience more positive emotions than those who score lower on this factor (Schultz & Schultz, 2013). On the other hand, introverted people are quiet, retiring sort of people, introspective, fond of books rather than people, are reserved and distant except to intimate

friends (Ewen, 2014). With regard to extraversion and bullying behaviour, research shows that both male and female learners who had high scores on extraversion, also had high scores on bullying behaviour with females having higher scores than men (Idemudia, 2013).

Based on his interest in the biological difference between extraverts and introverts, Eysenck found that the difference is in the cortical arousal level (Ewen, 2014; Schultz & Schultz, 2013). According to Eysenck, due to the low level of cortical arousal in extraverts, they seek external stimulation to increase their level of arousal, whereas introverts avoid external stimulation because of their high cortical arousal that will become painful if increased (Ewen, 2014).

Due to their high cortical arousal, introverts react more strongly than extraverts to sensory stimulation (Ewen, 2014). Ewen (2014) reports that individuals who are more introverted may be more sensitive to external stimulation, more easily aroused and overwhelmed by social events and noise, and better able to perceive subtle cues in the environment, therefore, they prefer low levels of stimulations (such as being alone). On the other hand, extraverts may require more stimulation to become aroused, hence they prefer noisy crowds and loud music (Ewen, 2014). According to Connolly and O'Moore (2003), extraverts are impulsive and impatient, they seek rewards without fear of consequences, therefore making them more prone to anti-social behaviour and crime.

3.4.2. Neuroticism (N)

People who score high in neuroticism tend to be anxious, depressed, tense, irrational, and moody (Schultz & Schultz, 2013), self-conscious, hostile, and vulnerable (Kail & Cavanaugh, 2013). These individuals are prone to guilty feelings and may have low self-esteem (Schultz & Schultz, 2013). According to Schultz and colleague (2013), Eysenck viewed neuroticism as a genetic product rather than a learned behaviour. Individuals who score low in

neuroticism tend to be calm and even-tempered, self-content, comfortable, unemotional, and hardy (Ewen, 2014; Kail & Cavanaugh, 2013).

There is high activity in the sympathetic branch of the autonomic nervous system (i.e., the part of the brain that is responsible for the flight-or-fight response) of people who score high in neuroticism (Schultz & Schultz, 2013). The sympathetic nervous system works as the body's alarm system. During stressful or dangerous situations, the sympathetic nervous system responds by increasing breathing rate, heart rate, blood flow to the muscles, and release of adrenalin. Schultz and Schultz (2013) report that, according to Eysenck, there is an overreaction of the sympathetic nervous system that results in chronic hypersensitivity even to mild stressors. This overreaction of the sympathetic nervous system results in heightened emotionality as a response to almost any stressful situation. According to Eysenck, people are genetically predisposed either toward neuroticism or toward emotional stability, therefore making this biological reactivity on the neuroticism factor inherent (Schultz & Schultz, 2013).

Studies show that there is a relationship between neuroticism and aggressive behaviour (Teng & Liu, 2013; Barlett & Anderson, 2012). Furthermore, Olweus (1993) and Tattum (1993) describe victims of bullying as follows: anxious, insecure, lonely, abandoned, physically weaker than the peers, are afraid to be hurt, they have poor social skills and find it difficult to make friends, they are sensitive, quiet, withdrawn, cautious and shy, they cry or become angry easily, they are insecure and suffer from low self-esteem, and they are unable to defend themselves. Some of these traits are used to characterise people who score high in neuroticism.

3.4.3. Psychoticism (P):

Aggression, antisocial behaviour, tough-mindedness, coldness, egocentrism, cruelty, hostility, and insensitivity to the needs and feelings of others are characteristics found in people who score high in psychoticism (Schultz & Schultz, 2013). Alcohol and drug abuse are also associated with people who score high in psychoticism compared to people who score low in psychoticism (Schultz & Schultz, 2013).

According to Heaven and Ciarrochi (2006), childhood environment plays an important role in influencing personality factors of the individual. These authors state that people who scored high in psychoticism had authoritarian and controlling parents compared to those who scored low. A study of 660 Australian adolescents found that in both boys and girls, low scores in emotional well-being were associated with high score in psychoticism (Ciarrochi & Heaven, 2007). Eysenck linked psychoticism to male hormones (Schultz & Schultz, 2013). Furthermore, according to Schultz and Schultz (2013), Eysenck suggested that people who score high in all the three factors tend to display criminal behaviour. Idemudia (2013) found that learners who scored high in psychoticism also had high scores in bullying behaviour.

Schultz and Schultz (2013) reported that Eysenck saw the diversity provided by people characterized by all the three personality factors as needed by society. According to these authors, in an ideal society, people are given the opportunity to make the best use of their traits and abilities. However, Schultz and Schultz (2013) also indicate that people adapt to the social environment differently. Hence, for example, a person with high score in psychoticism showing hostile and aggressive behaviours may become emotionally disturbed or show criminal tendencies, or channel the aggressive traits into a socially acceptable behaviour such as coaching college football.

Eysenck (1997) predicted higher scores on Psychoticism, Extraversion and Neuroticism in criminals. A study undertaken by Slee and Rigby (1993) on male primary school children, found that bullying behaviour was associated with psychoticism while victimization was associated with introversion and low self-esteem. The study on personality and family relations of children who bully, revealed higher scores on extraversion, psychoticism and neuroticism by bullies (Connolly & O'Moore, 2003).

It is evident from the literature that personality factors (i.e., psychoticism, neuroticism, and extraversion) are associated with bullying behaviour. However, there is little research on these aspects from the African context, which indicates the need for more research on bullying and personality in South Africa and Africa in general. The following section will provide empirical research on verbal, physical and indirect bullying based on gender differences.

3.5. GENDER DIFFERENCES IN BULLYING BEHAVIOUR

Researchers on bullying (e.g., James, 2010; Beran, 2012; Card et al., 2008) have agreed that there are differences in bullying behaviour for both males and females. The most common distinction made is between physical bullying, such as kicking, hitting, and punching, and verbal bullying, such as name calling, exclusion, gossip, and rumour spreading. Gender differences on bullying behaviour will be provided based on the three factors of bullying namely verbal, physical and indirect bullying behaviour.

3.5.1. Verbal bullying and gender

Verbal bullying constitutes about 70% of reported cases of bullying in schools (Rigby, 1996), and according to Bullyingstatistics.org (2015), verbal bullying is more common in girls than in boys. Bullyingstatistics.org (2015) suggests that girls are more subtle than boys in general, therefore, girls show their dominance and superiority by bullying others verbally and socially.

However, research show that some boys also use more subtle ways to bully others in an attempt to avoid the consequences that can come with bullying others physically (Olweus, 1993; Rigby, 1996; Bullyingstatistics, 2015).

3.5.2. Physical bullying and gender

Research indicates that boys tend to use more physical and direct bullying than girls (Card, Stucky, Sawalani & Little, 2008). A study by Erdur-Baker (2010) revealed that male students were more likely to be bullies and victims in both physical and cyberbullying than their female counterparts. Nansel et al. (2001) show that males reported being the victims of physical bullying more often than females. Earlier studies (Lagerspetz, Bjorkqvist, & Peltonen, 1988; Olweus, 1978; Smith, 1991; Whitney & Smith, 1993) have also found that physical bullying is more prevalent in males than in females.

3.5.3. Indirect bullying and gender

This type of bullying has been associated with females (Turkel, 2007) and has been found to be damaging as physical bullying (Lagerspetz et al., 1988). According to Olweus (1978) as cited in Turkel (2007, p. 248), females bully their victims indirectly by spreading rumours and manipulation of friendship as compared to their male counterparts. For example, a girl may tell other girls an embarrassing story about another girl, creating mean names, gossip and letting the girl know that she is rejected by the peer group (James, 2010). To concur with this, researchers such as (Powell & Jenson (2010) and Wang et al., (2009) suggest that indirect bullying is more prevalent among females. This type of bullying is also known as “relational” bullying as it is targeting relationships and friendships (Beran, 2012). This is supported by Felix and McMahon (2006) who state that males harm others through violence, i.e. they use physical victimization to harm others, while females harm others by damaging their relationships, i.e., they use relational victimization to bully others. Vaillancourt, Hymel,

and McDougall (2003) suggest that females with high-status use their status among their peers to bully others indirectly. This is supported by Lagerspetz et al. (1988) who wrote that indirect bullying is mostly practised by girls in high social status.

Farrington (1993) as cited in Wimmer (2009), found that males bully more than females do, with males being bullied only by males and females being bullied by both females and males. A study by Silva, Pereira, Mandonca, Nunes and de Oliveira (2013) reports that both boys and girls are victims and perpetrators of bullying with no significant differences in involvement in bullying between genders and the roles played. However, when considering different types of bullying, Silva et al., (2013) found that boys were more victims of bullying with the significant difference only in physical bullying.

According to Turkel (2007) these differences in bullying behaviour of males and females could be brought about by general socialization. Females are taught from a younger age not to be physically aggressive while males are taught more direct ways of dealing with their anger. Turkel (2007) reports that physical aggression in girls is discouraged by their parents and girls are expected to be non-aggressive and to be the kinder, gentler sex by society. On the other hand, kicking and punching is encouraged in boys as a way of expressing their anger. The above studies (Silva et al., 2013; James, 2010; Erdur-Baker, 2010; Turkel, 2007; Card et al., 2008; Beran, 2012) suggest that there is gender a difference in bullying behaviour. The following section focuses on differences in personality factors according to gender.

3.5.4. Gender differences in personality factors

Literature shows that there are gender differences related to personality factors, with the most distinction made between psychoticism and neuroticism. A study by Lynn and Martin (1997) conducted among 37 nations revealed that women scored higher than men on neuroticism in

all the 37 countries. Furthermore, Lynn and colleague reported the differences on the mean scores of men and women, with men scoring higher on psychoticism in 34 countries and on extraversion in 30 countries as compared to women. To support this, Canals, Vigil-Colet, Chico, and Marti-Henneberg (2005) also reported differences in the personalities of male and female learners. These authors found psychoticism and anti-social behaviour to be higher among boys than in girls. Canals et al., (2005) further reported that the scores of neuroticism became higher among girls as they became older compared to boys. However, contrary to the above studies, Petrides, Jackson, Furnham, and Levine (2003) found no gender differences on neuroticism and extraversion, but only for psychoticism.

Forrest, Lewis, and Shevlin (2000) found gender differences on psychoticism, neuroticism, and extraversion. It was found that males scored higher on psychoticism, and females scored higher on neuroticism (Forrest et al., 2000). Furthermore, a study aimed at assessing differences in Eysenck's personality dimensions of boys and girls who are classified as bullies, victims, bully/victim or neutral, found that girls had higher scores on neuroticism and tendency to dissimulate (i.e., lie) as compared to boys who scored higher on psychoticism (Sesar, Simic, & Barisic, 2011).

3.6. SUMMARY OF LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter provided the review of the current literature on bullying behaviour, and personality factors and bullying behaviour. The literature concerning gender differences in relation to bullying behaviour was also reviewed. Studies from abroad and in South Africa were reviewed in this study. From the reviewed literature, it is evident that fewer studies on bullying have been done in South Africa indicating a gap in the body of literature in bullying in South Africa. The available studies were mainly focused on the prevalence of bullying and some on effects of bullying, but only limited studies focused on personality factors and bullying behaviour, especially in South Africa. Therefore, the results of this study will add to

the current literature on bullying in South Africa and can serve as a guide for future studies. The next chapter covers the study design, participants, the instruments that were used for data collection, the procedure for data collection, and the statistical method used. Ethical consideration is also discussed.

3.7. HYPOTHESES

After review of the current literature on the variables of the study, the following hypotheses were formulated:

1. There will be a significant relationship between personality factors (extraversion, neuroticism and psychoticism) and bullying behaviour.
2. There will be a significant difference between personality factors (extraversion, neuroticism and psychoticism) and bullying, according to gender.

CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGY

4.1. INTRODUCTION

The research method used in this study is discussed in this chapter. The study design is discussed, followed by a discussion of participants, instruments used for data collection, the procedure for data collection and the statistical methods used in the study. The chapter concludes with the ethical considerations.

4.2. STUDY DESIGN

This is a quantitative study with a correlation design. The independent variables are personality factors (i.e., psychoticism, extraversion, and neuroticism) and gender. The dependent variable is bullying behaviour.

4.3. PARTICIPANTS

The study was conducted in the Ngaka Modiri Molema District, North West Province. Five (5) schools were sampled to participate in the general bullying study by the North West University. All five (5) schools were government schools and English-medium schools. The sample was drawn through the means of simple random sampling from a large sample of 4394 learners that participated in the general bullying study by the psychology department of the North West University. Learners from Grade 8 to Grade 12 participated in the study by completing the bullying questionnaire (BQPM) and the EPQ-R. A total of 234 participants were included in this study. The participant's age ranged from 18 to 23 with a mean of 18.59 years and Standard deviation (SD) of .910. Table 1 below provides characteristics of participants.

4.4. INSTRUMENTS

A questionnaire with biographic data and three sections was used for the collection of data. The instruments used to collect data in this study are the Bullying Questionnaire of the North-West University, Psychology Department-Mafikeng Campus (BQPM) and the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire-Revised (EPQ-R). Descriptions of the instruments are given below.

4.4.1. The Bullying Questionnaire of the North West University, Psychology Department-Mafikeng Campus (BQPM) (see Appendix A):

The BQPM was developed by the staff at North-West University, Psychology Department (Mafikeng Campus) in 2012 as part of the general bullying study by North-West University. The questionnaire is based on a 5-point scoring format (0 = never happened, 1 = rarely happened, 2 = sometimes happened, 3 = often happened, 4 = always happened). It has 38 subscales and it measures traditional bullying perpetration and victimization, sexual harassment/or bullying and cyberbullying behaviours in schools for both the bully and the victim. Higher scores indicate higher bullying behaviour. For the current study, the focus was on bullying victimization and bullying perpetration only. This questionnaire includes items such as “*Won’t let me be part of their group*” for bullying victimization and items such as “*Wrote bad things about them*” for bullying perpetration. A pilot study of 20 secondary school learners yielded a good consistency for the scale ($\alpha = 0.90$) (Louw, 2015). In the study conducted by Louw (2015) among learners in the Ngaka Modiri Molema District, the alpha coefficient of the scale was 0.79.

Factor analysis for the BQPM was done for the current study to uncover the underlying structure of the factors of the scale. Bullying victimization (Q7) has 11 items and bullying perpetration (Q23) also has 11 items (see Appendix A).

Data screening

The data was screened for univariate outliers. There was no missing data. A final sample size of 234 was included in the factor analysis of variables.

Factor analysis for bullying victimization (Q7)

Initially, the factorability of the 11 bullying victimization items was examined. Several well-recognised criteria for the factorability of a correlation were used. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure (KMO) of the sampling adequacy was .80, above the recommended value of .6, and Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($X^2(55) = 577.44, p < .000$). Diagonals of the anti-image correlation matrix were .5, supporting the inclusion of each item in the factor analysis. Communalities were all above .3, further confirming that each item shared some common variance with other items. Given these overall indicators, factor analysis was conducted with all the 11 items.

Principal component analysis was used because the primary purpose was to identify and compute composite scores for the factors underlying bullying victimization (Q7). The initial eigen values showed that the first factor explained 35% of the variance, the second factors explained 12% of the variance, and the third factor explained 10% of the variance (table 2). Factors four, five, and six had eigen values of over 6%. None of the items were eliminated because they contributed to a simple factor structure and had met minimum criteria of having a primary factor loading of .4 and above.

Principal component analysis of the 11 items using varimax and oblimin rotations was conducted with the 3 factors explaining 58% of the variance. An oblimin rotation provided the best defined factor structure. All items had primary loadings of .5 except for only one that had a cross loading above .3 (*Q7K-pushed or shoved me*) on factor 1. However, this item had

a strong primary loading of .5 on factor 2. The factor loading matrix for this final solution is presented in table 3.

Table 2: Total variances explained in the principal factor analysis for bullying victimization

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings ^a
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total
1	3.893	35.390	35.390	3.893	35.390	35.390	2.781
2	1.345	12.226	47.616	1.345	12.226	47.616	2.846
3	1.159	10.533	58.148	1.159	10.533	58.148	2.385
4	.915	8.317	66.466				
5	.711	6.463	72.929				
6	.670	6.092	79.021				
7	.593	5.393	84.414				
8	.519	4.722	89.136				
9	.467	4.246	93.382				
10	.424	3.858	97.240				
11	.304	2.760	100.000				

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis

Table 3: Factor loadings and communalities based on a principal components analysis with oblimin rotation for 11 items from bullying victimization (Q7).

	Component		
	1	2	3
Q7B	.932		
Q7A	.756		
Q7D	.599		
Q7H		.845	
Q7E		.729	
Q7G		.640	
Q7F		.489	
Q7K	.333	.484	
Q7I			.840
Q7J			.802
Q7C			.465

The 3 factors that were extracted and retained were verbal bullying victimization (3 items), direct bullying victimization (5 items), and indirect bullying victimization (3 items). Internal consistency for each scale was examined using the Cronbach's alpha. For verbal bullying victimization (3 items) the Cronbach's alpha is .74, for direct bullying victimization is .70, and for indirect bullying victimization is .65. Descriptive statistics for 3 factors from bullying victimization (Q7) items are presented on table 4 below.

Table 4: Descriptive statistics for the three bullying victimization (Q7) factors.

	No. of items	M	SD	Alpha
1. Verbal-bullying victimization	3	1.53	.97	.74
2. Direct-bullying victimization	5	1.01	.85	.70
3. Indirect-bullying victimization	3	.54	.63	.65

Factor analysis for bullying perpetration (Q23)

The procedure that was used for factor analysis of bullying victimization (Q7) items was also followed for factor analysis of bullying perpetration (Q23) items. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure (KMO) of the sampling adequacy was .84, above the recommended value of .6, and Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($X^2 (55) = 647.002, p < .000$). Diagonals of the anti-image correlation matrix were .5 supporting the inclusion of each item in the factor analysis. Communalities were all above .3, further confirming that each item shared some common variance with other items. Factor analysis was conducted with all the 11 items.

The composite scores for the factors underlying bullying perpetration (Q23) was identified by the use of principal component analysis. The initial eigen values showed that the first factor explained 38% of the variance, the second factors explained 13% of the variance, and the third factor explained 9% of the variance (table 5). Factors four, five, and six had eigen values of over 5%. All the items had a primary loading of .4, therefore, none of the items were eliminated because they contributed to a simple factor structure.

The same procedure used for bullying victimization (Q7) of principal component analysis of the 11 items using varimax and oblimin rotations was conducted for bullying perpetration (Q23). The extraction of the 11 items revealed that there were two factors explaining 51% of the variance. An oblimin rotation provided the best defined factor structure. All items had primary loadings of .5 except for only one that had loading above .4 (Q23E-won't let them be part of your group). The factor loading matrix for this final solution is presented in table 6.

Table 5: Total variances explained in the principal factor analysis for bullying perpetration

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings ^a
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total
1	4.271	38.831	38.831	4.271	38.831	38.831	3.840
2	1.447	13.155	51.987	1.447	13.155	51.987	2.860
3	.995	9.047	61.034				
4	.800	7.271	68.306				
5	.711	6.467	74.773				
6	.606	5.507	80.280				
7	.578	5.253	85.533				
8	.507	4.613	90.146				
9	.440	3.995	94.141				
10	.338	3.072	97.213				
11	.307	2.787	100.000				

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis

Table 6: Factor loadings and communalities based on a principal components analysis with oblimin rotation for 11 items from bullying perpetration (Q23).

	Component	
	1	2
Q23H	.817	
Q23F	.720	
Q23I	.705	
Q23G	.702	
Q23J	.587	
Q23C	.563	
Q23K	.550	
Q23E	.428	
Q23B		.869
Q23A		.868
Q23D		.652

The 2 factors that were extracted and retained were verbal bullying perpetration (3 items), and direct/indirect bullying perpetration (8 items). Internal consistency for each scale was examined using the Cronbach's alpha. For verbal bullying perpetration (3 items) the Cronbach's alpha is .75, and for direct/indirect bullying perpetration is .83. Descriptive statistics for the 2 factors from bullying perpetration (Q23) are presented on table 7 below.

Table 7: Descriptive statistics for the two bullying perpetration (Q23) factors.

	No. of items	M	SD	Alpha
1. Verbal-bullying perpetration	3	1.40	1.05	.75
2. Direct/indirect-bullying perpetration	8	.55	.85	.83

4.4.2 Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQR):

This instrument was used in the study to measure personality factors (see Appendix A). The EPQR was originally developed in England together with the EPI and the EPQ. The EPQR is the revised version of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ) which contains 90 items (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1975). It can be administered on adults (18+) (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1975). The EPQR contains 100 item (Eysenck, Eysenck & Barrett, 1985) as cited in Francis, Lewis and Ziebertz (2006). It measures psychoticism (P), extraversion (E), and neuroticism (N) dimensions. It contains the 90 items from the EPQ and additional new items of the P scale making it a 100 items scale (Idemudia, 2013; Aluja, Garcia & Garcia, 2003). The questionnaire also has the Lie scale which measures a tendency of some subjects to fake good or bad (Idemudia, 2013; Aluja et.al. 2003). However, as indicated in Chapter 1, the lie scale will not be discussed further in this study.

According to Eysenck, people who score high on E are sociable, active, lively and sensation seeking. Those with high N scores are anxious, depressed and react very strongly to aversive stimuli, and those who score high on P are aggressive, antisocial, cold and egocentric. In the study conducted by Idemudia (1997) among Nigerian prisoners, the scale was pre-test and showed a split half reliability of 0.80 for P scale, 0.79 for E scale, and 0.81 for N scale which indicates a high reliability for that sample or population. The internal consistency was also high with the alpha coefficient of 0.90 for P scale, 0.91 for E scale, and 0.89 for N. For this current study the reliability for P is .65, for E is .71, and for N is .80.

4.5. PROCEDURE

This mini dissertation forms part of the general bullying behaviour study by the North West University, Department of Psychology, South Africa. The Research Committee of the Human and Social Sciences of the North West University granted the Ethical Approval (ethics number: NWU-00284-14-A9) for the study (see Appendix B). Data was collected in 2012 on

the days that were arranged with the different schools. Participants were arranged in groups according to their grades. Test administrators were available to answer all the questions that participants had and to provide clarity when needed. Permission to conduct the study was obtained from the Ethical Committee of the North West University and from the Department of Education.

4.6. STATISTICAL METHOD USED

Pearson correlation was used to measure the strength and the direction of the relationship between personality factors and bullying behaviour. An independent t-test was used to compare gender differences on bullying behaviour and personality factors.

4.7. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Ethical approval (ethics reference number: NWU-00284-14-A9) was granted by the North West University, Mahikeng Campus Ethics Committee (see Appendix B). Numbers were assigned to the questionnaires to ensure that no name or identity of the participants can be used to link the information back to them. This ensured the anonymity of the participants. Participants were informed that the information gathered from them will be kept confidential and will be used only for the purpose of the study. Participants were informed that they had the right to withdraw from the study at any point and that they would not be paid. This was to ensure that participants took part in the study without being coerced but by volunteering. Psychologists were available if any student needed counselling.

4.8. SUMMARY

The focus of this chapter was on explaining the research methodology of the study. This includes the study design, participants and sampling method, instruments used for data collection, procedure for data collection, the statistical method, and ethical considerations.

The next chapter focuses on presenting the study results. The results are presented in table format.

CHAPTER 5

5.1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the results of the study of the tested hypotheses (see chapter 3). Pearson correlation analysis and independent t-test were used to test the study hypotheses. The results are presented in tables below.

5.2. RESULTS

The study relied on two hypotheses: the first hypothesis stated that there will be a relationship between personality factors and bullying behaviour. The second hypothesis stated that there will be a significant difference between personality factors and bullying behaviour according to gender.

To test the first hypothesis, a Pearson correlational analysis was used. The results for hypothesis 1 are presented in Table 8 below.

Table 8: A correlation analysis of personality factors and bullying behaviour

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Psychoticism	-	-.081	-.054	.105	.043	.084	.205**	.301**
2. Extraversion		-	.020	.035	-.041	-.118	.218**	.080
3. Neuroticism			-	.043	.261**	.128	-.066	.104
4. VB-victim				-	.379**	.380**	.231**	.123
5. IB-victim					-	.485**	-.086	.217**
6. PB-victim						-	-.095	.203**
7. VB-perp							-	.416**
8. P/IB-perp								-

Note: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Key: VB-victim = verbal bullying (victimisation), IB-victim = indirect bullying (victimisation), PB-victim = physical bullying (victimisation), VB-perp = verbal bullying (perpetration), P/IB-perp = physical/indirect bullying (perpetration).

The results above revealed a significant positive correlation for psychoticism and verbal bullying (perpetration) $r(234) = .20, p < .01$; psychoticism and physical/indirect bullying (perpetration) $r(234) = .30, p < .01$; extraversion and verbal bullying (perpetration) $r(234) = .21, p < .01$; neuroticism and indirect bullying (victimisation) $r(234) = .26, p < .01$. This suggests that as learners score higher on psychoticism, they also score higher on bullying perpetration (i.e., verbal and physical/indirect bullying (perpetration)). The results also revealed significant correlations between extraversion and verbal bullying (perpetration) indicating that individuals who scored higher on extraversion also scored higher on verbal bullying (perpetration). A significant correlation was also observed for neuroticism and indirect bullying (victimization) suggesting that learners who scored higher on neuroticism also scored higher on verbal bullying (victimization).

The results showed a significant positive correlation for psychoticism and verbal bullying (perpetration); psychoticism and physical/indirect bullying (perpetration); and neuroticism and indirect bullying (victimization). Furthermore, significant correlation was also observed for extraversion and verbal bullying (perpetration); and neuroticism and indirect bullying (victimization). Other factors did not show any correlation. Therefore, hypothesis one which states that there will be a significant relationship between personality factors (extraversion, neuroticism and psychoticism) and bullying behaviour factors (verbal, indirect and physical) was partially accepted.

Table 9: Independent t-test showing means, standard deviations, degrees of freedom of learners' personality factors according to gender differences.

Variables	Male			Female			t	P
	Mean	SD	df	Mean	SD	df		
4. P	10.92	4.19	230	10.17	4.12	230	1.372	ns
5. E	15.31	3.89	230	14.23	3.89	230	2.110	.03*
6. N	12.35	4.54	230	15.97	4.02	230	-6.424	<0.001**
7. VB-victim	1.52	.97	229	1.53	.97	229	-.102	ns
8. IB-victim	.82	.82	230	1.22	.83	230	-3.688	<0.001**
8. PB-victim	.46	.61	228	.63	.64	228	-2.006	.04*
9. VB-perp	1.44	1.01	223	1.35	1.09	223	.621	ns
10. P/IB-perp	.45	.73	215	.66	.96	215	-1.737	ns

Note: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Key: VB-victim = verbal bullying (victimisation), IB-victim = indirect bullying (victimisation), PB-victim = physical bullying (victimisation), VB-perp = verbal bullying (perpetration), P/IB-perp = physical/indirect bullying (perpetration).

The results from Table 2 above showed a significant difference on neuroticism scores ($t = -6.424$, $df = 230$, $p = <0.001$), with female learners scoring higher ($\bar{X} = 15.97$, $SD = 4.02$) than male learners ($\bar{X} = 12.35$, $SD = 4.54$). The study also revealed statistically significant differences on indirect bullying (victimisation) ($t = -3.688$, $df = 230$, $p = <0.001$). The female learners had higher scores on indirect bullying (victimization) ($\bar{X} = 1.22$, $SD = .83$) than male learners ($\bar{X} = .82$, $SD = .82$). Other statistical differences were observed on extraversion ($t = 2.110$, $df = 230$, $p = .03$) and direct bullying (victimisation) ($t = -2.006$, $df = 228$, $p = .04$). The mean scores revealed that male learners scored high on extraversion ($\bar{X} = 15.31$, $SD = 3.89$) compared to female learners who scored low ($\bar{X} = 14.23$, $SD = 3.89$). For physical bullying (victimisation), the mean scores show that female learners had higher scores on physical bullying (victimisation) ($\bar{X} = .63$, $SD = .64$) than male learners ($\bar{X} = .46$, $SD = .61$).

The study results showed no statistical differences on psychoticism ($t = 1.372$, $df = 230$, $p = ns$), verbal bullying (victimisation) ($t = -.102$, $df = 229$, $p = ns$), verbal bullying (perpetration) ($t = .621$, $df = 223$, $p = ns$), and physical/indirect bullying (perpetration) ($t = -1.737$, $df = 215$, $p = ns$). However, the mean difference does show that male learners scored higher on psychoticism ($\bar{X} = 10.92$, $SD = 4.19$) than female learners ($\bar{X} = 10.17$, $SD = 4.12$). These differences were also observed for verbal bullying (victimisation), where female learners had higher scores on verbal bullying (victimisation) ($\bar{X} = 1.53$, $SD = .97$) than male learners ($\bar{X} = 1.52$, $SD = .97$). The descriptive statistics also show that male learners had higher scores on verbal bullying (perpetration) ($\bar{X} = 1.44$, $SD = 1.01$) than female learners ($\bar{X} = 1.35$, $SD = 1.09$). On the other hand, the means scores revealed that female learners scored higher on physical/indirect bullying (perpetration) ($\bar{X} = .66$, $SD = .96$) than male learners ($\bar{X} = .45$, $SD = .73$).

The results showed a statistical significance for extraversion, neuroticism, indirect bullying (victimisation) and physical bullying victimisation according to gender differences, while other factors such as psychoticism, verbal bullying (victimisation), verbal bullying (perpetration) and physical/indirect bullying (perpetration) did not show any statistical significance. Therefore, hypothesis two which states that there will be a significant difference between personality factors (extraversion, neuroticism and psychoticism) and bullying behaviour (verbal, indirect and physical) according to gender differences was partially accepted.

5.3. CONCLUSION

The results of the study show that bullying perpetration (verbal, physical, and indirect) is associated with psychoticism. Furthermore, a correlation was observed in the current study for verbal bullying (victimization) and neuroticism, but not for other types of bullying

victimization. Moreover, as hypothesised, the results of the study revealed gender differences on bullying behaviour and personality factors. The next chapter focuses on the discussion of the results, conclusion, strengths and limitations of the study, and the recommendations.

CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between personality factors (extraversion, neuroticism and psychoticism) and bullying behaviour of learners and make comparisons according to gender differences in the Ngaka Modiri Molema District in the North West Province. The study was based on two hypotheses and thereby (1) determined the significant relationship between personality factors and bullying behaviour; and (2) determined the significant difference between personality factors and bullying behaviour according to gender.

6.2. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Hypothesis one: There will be a significant relationship between personality factors (extraversion, neuroticism and psychoticism) and bullying behaviour factors.

The findings from the current study show that neuroticism and indirect bullying (victimisation) were strongly correlated. These findings are consistent with previous studies (Teng & Liu, 2013; Barlett & Anderson, 2012) that show that there is a relationship between neuroticism and aggressive behaviour. Findings by Mitsopoulou and Giovazolias (2015) revealed that both bullying and victimisation were associated with lower levels of agreeableness and conscientiousness and higher levels of neuroticism and extraversion. Furthermore, these authors reported that victimisation was significantly correlated to high neuroticism and to low conscientiousness. Another study that concurs with these findings is by Harris (2011) which revealed that neuroticism and conscientiousness were significantly related to victimization. It is therefore not surprising to find that neuroticism and indirect bullying (victimisation) were strongly correlated.

However, for the current study, the correlation was only found between indirect bullying (victimization) and neuroticism, whereas other bullying victimization factors did not show any relationship with neuroticism. This finding could be because bullying victimization was divided into three factors which might have affected the results since previous research has shown that bullying victimization is associated with neuroticism. Furthermore, according to the bioecological model, this could be because factors other than the individual's personality play a role in bullying behaviour among learners. The bioecological model posits that other factors than the individual's personality such as age, gender, interaction with peers, parents and neighbours play a role in the development or absence of bullying behaviour among learners (Bronfenbrenner, 2005). Future studies are suggested to confirm the factors surrounding these findings.

The current study also found that psychoticism which, according to Jones et al., (2011) is a blend of five factor model traits of agreeableness and conscientiousness, was strongly correlated to bullying perpetration (i.e., verbal, and physical/indirect bullying (perpetration)). This finding is supported by Jones et al., (2011) who found a strong relationship between the domains of agreeableness, conscientiousness, and neuroticism and anti-social behaviour and aggression. Another study conducted by Jolliffe and Farrington (2011) which examined the relationship between low empathy (a personality characteristic found in people with high scores on psychoticism) and bullying, found that low affective empathy was independently related to male bullying but not to female bullying. A recent study on EPQ and self-esteem scores of male and female bullies in South Africa conducted by Idemudia (2013) revealed that learners with high scores in psychoticism and neuroticism also had high scores on bullying behaviour. These findings are also in line with Eysenck's theory of criminality. According to Eysenck (1990), individuals with criminal tendencies have high scores on extraversion, neuroticism and psychoticism. It is therefore not surprising that the current

study revealed that psychoticism is associated with bullying perpetration. Future studies that are qualitative are suggested to explore these findings in detail.

Other findings of the current study revealed a strong correlation between extraversion and verbal bullying (perpetration). To concur with these findings, previous research also reported that extraversion correlates with bullying behaviour (Idemudia, 2013). To support these findings, Connolly and O'Moore (2003) reported that children who bullied had higher scores on extraversion, neuroticism and psychoticism compared to their counterparts who did not bully. Furthermore, Mitsopoulou and Giovazolias (2015) found that higher levels of neuroticism and extraversion were associated with both bullying perpetration and bullying victimisation. Idemudia (2013) reported that learners who scored higher on bullying also scored higher on psychoticism, extraversion and neuroticism.

Eysenck (1997) predicted higher scores on psychoticism, extraversion and neuroticism in criminals. In support of this, the above findings show that there is a correlation between bullying behaviour factors and personality factors indicating a need to take into consideration different personality factors when formulating and implementing policies. Furthermore, more focus needs to be on psychoticism since learners who score high on this personality factor are at risk of becoming criminal offenders in adulthood. Since few studies, especially in South Africa, have been conducted on personality factors and bullying behaviour of learners, this study encourages research on this concept to be added to the body of literature.

Hypothesis two: There will be a significant difference between personality factors (extraversion, neuroticism and psychoticism) and bullying behaviour factors (verbal, indirect and direct) according to gender.

The second hypothesis compared gender difference between personality factors and bullying behaviour. The study results revealed that there are personality differences between male and

female learners with male learners scoring higher on psychoticism, and extraversion as compared to female learners, who scored high on neuroticism. Earlier studies conducted by Feingold (1994) and Lynn and Martin (1997) reported that neuroticism is one of the negative affect personality factors that is predominant among females. To support these findings, Canals et al. (2005) conducted a five year study with 578 school children of 10 and 11 years and found that boys obtained higher scores on psychoticism and anti-social behaviour than girls. Canals et al., (2005) also found that from age 13 the scores for girls on neuroticism increased, becoming higher than the scores for boys. Lynn and Martin (1997) reported findings on gender differences on extraversion, neuroticism and psychoticism in 37 nations and found that women scored high on neuroticism for all the 37 countries, and men scored higher on psychoticism compared to women in 34 countries and on extraversion in 30 countries. Although other studies found gender differences in extraversion and neuroticism, Petrides et al., (2003) didn't find such differences. However, Petrides et al., (2003) reported that men scored higher on psychoticism than women.

The results of the study further revealed differences in bullying behaviour factors between male and female learners. Even though the statistics revealed no significant differences between males and females on verbal bullying (victimisation), verbal bullying (perpetration) and physical/indirect bullying (perpetration), the mean scores show that female learners scored higher than male learners on bullying victimisation (i.e., verbal, physical and indirect bullying victimisation) and on physical/indirect bullying (perpetration) compared to male learners who scored higher on verbal bullying (perpetration). From the findings of the current study, it could be argued that, although female learners scored higher on physical/indirect bullying (perpetration), it is no surprise that they also scored higher on bullying victimisation as compared to male learners. In their studies, Erdur-Baker (2010) and Ferrington (1993) found that bullying perpetration behaviour is more prevalent among males than females, and

that females were more likely to be victims as is shown in the findings of the current study that females scored higher on victimization than males.

Additionally, the study further revealed that male learners scored higher on verbal bullying (perpetration) compared to female learners who scored higher on physical/indirect bullying (perpetration). These results are not expected. According to Oleuw (1978) as cited in Turkel (2007, p. 248), boys engage in more direct physical bullying than females who engage in more indirect bullying, such as spreading rumours and manipulation of friendships. Furthermore, Felix and McMahon (2006) reported that males harm others through violence, i.e., they use physical victimisation to harm others, while females harm others by damaging their relationship.

However, in support of the current findings, Winner (2009) reported that 100% of females reported being bullied verbally and emotionally, 80% of females reported bullying someone verbally and emotionally, while only 20% of males reported bullying someone physically compared to 80% who reporting that they have bullied someone verbally. To concur with this, Rigby (1996) and Bullyingstatistics (2015) also reported that boys resort to subtle ways of bullying in an attempt to escape the consequences that can come with using more direct ways of bullying others. There is, however, no further research supporting the findings that males bully verbally more than physically as it has been documented in previous research (e.g., Turkel, 2007). From the finding of the current study, it can be inferred that perhaps these differences are due to the fact that physical and indirect bullying are classified together under one factor, therefore leading to the findings. Moreover, these differences could be explained from the social learning theory's point of view. This theory suggests that learning occurs through observation, imitation and modelling (Bandura, 1997). Therefore, it can be inferred from these findings that through observation (i.e., observing their environment), male learners noticed that physical bullying is easily noticed and therefore the behaviour is

punished, while on the other hand one can easily go free with verbal bullying. Bandura (1997) highlights that learning takes cognitive factors into consideration and follows the process of efficacy. Therefore, for example, a male learner may choose more indirect ways of bullying than direct ways of bullying after observing that physical bullying has dire consequences, not only for the victim but for the bully too.

6.3.CONCLUSION

Learners with high psychoticism, neuroticism and extraversion scores scored high on bullying behaviour, with male learners scoring high in psychoticism, and extraversion and female learners scoring high in neuroticism. Bullying victimization is higher in females than in males, with male learners reporting higher scores on verbal bullying (perpetration) only. Bullying perpetration is found to be associated with high psychoticism and extraversion scores while high neuroticism score is associated with indirect bullying (victimisation). Previous studies support these findings (e.g., Erdur-Baker, 2010; Mitsopoulou & Giovazolias, 2015).

6.4. STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The fact that this study is one of the few studies in South Africa to investigate the relationship between personality factors on bullying behaviour of learners serves as one of the strengths of this study. It has therefore contributed to the existing body of literature in a significant way and has opened the door for future research. Another important fact to note is that this study has used a new bullying scale (BQPM) that has been developed for the current population (i.e., learners in the Ngaka Modiri Molema District). It is hoped that this scale will be used in future research on bullying in South Africa.

However, there are several limitations of this study to consider. The study used the EPQ which is not standardized for the South African population. Even though the scale has been

used by other researchers in South Africa, some words in the scale were too difficult for the participants to understand which might have impacted negatively on the results. Another issue to consider is that the EPQ and the BQPM are self-report measures and the desire to appear good may have influenced the responses of the participants. The use of self-report measures only for data collection could limit generalization of the study results. Furthermore, the BQPM is a relatively new scale that still needs to be further developed to strengthen its reliability and validity. This can be achieved by using the scale in future bullying studies.

This study also looked only at the relationship between personality factors and bullying behaviour of learners and did not consider other factors such as family structure, parenting styles, age, peers or emotional intelligence of participants and other aspects worth considering. Future studies are necessary to explore these factors from a South African context as the findings were mostly supported by international studies.

6.5. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this study, there are a few recommendations made for future research that could further our understanding of bullying behaviour of learners at schools.

Parents and schools need to work together in order to deal effectively with bully/victim problems of learners. According to research conducted by Holt et al., (2009) in the United States, it was reported that about a third of the parents did not think that they should work in conjunction with school staff to deal with bullying. Responsibility for educating parents about bullying lies in part with schools. Parents need to be informed about what policies and practices are adopted by schools to counter bullying, and the opportunities provided by schools for meetings with parents to discuss issues and cases.

Teachers and parents need to try and understand the reasons behind learners' bullying behaviour. In some cases, bullying among learners emerges as a result of trouble in managing

strong emotions like anger, frustration, or insecurity. In other cases, learners haven't learned cooperative ways to work out conflicts and understand differences. It is therefore essential that teachers and parents orientate themselves about possible unmanageable situations that children often find themselves in.

Teachers, being proactive in gathering information about bullying before it happens, could assist rather than having to wait until bullying takes place. Perhaps collaboration with health professionals such as counsellors, social workers, psychologists, etc., could assist in terms of intervening and dealing with hidden factors associated with aggression often found among male bullies. Future studies may also explore deeper meanings attached to these childrens' bullying behaviour, qualitatively.

6.6. SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Reviewed studies on personality factors and bullying behaviour indicate a gap in the literature on these factors in South Africa. Therefore, this study recommends that researchers conduct similar studies to contribute to the body of literature and the theoretical understanding of intervention and prevention programmes for bullying behaviour in schools. Future studies can also take on a qualitative method to get an in-depth understanding of bullying behaviour among learners.

Bullying behaviour can be attributed to many factors such as family structure, parenting styles, age, peers or emotional intelligence. It is recommended that future studies focus on these factors and how they affect/or influence bullying behaviour of learners. Furthermore, it is recommended that future studies use a larger sample extending to other provinces in the country that can lead to generalization of results and contribute to the development of intervention and prevention strategies for both parents and schools.

This study used a new bullying questionnaire (BQPM) that has been standardized for the current population (i.e., learners in the Ngaka Modiri Molema District). It is therefore recommended that researchers make use of this scale in their studies in South Africa to contribute to its improvement. In South Africa, there is a scarcity in the development of scales, and thus less measures of bullying behaviour and personality factors, leaving a gap in research.

REFERENCES

- Aluja, A., Garcia, O., & Garcia, L. F. (2003). A psychometric analysis of the revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire short scale. *Personality and Individual Differences, 35*, 449-460.
- Amarasing, P. (2013). *Social Learning Theory*. Retrieved from <http://www.uni-koeln.de/phil-fak/paedsem/psych/medien/medpsy/bandura/index.html>
- Baldry, A. C., & Farrington, D. P. (2000). Bullies and delinquents: personal characteristics and parental styles. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 10*(1), 17-31. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1099-1298(200001/02)
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
- Barlett, C. P., & Anderson, C. A. (2012). Direct and indirect relations between the Big 5 personality traits and aggressive and violent behaviour. *Personality and Individual Differences, 52*, 870-875. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2012.01.029
- Belsky, J. (1997). Theory testing, effect-size evaluation and differential susceptibility to rearing influence: The case of mothering and attachment. *Child Development, 68*, 598-600.
- Beran, T. (2012). *Bullying: What are the differences between boys and girls?* Retrieved from http://www.education.com/reference/article/Ref_Bullying_Differences/
- Berk, L. E. (2000). *Child development* (5th ed). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Besag, V. (1989). *Bullies and victims in schools*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Bidwell, N. (1997). *The nature and prevalence of bullying in elementary schools*. Regina: Saskatchewan. Research Report 97-06 Saskatchewan School Trustees Association.

- Boeree, G. C. (2006). *Personality theories: Hans Eysenck (and other temperament theorists)*. Retrieved from webspace.ship.edu
- Bollmer, J. M., Harris, M. J., & Milich, R. (2006). Reaction to bullying and peer victimization: Narrative, physiological arousal, and personality. *Journals of Research in Personality, 40*, 803-828.
- Book, A. S., Volk, A. A., & Hosker, A. (2012). Adolescence bullying and personality: An adaptive approach. *Personality and Individual Differences, 52*, 218-223.
- Breivik, K., & Olweus, D. (2006). Adolescent's adjustment in four post-divorce family structures: Single mother, stepfather, joint physical custody and single father families. *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage, 44*, 99-124.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). Contexts of child rearing: Problems and prospects. *American Psychologist, 34*, 844-850.
- Broidy, L., & Agnew, R. (1997). Gender and crime: A general strain theory perspective. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 34*(3), 275-306.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1993). The ecology of cognitive development: Research models and fugitive findings. In R. Wozniak & K. Fischer (Eds.), *Development in context: Acting and thinking in specific environments* (pp. 3-44). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1994). Ecological models of human development. In M. Gauvain & M. Cole (Eds.), *Reading on the development of children, 2nd Ed.* New York: Freeman.

- Bronfenbrenner, U. (2005). *Making human beings human: Bioecological perspectives on human development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. A. (1998). The ecology of developmental processes. In W. Damon & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology, Vol 1: Theoretical models of human development* (5th ed, pp. 993-1023). New York: Wiley.
- Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. A. (2006). The bioecological model of human development. In W. Damon & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology, Vol 1: Theoretical models of human development* (6th ed, pp. 793-828). New York: Wiley.
- Bullying.org. (2015). *Facts and myths about bullying*. Retrieved from http://www.bullying.org/external/documents/Bullying.org_Bullying_Myths-Facts%20Pamphlet.pdf
- Burton, P., & Leoschut, L. (2013). *School violence in South Africa: Results of the 2012 national school violence study*. Cape Town: Centre for Justice and Crime Prevention.
- Cale, E. M. (2006). A quantitative review of the relations between the “Big 3” higher order personality dimensions and antisocial behavior. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40, 250-284.
- Canadian Council on Learning. (2008). *Bullying in Canada: How intimidation affects learning*. Retrieved from www.ccl-cca.ca.
- Canals, J., Vigil-Colet, A., Chico, E., & Marti-Henneberg, C. (2005). Personality changes during adolescence. The role of gender and pubertal development. *Personality and Gender Differences*, 39, 179-188.

- Card, N. A., Stucky, B. D., Sawalani, G. M., & Little, T. D. (2008). Direct and indirect aggression during childhood and adolescence: a meta-analytic review of gender differences, intercorrelations, and relations to maladjustment. *Child Development*, 79(5), 1185-1229. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2008.01184.x.
- Cardwell, M. (1996). *Dictionary of psychology*. United Kingdom, Fitzroy Dearbon Publishers.
- Carpenter, D., & Ferguson, C. J. (2014). *History of bullying*. Retrieved from <http://www.netplaces.com/what-is-bullying/>
- Ciarrochi, J., & Heaven, P. C. (2007). Longitudinal examination of the impact of Eysenck's psychoticism dimension on emotional well-being in teenagers. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 42(3), 597-608.
- Cohn, A., & Canter, A. (2003). *Bullying: Facts for schools and parents*. Retrieved from http://www.nasponline.org/resources/factsheets/bullying_fs.aspx
- Coloroso, B. (2003). *The bully, the bullied, and the bystander*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Connolly, I., & O'Moore, M. (2003). Personality and family relations of children who bully. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 35, 559-567.
- Culpeper, J. (2011). *Impoliteness: Using language to cause offence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cwd1810. (2011). *Social learning theory and Bandura's bobo doll experiment (Blog two)*. Retrieved from <https://cwd1810.wordpress.com/2011/10/06/social-learning-theory-and-bandura%E2%80%99s-bobo.doll.experiment-blog-two/>

- De Wet, N. C. (2005). The nature and extent of bullying in Free State secondary schools. *South African Journal of Education, 25*(2), 82-88.
- Dijkstra, J. K., Lindenberg, S., & Veenstra, R. (2008). Beyond the class norm: Bullying behaviour of popular adolescents and its relation to peer acceptance and rejection. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 36*, 1289-1299.
- Ellis, B. J., Boyce, W. T., Belsky, J., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., & van Ijzendoorn, M. H. (2011). Differential susceptibility to the environment: An evolutionary-neurodevelopmental theory. *Development and Psychology, 23*, 7-28.
- Ellis, B. J., Shirtcliff, E. A., Boyce, W. T., Dearing, J., & Essex, M. J. (2011). Quality of early family relationships and the timing and tempo of puberty: Effects depend on biological sensitivity to context. *Development and Psychopathology, 23*, 85–99.
- Erdur-Baker, O. (2010). Cyberbullying and its correlation to traditional bullying, gender and frequent and risky usage of internet-mediated communication tools. *New Media Society, 12*(1), 109-125.
- Ewen, R. B. (2014). *An introduction to theories of personality* (7th ed). New York: Psychology Press.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1947). *Dimensions of personality*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1964). *Crime and personality*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1967). *The biological basis of personality*. Springfield, IL: Charles C.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1978). Superfactors P, E and N in a comprehensive factor space. *Multivariate Behavioural Research, 13*, 475-482.

- Eysenck, H. J. (1990). Biological dimensions of personality. In L. A. Pervin (Ed.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 244-276). New York: Guilford.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1997). Personality and experimental psychology: The unification of psychology and possibility of a paradigm. *Journal of Psychology and Social Psychology, 73*, 1224-1237.
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1975). *Manual of the Eysenck personality questionnaire (junior and adult)*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Fall. (2011). *How does a person become a bully: Understanding reasons for a bully's behaviour, lesson 7, student activity 3: Middle school cyberbullying curriculum*. Retrieved from http://sps.ss8.sharpschool.com/modules/groups/homepagefiles/cms/1583136/File/Departmental%20Content/cyber%20bullying/lesson%207/cbms_7_sa3.pdf
- Farrington, D. P. (1993). Understanding and preventing bullying. *Crime and Justice, 17*, 381-458.
- Farrington, D. P., & Ttofi, M. M. (2009). *School-based programs to reduce bullying and victimization*. Campbell Systematic Reviews 10.4073/csr.2009.6. Retrieved from <http://campbellcollaboration.org/lib/download/718/>
- Feinberg, T. (2003). Bullying Prevention and Intervention. *Principal Leadership Magazine, 4(1)*. http://www.naspcenter.org/principals/nassp_bullying.html
- Feingold, A. (1994). Gender differences in personality: A meta-analysis. *Psychol. Bull, 116(3)*, 429-456.

- Felix, E. D., & McMahon, S. D. (2006). Gender and multiple forms of peer victimisation: how do they influence adolescent psychosocial adjustment? *Violence and Victims, 21*(6), 707-724.
- Forrest, S., Lewis, C. A., & Shevlin, M. (2000). Examining the factor structure and differential functioning of Eysenck personality questionnaire revised-abbreviated. *Personality and Individual Differences, 29*, 579-588.
- Francis, L. J. (1991). The dual nature of the EPQ lie scale among college students in England. *Personality and Individual Differences, 12*, 1255-1260.
- Francis, L., Lewis, C., & Ziebertz, H. (2006). The short-form revised Eysenck personality questionnaire (EPQ-S): A German edition. *Social Behavior and Personality, 34*(2), 197-204.
- Fraser-Thill, R. (2015). *Definition of physical bullying: What is physical bullying*. Retrieved from <http://tweenparenting.about.com/od/socialdevelopment/a/physical-bullying.htm>
- Garrett, A. G. (2003). *Bullying In American Schools*. Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland Company.
- Gong, Y. (1984). The use of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire in China. *Personality and Individual Differences, 5*(4), 431-438.
- Greimel, E., & Kodama, M. (2011). *Bullying from a cross-cultural perspective: A comparison between Australia and Japan*, Hiroshima University Institutional, ir.lib.hiroshima-u.ac.jp/metadb/up/kiyo/AA1244667X/JEducSci_4_29.pdf.
- Grille, R. (2015). *Natural born bullies*. Retrieved from www.naturalchild.org/robin_grille/natural_born_bullies.html

- Hanish, L., & Guerra, N. (2000). The role of ethnicity and school context in predicting children's victimization by peers. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 28, 201-223.
- Harris, M. A. (2011). *Personality and self-compassion of former victims of bullying* (Honour's thesis, University of Arizona, Arizona). Retrieved from <http://arizona.openrepository.com/arizona/handle/10150/144360>
- Heaven, P. C. L., & Ciarrochi, J. (2006). Perceptions of parental styles and Eysenckian psychoticism in youth: A prospective analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 41(1), 61-70.
- Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. W. (2009). *Bullying beyond the schoolyard: Preventing and responding to cyberbullying*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. W. (2010). Bullying, Cyberbullying, and Suicide. *Archives of Suicide Research*, 14(3), 206-221.
- Holt, M. K., Kaufman, K. G., & Finkelhor, D. (2009). Parent/child concordance about bullying involvement and family characteristics related to bullying and peer victimization. *Journal of Social Violence*, 9, 42-63.
- Hong, J. S., & Espelage, D. L. (2012). A review research on bullying and peer victimization in school: An ecological system analysis. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 17, 311-322. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2012.03.003
- Idemudia, E. S. (1997). Are people in prisons offenders or patients? The Eysenck-three factor personality trait explanation. *Ife Psychologia: An International Journal*, 5(2), 162-184.

- Idemudia, E. S. (2013). EPQ and self-esteem scores of male and female bullies in Mafikeng schools, South Africa. *Gender and Behaviour, 11*(1), 5208-5219.
- Idone, O. (2014). *Indirect bullying*. Retrieved from <https://prezi.com/tjp2lwqzllvi/indirect-bullying/>
- James, A. (2010). School bullying (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Goldsmiths University of London, London.
- Johnson, D. A. (2014). Learners understanding and experiences of bullying at a primary school in the Western Cape (Masters thesis). Cape Peninsula University of Technology, Cape Town.
- Jolliffe, D., & Farrington, D. P. (2011). Is low empathy related to bullying after controlling for individual and social background variables? *Journal of Adolescence, 34*, 59-71.
doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2010.02.001
- Jones, E. S., Miller, J. D., & Lynam, D. R. (2011). Personality, antisocial behavior, and aggression: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 39*, 329-337.
doi:10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2011.03.004
- Kail, R. V., & Cavanaugh, J. C. (2013). *Human development: A life-span view* (6th ed). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Kansas State Department of Education. (2014). *Exploring the nature and prevalence of bullying*. Retrieved from <http://www.education.com/reference/article/defintions-characteristics-bullying/>
- Klomek, B.A., Sourander, A., & Gould, M.S. (2011). Bullying and suicide detection and intervention. *Psychiatric Times, 28*(2), 1-6.

- Kowalski, R. M., & Limber, S. P. (2007). Electronic bullying among middle school students. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 41*, S22-S30.
- Kruger, L. (2010). *Incidence and gender differences in bullying behaviour in a South African high school* (Master's thesis). North-West University (Potchefstroom Campus), South Africa.
- Kruger, R. (2013, August 1). Deadly menace of bullying continues. *The Cape Argus*. Retrieved from capeargus.newspaperdirect.com
- Kshirsagar V. Y., Agarwal, R., Bavdekar, S. B. (2007). Bullying in schools: Prevalence and short-term impact. *Indian Pediatric, 44*, 25–8.
- Ladd, B., & Ladd, G. W. (2001). Variations in peer victimization: Relations to children's maladjustment. In J. Juvonen & S. Graham (Eds.), *Peer harassment in school: The plight of the vulnerable and victimized* (pp. 25-48). New York: Guilford Press.
- Lagerspertz, K. M. J., Bjorkqvist, K., & Peltonen, T. (1988). Is indirect aggression typical of females? Gender differences in aggressiveness in 11-to 12-year-old children. *Aggressive Behavior, 14*, 403-414.
- Lamden, A. M., King, M. J., & Goldman, R. K. (2002). Divorce: Crisis intervention and prevention with children of divorce and remarriage. In J. Sndoval (Ed.), *Handbook of crisis counselling, intervention, and prevention in the schools* (pp. 83-104). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Lee, S. S. (2009). Personal and interpersonal correlates of bullying behaviors among Korean middle school students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25*, 152-176.

- Lerner, R. M., Bornstein, M. H., & Leventhal, T (Eds.). (2015). *Handbook of child psychology and developmental science, Vol 4: Ecological settings and processes* (7th ed). Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- Liang, H., Flisher, A. J., & Lombard, C. J. (2007). Bullying, violence, and risk behaviour in South African school students. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 31*, 161-171.
- Lines, D. (2008). *The bullies: Understanding bullies and bullying*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Livesey, G., McAleavy, G., Donegan, T., Duffy, J., O'Hagan, C., Adamson, G., & White, R. (2007). *The nature and extent of bullying in schools in north of Ireland. Research report No. 46*. Bangor, Northern Ireland: Department of Education for Northern Ireland.
- Louw, K. E. (2015). *Emotional profile index as correlates to bullying victimization among adolescents in Ngaka Modiri Molema District, Mahikeng* (Unpublished Master's thesis). North-West University (Mafikeng Campus), Mafikeng.
- Lutzker, J. R. (2006). *Preventing violence, research and evidence based intervention strategies*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Lynn, R., & Martin, T. (1997). Gender differences in extraversion, neuroticism, and psychoticism in 37 nations. *Journal of Social Psychology, 137*(3), 369-373.
- Malchiodi, C. (2010). *What is relational bullying?* Retrieved from <http://tlcinstitute.wordpress.com/2010/10/19/what-is-relational-bullying/>
- McGrath, M. J. (2007). *School bullying: tools for avoiding harm and liability*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.

- McGuckin, C., Cummins, P. K., & Lewis, C. A. (2010). Experiences of school bullying, psychological well-being and stress in Northern Ireland. *The Irish Journal of Psychology, 31*, 53-61.
- Memoh, C. N. (2013). An investigation of the different forms of bullying amongst grade10 learners in South African schools: A case study of three schools in the Western Cape (Masters thesis). University of Western Cape, Cape Town.
- Menesini, E., Camodeca, M., & Nocentini, A. (2010). Bullying among siblings: The role of personality and relational variables. *The British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 28*(4), 921-939.
- Mitsopoulou, E., & Giovazolias, T. (2015). Personality traits, empathy and bullying behaviour: A meta-analytic approach. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 21*, 61-72.
doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2015.01.007
- Mlisa, L.M., Ward, C.L., Flisher, A.J., & Lombard, C. (2008). Bullying at rural high schools in the Eastern Cape Province, South Africa: Prevalence and risk and protective factors at school and in the family. *Journal of Psychology in Africa, 18*(2), 261-268.
- Morita, Y. (1985). *Oku, e Shudan no Kozo ni Kansuru Shakaigakuteki Kenyu* [Sociological study on the group structure of bullying in schools]. Osaka: Department for Sociology, Osaka City University, Osaka, Japan.
- Mynard, H., & Joseph, S. (1997). Bully/Victims problems and their association with Eysenck's personality dimensions in 8 to 13 years-olds. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 67*(1), 51-54.

- Nansel, T. R., Overpeck, M. D., Haynie, D. L., Ruan, W. J., & Scheidt, P. C. (2003). Relationships between bullying and violence among U.S. youth. *Archives of Pediatric Adolescent Medicine*, *157*, 348-353.
- Nansel, T. R., Overpeck, M., Pilla, R. S., Ruan, W. J., Simons-Morton, B., & Scheidt, M. D. (2001). Bullying behaviors among US youth: Prevalence and association with psychosocial adjustment. *Jama*, *285*(16), 2094-2100.
- Ndebele, C., & Msiza, D. (2014). An analysis of the prevalence and effects of bullying at a remote rural school in the Eastern Cape Province of South Africa: Lessons for school principals. *Student Tribes Tribals*, *12*(1), 113-124.
- Neser, J., Ovens, M., Van der Merwe, E., Morodi, R., & Ladikos, A. (2003). Peer victimization in schools: The victims. *Crime Research in South Africa*, *5*(1). Retrieved from <http://www.crisa.org.za/>
- Newman, B. M., & Lewman, P. R. (2009). *Development through life: A psychosocial approach*. Belmont, USA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- NoBullying.com. (2014). *How to counter devastating effects of verbal bullying*. Retrieved from <http://nobullying.com/how-to-counter-the-devastating-effects-of-verbal-bullying/>
- NoBullying.com. (2014). *Indirect bullying*. Retrieved from <http://nobullying.com/indirect-bullying/>
- Ojedokun, O., & Idemudia, E. S. (2013). The moderating role of emotional intelligence between PEN personality factors and cyber bullying in a student population. *Life Science Journal*, *10*(3), 1924-1930.

- Olweus, D. (1973). Personality and aggression. In J. K. Cole & D. D. Jensen (Eds.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation 1972*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Olweus, D. (1978). *Aggression in the schools: Bullies and whipping boys*. Washington, D.C.: Hemisphere (Wiley).
- Olweus, D. (1992). Bullying among schoolchildren: Intervention and prevention. In R. D. Peters, R. J. McMahon, & V. L. Quinsey (Eds.), *Aggression and violence throughout the life span* (pp. 100-125). London: Sage Publications.
- Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Paquette, D., & Ryan, J. (2001). *Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory*. Retrieved from <http://pt3.nl.edu/paquetteryanwebquest.pdf>
- Petrides, K. V., Jackson, C. J., Furnham, A., & Levine, S. Z. (2003). Exploring issues of personality measurement and structure through the development of a short form of the Eysenck Personality Profiler. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 81, 271-280.
- Powell, A., & Jenson, J. M. (2010). Predictors of peer victimization among Hispanic adolescent girls: Implications for school social work. *Child. Sch.* 32, 211-222.
- Protegerou, C., & Flisher, A. (2012). Bullying in schools. In A. van Niekerk, S. Suffla & M. Seedat (Eds.), *Crime, violence and injury in South Africa: 21st century solutions for child safety*. Tygerberg: MRC, pp. 119-133.
- Ramadie, K. (2013). *Nature and prevalence of bullying among adolescents in Ngaka Modiri Molema district North-West Province South Africa* (Master's thesis). North-West University (Mafikeng Campus), Mafikeng.

- Richards, D. (2013). *Creating healthier environments and making schools safer: Strategies to decrease bullying behaviour in K-5 schools to improve academic performance* (Master's thesis). Northern Michigan University, Michigan.
- Rigby, K. (1996). *Bullying in schools and what to do about it*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Rigby, K. (2005). Why do some children bully at school? The contributions of negative attitudes towards victims and the perceived expectations of friends, parents and teachers. *School Psychology International*, 26, 147-161.
- Rodkin, P. C., & Berger, C. (2008). Who bullies whom? Social status asymmetries by victim gender. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 32, 473-485.
- Roland, E. (1989). Bullying: The Scandinavian research tradition. In D. Tattum & D. Lane (Eds.), *Bullying in schools* (pp. 21-32). London: Trentham Books.
- Russel, P. (2015). *Discriminatory bullying and adolescent: cross-national evidence*. Retrieved from ecdprbraga2015.com/stephen.php
- Scaglione, J., & Scaglione, A.R. (2006). *Bully-proofing children: a practical hands on guide to stop bullying*. Plymouth, USA: Rowland and Little Education Publishers.
- Schneider, S. K., O'Donnell, L., Stueve, A., & Coulter, R. W. S. (2011). Cyberbullying, school bullying, and psychological distress: A regional census of high school students. *American Journal of Public Health*, e1-e7. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2011.300308
- Schultz, D. P., & Schultz, S. E. (2013). *Theories of personality* (10th ed). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

- Sesar, K., Simic, N., Barisic, M. (2011). Roles in bullying behavior and Eysenck's personality dimensions in elementary school children. *Paediatrics Today*, 7(1), 26-36.
- Shariff, S. (2008). *Cyber-bullying: Issues and solutions for the school, the classroom and the home*. New York: Routledge.
- Silva, M. A. I., Pereira, B., Mendonca, D., Nunes, B., & de Oliveira, W. A. (2013). The involvement of girls and boys with bullying: An analysis of gender differences. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 10, 6820-6831. doi: 10.3390/ijerph10126820
- Slee, P. T., & Rigby, K. (1993). The relationship of Eysenck's personality factors and self-esteem to bully/victim behaviour in Australian school boys. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 14, 371-373.
- Smith, P. K. (1991). The silent nightmare: Bullying and victimization in school per groups. *The Psychologist*, 4, 243-248.
- StopBullying.gov. (2014). *What is bullying?* Retrieved from <http://www.stopbullying.gov/what-is-bullying/>
- StopBullying.gov. (2015). *Effects of bullying*. Retrieved from <http://www.stopbullying.gov/at-risk/effects/>
- Sullivan, K., Cleary, M., & Sullivan, G. (2004). *Bullying in secondary schools: What it looks like and how to manage it*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Sullivan, K. (2000). *The anti-bullying handbook*. New Zealand: Oxford UP.
- Sullivan, K. (2006). *Bullying: How to spot it, how to stop it: A guide for parents and teachers*. London: Rodale International Ltd.

- Swart, E., & Bredekamp, J. (2009). Non-physical bullying: Exploring the perspectives of Grade girls. *South African Journal of Education, 29*, 405-425.
- Taiwo, T., & Goldstein, S. (2006). Drug use and its association with deviant behaviour among rural adolescent students in South Africa. *East African Medical Journal, 83*(9), 500-506.
- Tani, F., Greenman, P. S., Schneider, B. H., & Fregoso, M. (2003). Bullying and the Big Five: A study of childhood personality and participant roles in bullying incidents. *School Psychology International, 24*, 131-146.
- Tattum, D. (Ed.). (1993). *Understanding and managing bullying*. Oxford: Heinemann School Management.
- Tattum, D., & Tattum, E. (1992). *Social education and personal development*. London: David Fulton.
- Teng, Z., & Liu, Y. (2013). The role of neuroticism in the relation between self-esteem and aggressive emotion among 1085 chinese adolescents. *Psychology, 4*(10), 729-735.
- Tiwari, T., Singh, A. L., & Singh, I. L. (2009). The short-form revised Eysenck personality questionnaire: A Hindi edition (EPQRS-H). *Individual Psychiatry Journal, 18*, 27-31.
- Tokunaga, R. S. (2010). Following you home from school: A critical review and synthesis of research on cyberbullying victimization. *Computers in human Behavior, 26*, 277-287.
- Townsend, L., Flisher, A. J., Chikobvu, P., Lombard, C., & King, G. (2008). The relationship between bullying behaviours and high school dropout in Cape Town, South Africa. *South African Journal of Psychology, 38*(1), 21-32.

- Tudge, J. R. H., Mokrova, I., Hatfield, B. E., & Karnik, R. B. (2009). Uses and misuses of Bronfenbrenner's bioecological theory of human development. *Journal of Family Theory and Review*, 198-210.
- Turkel, A. R. (2007). Sugar and spice and puppy dog's tails: The psychodynamics of bullying. *Journal of The American Academy of Psychoanalysts and Dynamic Psychiatry*, 35(2), 243-258.
- Unisa. (2012). *Nature, extent and impact of bullying among secondary school learners in Gauteng*. Retrieved from <http://www.unisa.ac.za>.
- Vaillancourt, T., Hymel, S., & McDougall, P. (2003). Bullying is power: Implications for school-based intervention strategies. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, 19, 157-176.
- Van Zeijl, J., Mesman, J., Stolck, M. N., Alink, L. R. A., van IJzendoorn, M. H., Bakersmans-Kranenburg, M. J.,...Koot, H. M. (2007). Differential susceptibility to discipline. The moderating effect of child temperament on the association between maternal discipline and early childhood externalizing problems. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 21(4), 626-636.
- Veenstra, R., Lindenberg, S., Oldenhinkel, A. J., De Winter, A. F., Verhulst, F. C., & Ormel, J. (2005). Bullying and victimization in elementary schools: A comparison of bullies, victims, bully/victim and uninvolved preadolescents. *Developmental Psychology*, 41(4), 672-682. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.41.4.672
- Volk, A., Craig, W., Boyce, W., & King, M. (2006). Adolescent risk correlates of bullying and different types of victimization. *International Journal of Adolescent Medicine and Health*, 18, 575-586.

Wakefield, S. (2013, January 24). *57% SA children claim to have been bullied at school.*

Retrieved from <http://www.timeslive.co.za/local/>

Wang, J., Iannotti, R. J., Tonja, R., & Nansel, J. R. (2009). School bullying among adolescents in the United States: physical, verbal, relational and cyber. *Journal of Adolescents' Health*, 45(4), 368-375

Whitney, I., & Smith, P. K. (1993). A survey of the nature and extent of bullying in primary and secondary schools. *Educational Research*, 35, 34-39.

Wimmer, S. (2009). Views on gender differences in bullying in relation to language and gender role socialisation. *Griffith Working Papers in Pragmatics and Intercultural Communication*, 2(1), 18-26.

Wolke, D., Woods, S., Bloomfield, L., & Karstadt, L. (2000). The association between direct and relational bullying and behaviour problems among primary school children. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 41(8), 989-1002.

Zerrilo, C., & Osterman, K. F. (2011). Teacher perceptions of teacher bullying. *Improving Schools*, 14(3), 239-257.

Appendix A: Questionnaires

Bullying happens when someone hurts or scares another person on purpose and the person being bullied has a hard time defending him or herself. Usually bullying happens over and over. Examples include the following:

- Punching, shoving, and other acts that hurt people physically
- Spreading bad rumours about people
- Keeping certain people out of a group
- Teasing people in a mean way
- Getting people to ‘gang up’ on others

This project is being undertaken by researchers at the Psychology Department of the North West University (Mafikeng Campus). Participation in this survey is voluntary and you may stop any time you choose. All responses are confidential and you do not have to give any personal information on this questionnaire. Your identity and your responses are confidential.

INSTRUCTIONS

In this survey you will be asked to respond to questions and statements about ‘bullies’ and ‘bullying’.

Section A: Biographical data

Questionnaire on bullying						<i>OFFICIAL USE</i>
Please tick the correct box with a X – Question 2 and 3 write the number						
1.	GENDER:	<i>Male</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Female</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2.	AGE (<i>Just write your age in years</i>)					
3.	GRADE (<i>Just write the grade</i>)					

Section B: Bullying Victimization

HAS THIS EVER BEEN DONE TO YOU

Experience with bullying (VICTIMIZATION)

7. Have you ever experienced any of the following behaviours listed below during the past year?

		Never happened	Rarely happened	Sometimes happened	Often happened	Always happened	<i>OFFICIAL USE</i>
A	Called me names						
B	Made fun of me						
C	Said they will do bad things to me						
D	Played jokes on me						
E	Won't let me be part of their group						
F	Broke my things						
G	Attacked me						
H	Nobody would talk to me						
I	Wrote bad things about me						
J	Said mean things behind my back						
K	Pushed or shoved me						
l	Other ways you were bullied?						

9. Where did you experience these behaviours listed in question no 7? (VENUE OF VICTIMIZATION)

		<i>OFFICIAL USE</i>
	In the classroom	
	Before school	
	After school	

	Sporting events		
	Bathroom		
	Hallway		
	Telephone		
	Text message		
	Facebook		
	On your way to school		

Section C: Bullying Perpetration

**23. Did you ever do any of the following to a person? (tick how often it happened)
(PERPETRATING BULLY / BEHAVIOUR OR ACTION USED TO BULLY
OTHERS)**

		Never happened	Rarely happened	Sometimes happened	Often happened	Always happened	<i>OFFICIAL USE</i>
a	Called them names						
b	Made fun of them						
c	Said you will do bad things to them						
d	Played jokes on them						
e	Won't let them be part of your group						
f	Broke their things						
g	Attacked them						
h	Nobody would talk to them						
i	Wrote bad things about them						
j	Said mean things behind their back						
k	Pushed or shoved them						
l	Other ways they were bullied?						

Section D: Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQR)

Please answer each question by ticking YES or NO. There are no right or wrong answers, and no trick questions. Work quickly and don't think too long about the exact meaning of the questions. **PLEASE REMEMBER TO ANSWER EACH QUESTION.**

		YES	NO	OFFICIAL USE
1	Do you have many different hobbies?			
2	Do you stop to think things over before doing anything?			
3	Does your mood often go up and down?			
4	Have you ever taken the praise for something you knew someone else had really done?			
5	Do you take much notice of what people think?			
6	Are you a talkative person?			
7	Would being in debt worry you?			
8	Do you ever feel 'just miserable' for no reason?			
9	Do you give money to charities?			
10	Were you ever greedy by helping yourself to more than your share of anything?			
11	Are you rather lively?			
12	Would it upset you a lot to see a child or an animal suffer?			
13	Do you often worry about things you should not have done or said?			
14	Do you dislike people who don't know how to behave themselves?			
15	If you say you will do something, do you always keep your promise no matter how inconvenient it might be?			
16	Can you usually let yourself go and enjoy yourself at a lively party?			
17	Are you an irritable person?			
18	Should people always respect the law?			
19	Have you ever blamed someone for doing something you knew was really your fault?			
20	Do you enjoy meeting new people?			
21	Are good manners important?			
22	Are your feelings easily hurt?			
23	Are <i>all</i> your habits good and desirable ones?			
24	Do you tend to keep in the background on social occasions?			
25	Would you take drugs which may have strange or dangerous effects?			
26	Do you often feel 'fed-up'?			
27	Have you ever taken anything (even a pin or button) that belonged to someone else?			
28	Do you like going out a lot?			
29	Do you prefer to go your own way rather than act by the rules?			
30	Do you enjoy hurting people you love?			
31	Are you troubled about feelings of guilt?			
32	Do you sometimes talk about things you know nothing about?			

33	Do you prefer reading to meeting people?			
34	Do you have enemies that want to hurt you?			
35	Would you call yourself a nervous person?			
36	Do you have many friends?			
37	Do you enjoy making practical jokes that can sometimes really hurt people?			
38	Are you a worrier? Do you easily worry about things?			
39	As a child did you do as you were told immediately and without moaning?			
40	Would you call yourself 'happy-go-lucky'?			
41	Do good manners and cleanliness matter much to you?			
42	Have you often gone against your parents' wishes?			
43	Do you worry about awful things that might happen?			
44	Have you ever broken or lost something belonging to someone else?			
45	Do you usually take the initiative in making new friends?			
46	Would you call yourself tense or 'highly strung'?			
47	Are you mostly quiet when you are with other people?			
48	Do you think marriage is old-fashioned and should be done away with?			
49	Do you sometimes boast a little?			
50	Are you more easy-going about right and wrong than most people?			
51	Can you easily get some life into a rather dull party?			
52	Do you worry about your health?			
53	Have you ever said anything bad or nasty about anyone?			
54	Do you enjoy co-operating with others?			
55	Do you like telling jokes and funny stories to your friends?			
56	Do most things taste the same to you?			
57	As a child were you ever cheeky to your parents?			
58	Do you like mixing with people?			
59	Does it worry you if you know there are mistakes in your work?			
60	Do you suffer from sleeplessness?			
61	Have people said that you sometimes act too rashly?			
62	Do you always wash before a meal?			
63	Do you always have a 'ready answer' when people talk to you?			
64	Do you like to arrive at appointments in plenty of time?			
65	Have you ever felt listless and tired for no reason?			
66	Have you ever cheated at a game?			
67	Do you like doing things in which you have to act quickly?			
68	Is (or was) your mother a good woman?			
69	Do you often make decisions on the spur of the moment?			
70	Do you often feel life is very dull?			
71	Have you ever taken advantage of someone?			
72	Do you often take on more activities than you have time for?			
73	Are there several people who keep trying to avoid you?			
74	Do you worry a lot about your looks?			
75	Do you think people spend too much time safeguarding their future with savings and insurance?			
76	Have you ever wished that you were dead?			

77	Would you dodge paying taxes if you were sure you could never be found out?			
78	Can you get a party going?			
79	Do you try not to be rude to people?			
80	Do you worry too long after an embarrassing experience?			
81	Do you generally 'look before you leap'?			
82	Have you ever insisted on having your own way?			
83	Do you suffer from nerves?			
84	Do you often feel lonely?			
85	Can you on the whole trust people to tell the truth?			
86	Do you always practice what you preach?			
87	Are you easily hurt when people find fault with you or the work you do?			
88	Is it better to follow 'society's rules' than go your own way?			
89	Have you ever been late for an appointment or school?			
90	Do you like plenty of excitement around you?			
91	Would you like other people to be afraid of you?			
92	Are you sometimes bubbling over with energy and sometimes very sluggish?			
93	Do you sometimes put off until tomorrow what you ought to do today?			
94	Do other people think of you as being very lively?			
95	Do people tell you a lot of lies?			
96	Do you believe one has special duties to one's family?			
97	Are you touchy about some things?			
98	Are you always waiting to admit it when you have made a mistake?			
99	Would you feel sorry for an animal caught in a trap?			
100	When your temper rises, do you find it difficult to control?			



Private Bag X6001, Potchefstroom
South Africa 2520

Tel: (018) 299-4900
Faks: (018) 299-4910
Web: <http://www.nwu.ac.za>

Ethics Committee

Tel +27 18 299 4849
Email Ethics@nwu.ac.za

ETHICS APPROVAL OF PROJECT

The North-West University Research Ethics Regulatory Committee (NWU-RERC) hereby approves your project as indicated below. This implies that the NWU-RERC grants its permission that provided the special conditions specified below are met and pending any other authorisation that may be necessary, the project may be initiated, using the ethics number below.

Project title: The influence of personality factors on bullying behavior of adolescents																															
Project Leader:	Dr P Erasmus																														
Student:	MP Moalusi																														
Ethics number:	<table border="1"><tr><td>N</td><td>W</td><td>U</td><td>-</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>2</td><td>8</td><td>4</td><td>-</td><td>1</td><td>4</td><td>-</td><td>A</td><td>9</td></tr><tr><td colspan="3">Institution</td><td colspan="5">Project Number</td><td colspan="2">Year</td><td colspan="5">Status</td></tr></table> <small>Status: S = Submission; R = Re-Submission; P = Provisional Authorisation; A = Authorisation</small>	N	W	U	-	0	0	2	8	4	-	1	4	-	A	9	Institution			Project Number					Year		Status				
N	W	U	-	0	0	2	8	4	-	1	4	-	A	9																	
Institution			Project Number					Year		Status																					
Approval date:	2014-09-29																														
Expiry date:	2019-09-28																														

Special conditions of the approval (if any): None

General conditions:

While this ethics approval is subject to all declarations, undertakings and agreements incorporated and signed in the application form, please note the following:

- The project leader (principle investigator) must report in the prescribed format to the NWU-RERC:
 - annually (or as otherwise requested) on the progress of the project,
 - without any delay in case of any adverse event (or any matter that interrupts sound ethical principles) during the course of the project.
- The approval applies strictly to the protocol as stipulated in the application form. Would any changes to the protocol be deemed necessary during the course of the project, the project leader must apply for approval of these changes at the NWU-RERC. Would there be deviated from the project protocol without the necessary approval of such changes, the ethics approval is immediately and automatically forfeited.
- The date of approval indicates the first date that the project may be started. Would the project have to continue after the expiry date, a new application must be made to the NWU-RERC and new approval received before or on the expiry date.
- In the interest of ethical responsibility the NWU-RERC retains the right to:
 - request access to any information or data at any time during the course or after completion of the project;
 - withdraw or postpone approval if:
 - any unethical principles or practices of the project are revealed or suspected,
 - it becomes apparent that any relevant information was withheld from the NWU-RERC or that information has been false or misrepresented,
 - the required annual report and reporting of adverse events was not done timely and accurately,
 - new institutional rules, national legislation or international conventions deem it necessary.

The Ethics Committee would like to remain at your service as scientist and researcher, and wishes you well with your project. Please do not hesitate to contact the Ethics Committee for any further enquiries or requests for assistance.

Yours sincerely

Prof Amanda Lourens

Chair NWU Research Ethics Regulatory Committee (RERC)

CERTIFICATE OF LANGUAGE EDITING

The mini dissertation entitled

**RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERSONALITY FACTORS AND BULLYING
BEHAVIOUR OF LEARNERS IN NGAKA MODIRI MOLEMA DISTRICT**

Submitted by **MMAPULA PATRICIA MOALUSI**

For the degree of

**MASTER OF SOCIAL SCIENCE
(CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY)**

In the

**FACULTY OF HUMAN AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
MAFIKENG CAMPUS
NORTH WEST UNIVERSITY**

has been edited for language by

Mary Helen Thomas B.Sc.(Hons) P.G.C.E



Ms. Helen Thomas

Lecturer

School of Teacher Education and Training