

# **Teachers and Students Perception towards Bullying in Batu Pahat District Secondary School**

**Azizi Yahaya**

*Faculty of Education, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia*

**Jamaludin Ramli**

*Faculty of Education, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia*

**Shahrin Hashim**

*Faculty of Education, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia*

**Mohd. Ali Ibrahim**

*Faculty of Education, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia*

**Raja Roslan Raja Abd Rahman**

*Universiti Teknikal Malaysia*

## **Abstract**

This study attempts to identify the prevalence and the type of bullying and its intervening programs at secondary in Batu Pahat, Johor. This study also attempts to identify the perception of the students and teachers about bullying in secondary schools. Beside that this study also attempts to identify students' perception about safety issues at secondary schools. 80 teachers and 480 students from eight secondary schools in Batu Pahat were randomly selected in this study. All information was gathered through Peer Relations Questionnaire - PRQ and The Nature and Prevalence of Bullying in Schools Questionnaire. The alpha cronbach for these two instruments were 0.7010 and 0.8097. Results have shown that there is a different perception about the prevalence of bullying among secondary school students and teachers. Students reported that the overall rate of the bullying prevalence were at moderate level where as teachers reported the bullying prevalence overall rate were at low level. There is no significant on the prevalence of bullying between male and female students but there is a significant difference on the prevalence between verbal bullying and physical bullying. Verbal bullying was seen more frequent compare to physical bullying.

**Keywords:** Bullying, prevalence, perception, intervention, verbal bullying, physical bullying

## **Introduction**

Bullies are aggressive children who repeatedly physically or emotionally abuse. Bully gives large implication towards victim especially school children. Children who become the targets of bullies generally have negative view of violence and go out of their way to avoid conflict.

Recently, bully has becoming a major problem and it needs to be overcome through intervening program (Greenbaum, Turner, Stephens, 1989; Wilson, 1992). Teachers should aware of this problem.

They should make sure school is a safer place for the children. They should plan and discourage violence in school.

Moreover, school is a place for children to gain knowledge and trust. It will lead to wrong perception if school teachers or personnel fail to promote a safer environment.

Arising in social problems such as raping, free sex among teenagers, murdered and bullying have set the society in fear. Unfortunately they only know to put the blame on others but none of them come up with the brilliant ideas on how to overcome this matter. Parents and teachers were always the one held responsible for the mischief done by the adolescence.

Actually, to solve this kind of problem everybody should consider the root of the issue. Why this is always happen among young children? What is bully? Are these young children aware of bully? Are there anyway bully can be stops?

It is hope that through this research, it can lead us the way to identify the category of bully and also to gain teachers and secondary student's perception towards bully.

## **Study Aim**

The aim of this research is to find out how big is the problem among teenagers especially secondary students and teachers. The main objectives are to find;

- (i) The frequent occurrence of bullying among students in school
- (ii) Types of bully in school
- (iii) Intervention program in school
- (iv) Students awareness of protecting themselves from bully.

## **The Importance of Research**

A bully's behavior does not exist in isolation. It may indicate the beginning of generally antisocial and rule-breaking behavior pattern that can extend to adulthood. Hopefully this research may help secondary students understand as well as to identify types of bully around them. As a result, they can avoid them and be happy with their life and as for bullies; they will realize their wrongdoing and stop it. Victims will get help from counselor and gradually reduce their trauma that they experienced.

Schools will design programs to address the problem. School authority must reduce the opportunities for bullying behavior to arise. The strategy behind this program is to involve school staffs, students, and parents in efforts to design to develop the awareness on bullying, improve peer relations, intervene to stop intimidation, develop clear rules against bullying behavior, and support and protect the victims.

## **Research Limitation**

Eight schools in Batu Pahat, Johor were involved in this research. The main participants are among teachers and secondary students. Researcher believes that perceptions among secondary students and teachers may lead them to the answer of this research. On a condition that bully only happen in secondary school. Therefore, the research only based on that population of sample.

## **Literature Review**

According to Nansel et al. (2001), 8.4 percent to 20 percent of young children in United State of America reported that they become victimized several time in a week. Haynie, et al. (2001), there are 24.4 percent to 44.6 percent of children experience it at least once in their life time. Their findings show bullying is a serious problem and can dramatically affect them up to 25 percent to 50 percent of children in school.

According to Smith and Sharp (1994), United Kingdom school children bully other people by calling names, saying or writing nasty things, hitting or kicking them, threatening them and spread rumors. Lagerspetz, Bjorqvist and Peltonen (1988), most frequent characteristics of bullying reported for girls are deliberately hurting the feelings of others, character assassination or rejection, Spreading false rumors, and isolating the victim from others.

Research done by Charach, Pepler, and Ziegler (1995), found that teachers seldom discussing on bully with students in the classroom. They belief that bullying is a natural part of childhood only perpetuates the problem. They belief it just physical aggression.

Stevens, Bourdeaudhuij and Oost (2000), done a programmed anti bully in Finland. The respondent are from 18 schools with 1104 students took part in the program. The result showed that there is a positive change in the use of intervention program in primary school and zero in secondary school.

## **Methodology of the Research**

### **Research Design**

Sample of bully are taken from secondary school. The variables are from reference document, articles, journals, and earlier projects. There are 33534 secondary school students in Batu Pahat (Pejabat Daerah Batu Pahat, 2004). The population included teachers too. Therefore, 80 teachers and 240 boys and 240 girls been selected for this research. They are selected in random from 8 zones in Batu Pahat. They are Air Hitam, Senggarang, Yong Peng, Seri Gading, Bandar, Penggaram, Bagan, and Parit Sulong.

### **Instrumentation**

Two set of questioner (a set for teachers and a set for secondary students) used to collect data. Students set contain two parts but teachers set only contain one part.

(i) Students set

a) Section A: student's biodata

The aim is to identify student's background such as name, age, address, gender, level of parent's education.

b) Section B:

questioner on pattern and rate of repetition of bully in school. Researcher adapt few sample of questioner (Rigby & Slee, 1995; Orpinas & Kelder, 1995; Division of Adolescent and school Health (DASH), 1993), to build questioner that shows the frequency of bully contain 58 items to collect data on perception of students towards bully in school.

(ii) Teachers set

Researcher used the questioner adaptation from Ziegler and Rosenstein – Manner (1991), Massey, Armstrong, and Santoro (2000), to collect all the data of perception, frequents, types, intervene programmed, and the location of bully that been identified by the teachers in school. There are 61 items. Researcher made changes towards the items in the questioner to get the objectives and problems of the thesis.

### **Pilot Study**

Pilot research was done at Batu Pahat School involving 15 teachers and 30 secondary students that have been randomly selected. There are 7 boys and 8 girls from form three, 8 boys and 7 girls from form five. Results was obtained from the sample using test repetition towards overall of the item of the questioners shows the value of cronbach alpha of teachers is 0.8097 whereas value of cronbach alpha of students is 0.7010.

## Data Analysis

Collected data is analyzed based on the aim and the hypothesis of this research. The analysis of frequency and percent used to see the background of the respondent such as gender, age, race, whether they live in the hostel, parents education and experience in teaching in secondary school. Mean score is used to identify the frequent and the students' and teachers perception on bully in school. Mean value score is based on Roslan's (2004).

## Research Finding

### (i). Respondent's Background

In this research the respondents were secondary school students and also teachers of the secondary school in Batu Pahat. Based on table 1 numbers of respondents are 240 Male (50.0%) and 240 female (50.0%). The total made from 160 (33.3%) were from form 1 students, 160 (33.3%) were from form 2 students and 160 (33.3%) were from form 4 students. Malay students were the majority of 390 students (81.3%), Chinese were 85 students (17.7%) and Indians were 5 students (1.0%). Respondents who live in the hostel were 63 students (31.1%). Based on table 2 Most of the parents finished their secondary school education. (316 mothers: 65.8%), and (313 fathers: 65.2%).

**Table 1:** Respondents Distribution based on gender, races and forms

	Male	Female	Form 1	Form 2	Form 4	Malays	Chinese	Indian	Stays in hostel
No.	240	240	160	160	160	390	85	5	63
%	50.0	50.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	81.3	17.7	1.0	31.1

**Table 2:** Numbers of Parents Education level

Level of Education	Mother		Father	
	No.	%	No.	%
Secondary School	316	65.8	313	65.2

**Table 3:** Numbers of respondent with experience of teaching

Teaching Experience	No.	Percent	Experience teaching in the same school	No	Percent
1-5 years	23	28.75	1-5 years	45	56.25
6-10 years	26	32.5	6-10 years	22	27.5
11-15 years	12	15.0	11-15 years	9	11.25
16-20 years	10	12.5	16-20 years	3	3.75
21-25 years	4	5.0	21-25 years	0	0.00
26-30 years	3	3.75	26-28 years	1	1.25
>30 years	2	2.5	>28 years	0	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 2 shows that 80 teachers were chosen from secondary school around Batu Pahat district. They were teachers who have experienced teaching for 1 to 34 years as well as teachers who have experienced teaching in the same school for 1 to 28 years. The total of respondents who has the teaching experience of 1 year (12 teachers: 15%) and teachers who have experience teaching in the same school for a year (16 teachers: 20%), were the most sample group of respondents.

**Table 4:** Frequency of verbal bullying (Students report)

Statements	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	SD
A student jeers other students to. make them angry	65 (13.5)	78 (16.3)	89 (18.5)	125 (26.0)	123 (25.6)	3.34	1.37
A student made fun to other Students	51 (10.6)	77 (16.0)	86 (17.9)	134 (27.9)	132 (27.5)	3.46	1.33
A students asks other students to Fight	157 (32.7)	151 (31.5)	94 (19.6)	55 (11.5)	23 (4.8)	2.24	1.16
A student calls to other students with bad names	31 (6.5)	51 (10.6)	50 (10.4)	112 (23.3)	236 (49.2)	3.98	1.27
A student threatening to hit or injure other students	196 (40.8)	130 (27.1)	90 (18.8)	47 (9.8)	17 (3.5)	2.08	1.14
A student try to arouse displeasure to other students	30 (6.3)	53 (11.0)	70 (14.6)	113 (23.5)	214 (44.6)	3.89	1.26

**\*total of Mean score on verbal bullying = 3.17; Standard Deviation= 0.88; n=480**

1= never (none);                               2= seldom (1 or 2 times a year)  
 3= rare (1 or 2 times a month)       4= often (1 or 2 times a week)  
 5= always (everyday);                     SD= Standard Deviation

Based on table 4, majority of the students reported that bully in secondary school in Batu Pahat district is a moderate with the Mean score 2.72 and the Standard Deviation 0.75. Meanwhile verbal bullying (Mean score= 3.17, Standard Deviation =0.88). Verbal bullying it happened frequently compare to physically bullying (Mean score=2.55, Standard Deviation= 0.91). This finding is similar to the findings made by Boulton, Trueman and FleMeangton (2002); verbal bullying was the most reported by the students. Similarity with the findings done by Dawkins (1995), the finding found that calling other students with names can be put in the category as the most frequent happened among students in the school (Mean score =3.98, Standard Deviation = 1.27) followed by hurting others feeling, insinuation, fighting and threatening to hurt other students.

**Table 5:** Frequency of physical bullying (students' report)

A student had beaten other students	138 (28.8)	158 (32.9)	105 (21.9)	61 (12.7)	18 (3.8)	2.30	1.13
A student pushed other students	67 (14.0)	92 (19.2)	88 (18.3)	111 (23.1)	122 (25.4)	3.27	1.39
A student roughen other students	74 (15.4)	108 (22.5)	117 (24.4)	106 (22.1)	75 (15.6)	3.00	1.30
A student slapped other students	215 (44.8)	143 (2.98)	70 (14.6)	35 (7.3)	17 (3.5)	1.95	1.10
A student kicked other students	174 (3.63)	136 (28.3)	89 (18.5)	55 (11.5)	26 (5.4)	2.21	1.20

**\*total of Mean score on physical bullying= 2.55; Standard Deviation = 0.91; n=480**

1= never (none);                               2= seldom (1 or 2 times a year)  
 3= rare (1 or 2 times a month);       4= often (1 or 2 times a week)  
 5= always (everyday);                     SD= Standard Deviation

Based on Table 5 it is shows that push other students was the most frequent physical bullying observed in the secondary school in Batu Pahat district with the Mean score 3.27 and Standard Deviation 1.39. It is contradict with the findings done by Borg (1999) who found that hurting students was the popular physical bullying that frequent happened among students.

**Table 6:** Four locations that bullying always happened in school (reported by Students)

Statements	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	SD
In classroom	131 (2.73)	90 (18.8)	87 (18.1)	73 (15.2)	99 (20.6)	2.83	1.49
Recess time	113 (23.5)	121 (25.2)	112 (23.3)	86 (17.9)	48 (10.0)	2.66	1.29
On the way to school	309 (64.4)	75 (15.6)	41 (8.5)	34 (7.1)	21 (4.4)	1.71	1.15
On the way from school	255 (53.1)	111 (23.1)	41 (8.5)	44 (9.2)	29 (6.0)	1.91	1.23

\*total mean score = 2.28                      Standard Deviation =0.93                      n= 480

1= never (none)                                      2= seldom (1 or 2 times a year)  
 3= rare (1 or 2 times a month)                      4= often (1 or 2 times a week)  
 5= always (everyday)                                      SD= Standard Deviation

Table 6 stated that classroom (Mean score =2.83, Standard Deviation= 1.49) is the location where bully often happened. It also happened during recess, on the way to and from school. It is similar to the findings by Olweus and Limber (1999), classroom is the location that bullying always been reported. Borg (1999) findings that bully always happened in the classroom, playground and followed by the road on the way to and from school and the school corridor.

**Table 7:** Students’ perception of reason to bully in school

Statements	SD	D	U	A	SA	Mean	SD
Just for fun	162 (33.8)	114 (23.8)	86 (17.9)	90 (18.8)	28 (5.8)	2.39	1.28
Because they hurt my feelings	40 (8.3)	69 (14.4)	103 (21.5)	187 (39.0)	81 (16.9)	3.42	1.17
Because they coward	145 (30.2)	138 (28.8)	134 (27.9)	44 (9.2)	19 (4.0)	2.28	1.11
To get reward or funding	187 (39.0)	91 (19.0)	81 (16.9)	83 (17.3)	38 (7.9)	2.36	1.35
To show how strong I am	174 36.3	107 22.3	107 22.3	51 10.6	41 8.5	2.33	1.29
Because they do it	134 (27.9)	113 (23.5)	129 (26.9)	79 (16.5)	25 (5.2)	2.48	1.21
To revenge	55 (11.5)	69 (14.4)	120 (25.0)	132 (27.5)	104 (21.7)	3.34	1.28

\*total Mean Score on reason to bully =2.66;                      Standard Deviation = 0.80;                      n= 480

SD = strongly disagree; D = disagree; U = Undecided; A= agree; SA = strongly agree  
 SD= Standard Deviation

Table 7 shows that the item ‘they hurt my feelings’ is the main reason of bully (Mean score = 3.42, different score = 1.17) reported by the secondary students of Batu Pahat district. It gives the opportunity for them fight back because other students doing it for pleasure. It is also an act to show their superiority towards the weaklings. Findings also shows that students perception on the reason to bullying other students were moderate (Mean score = 2.66, Standard Deviation = 0.80).

**Table 8:** Students’ Perception to discourage bully in school n=480

Teachers and students have to stop the bully	23 (4.8)	11 (2.3)	15 (3.1)	121 (25.2)	310 (64.6)	4.43	1.01
Teachers have to stop the bully	21 (4.4)	13 (2.7)	27 (5.6)	163 (34.0)	256 (53.3)	4.29	1.00
Students themselves have to stop the bully	15 (3.1)	13 (2.7)	69 (14.4)	161 (33.5)	222 (46.3)	4.17	0.98
Yourself has to stop bully when it happened on you	32 (6.7)	46 (9.6)	175 (36.5)	160 (33.3)	67 (14.0)	3.38	1.05
Teachers and students have to cooperate to stop bully	14 (2.9)	16 (3.3)	33 (6.9)	159 (33.1)	258 (53.8)	4.31	0.95
You can get help from someone to stop from being bully	21 (4.4)	32 (6.7)	129 (26.9)	187 (39.0)	111 (23.1)	3.70	1.04
You interested in discussing bully in school with another students to stop bully	41 (8.5)	54 (11.3)	152 (31.7)	151 (31.5)	82 (17.1)	3.37	1.15

\*total Mean Score to discourage bully = 3.95; Standard Deviation = 0.66

SD = strongly disagree; D = disagree; U = Undecided; A= agree; SD = strongly agree; SD= Standard Deviation

Table 8 shows that Secondary students in Batu Pahat district have high perception towards their ability on fight back and stop their friends from bullying them (Mean score =2.97), Standard Deviation 1.22). This research found that students’ desire to hurt or to pester other students jotted a lower score. This is further supported by research done by Boulton, Trueman and FleMeangton (2002). Students in the UK have the tendency towards the act of bullying and posses sympathy towards the victims. Salmivalli (2001) found that most of the students in south Finland have positive response towards bully and their ability to face the problems. As a whole, students’ perception towards discouraging bully is on the high level (Mean score = 3.95, Standard Deviation = 0.69). Most of the student beliefs that teachers and students have to realize that they have to stop bully (89.8 percent). They also agreed that cooperation between teachers and students stop the act of bully.

**Table 9:** Students perception on their ability to stop bullying in school n=480

Statement	TF	KB	TP	B	SB	Mean	SD
How you able to stop the bully from bullying you?	74 (15.4)	97 (20.2)	123 (25.6)	143 (29.8)	43 (9.0)	2.97	1.22
How you able to bully if you can to bully?	169 (35.2)	67 (14.0)	148 (30.8)	75 (15.6)	21 (4.4)	2.40	1.23
Have you intended to hurt or trouble others?	292 (60.8)	38 (7.9)	98 (20.4)	45 (9.4)	7 (1.5)	1.83	1.14
Have you think to involve in bullying?	252 (52.5)	39 (8.1)	127 (26.5)	37 (7.7)	25 (5.2)	2.10	1.25

\* Total Mean score =2.31 Standard Deviation = 0.76

TF = Never think of KB = not manage TP= not sure B = can manage

SB = really manage SD= Standard Deviation

Table 9 indicates that students from secondary school around Batu Pahat district, they stated that vandalism action such as breaking the school properties is a serious matter. This is also followed by issues of gangsterism, bullying and physical harassment, as well as verbal harrying, and threatening others during or outside schooling times. Initial research done by Henson, Massey and Armstrong (2002), also found that student who bring dangerous equipment to school and gangstericms in the school has jotted a low percentage. As a whole, students’ perceptions on safety in school were moderate. This has shows that they are aware towards the safety issues in school.

**Table 10:** Students’ perception on safeties in school

Statements	TM	M	SD	SR	PS	Mean	SD
Verbal threatening among students	79 (16.5)	82 (17.1)	178 (37.1)	87 (18.1)	54 (11.3)	2.91	1.21
Threatening to hurt other students on the way to school	121 (25.2)	104 (21.7)	120 (25.0)	92 (19.2)	43 (9.0)	2.65	1.29
Threatening to hurt other students on the way home	98 (20.4)	122 (25.4)	103 (21.5)	113 (23.5)	44 (9.2)	2.76	1.27
Physical harassment	58 (12.1)	115 (24.0)	140 (29.2)	96 (20.0)	71 (14.8)	3.01	1.23
Bullying	33 (6.9)	86 (17.9)	146 (30.4)	155 (32.3)	60 (12.5)	3.26	1.10
Gangster activities among students	60 (12.5)	88 (18.3)	110 (22.9)	100 (20.8)	122 (25.4)	3.28	1.35
Vandalism	34 (7.1)	74 (15.4)	148 (30.8)	132 (27.5)	92 (19.2)	3.36	1.16

**\*total Mean score = 3.03      Standard Deviation = 0.91      n=480**

TM = no problems; M= Mean; SD = moderate; SR = serious; PS = too serious  
SD – Standard Deviation

Table 10 shows that out of 480 respondents, only 109 (22.7 percent) respondents said that they had become the victims of bully. 2.5 percent of them said that they were being bullied everyday, 2.7 percent said they were being bullied for 1 or 2 times a week, 5.6 percent said that they were often being bullied (1 to 2 times a month) and 11.9 said that they were seldom being bullied (1 to 2 times a year). It is clearly observed that the findings show a significant event in secondary school at Batu Pahat district to be in low percentage (Mean score = 1.41, Standard Deviation = 0.91). The report shows that the frequency of bully in secondary school in Batu Pahat is lower than the findings done by Smith and Sharp(1994), who found that UK reported 4 percent of their students being bullied at least once in a week.

Based on this report, the findings found that verbal abuse is the most bullying act than the physical act. In contrast to report done by students who witnessed the bullying action said that the victims experienced verbal bullying, followed by flouting, cursing others with bad names, torment by jeers, fighting and lastly threatening to hurt them. According to the victims, most of them were being physically provoked hence, resulting to a more violence actions such as slapping and kicking.



**Table 11:** Frequency of bully in school

Statements	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	SD
Do you being bully in school this year?	371 (77.3)	57 (11.9)	27 (5.6)	13 (2.7)	12 (2.5)	1.41	0.91
A students had flout to make me mad	13 (2.7)	20 (4.2)	32 (6.7)	21 (4.4)	23 (4.8)	3.19	1.29
A student had jeers me	14 (2.9)	28 (5.8)	30 (6.3)	17 (3.5)	20 (4.2)	3.01	1.29
A students asked me to fight	55 (11.5)	27 (5.6)	12 (3.5)	9 (1.9)	6 (1.3)	1.94	1.20
A students had called me with bad names	19 (4.0)	19 (4.0)	25 (5.2)	17 (3.5)	29 (6.0)	3.17	1.44
A students had threatening that will hurt me	65 (13.5)	23 (4.8)	13 (2.7)	7 (1.5)	1 (0.2)	1.68	0.98
A students had hurting my feelings	10 (2.1)	27 (5.6)	18 (3.8)	22 (4.6)	32 (6.7)	3.36	1.37
A student had hit me	48 (10.0)	31 (6.5)	19 (4.0)	10 (2.1)	1 (0.2)	1.95	1.03
A student had push me	31 (6.5)	27 (5.6)	25 (5.2)	16 (3.3)	10 (2.1)	2.51	1.30
A student had harsh on me	42 (8.8)	31 (6.5)	17 (3.5)	15 (3.1)	4 (0.8)	2.16	1.19
A student had slapped me	74 (15.4)	22 (4.6)	9 (1.9)	2 (0.4)	2 (0.4)	1.50	0.87
A student had kick me	66 (13.8)	21 (4.4)	8 (1.7)	10 (2.1)	4 (0.8)	1.76	1.15

\*total Mean score of verbal bullying =2.72

\*total Mean score of physical bullying = 1.97

1= never (none);

3= rare (1 or 2 times a month)

5= always (everyday)

Standard Deviation=0.85; n= 109

Standard Deviation = 0.80 n = 109

2= seldom (1 or 2 times a year)

4= often (1 or 2 times a week)

SD= Standard Deviation

Table 11 shows that most of the victims are teenagers. The findings was found to be differ to Perry, Williard and Perry (1990), who found that teenagers only show low empathy towards the bully victims. Furthermore, findings show that the bully victims had no confident in their school authorities to solve the problem. This is probably because teachers Spent limited time discussing these problems with their students in class (Charach, Pepler and Ziegler, 1995).

The findings also found that school managements have less attention to address this problem and treat it as Minor issue. Crozier and Skliopidou (2002) found that teachers have taken less action when the victims refer this problem to them. Borg (1998) also found that teachers’ refusal to care for the bully victims have ignited hatred mentally and emotionally.

**Table 12:** the bully victim’s References

<b>statements</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
Your mother	54 (11.3)	55 (11.5)	1.50	0.50
Your father	29 (6.0)	80 (16.7)	1.27	0.44
Your teacher	18 (3.8)	91 (19.0)	1.17	0.37
Your principal	1 (0.20)	108 (22.5)	1.01	0.10
Your school counselor	6 (1.3)	103 (21.5)	1.06	0.23
Your friend	92 (19.2)	17 (3.5)	1.84	0.36

\*total Mean score = 1.69 Standard Deviation=0.22 n= 109

Y = Yes N = No SD = Standard Deviation

**(ii). Teachers Perception towards bully**

In contrast to students report, teachers of secondary school in Batu Pahat district reported that the frequency of bullying is low (Mean score = 2.31, Standard Deviation = 0.68). However, teachers and students agreed that verbal bullying is the most compare to physical bullying. This finding is contradict to findings made by Hazler et, al.(2001), who found that teachers observe more physical bullying to occurred than verbal bullying. Verbal bullying such as flout, hurt feelings, calling bad names are likely to occur followed by physical bullying such as fighting and hurting others. Teachers reported that hurting other students is the most physical bullying which is followed by pushing, hitting, kicking and lastly slapping.

**Table 12:** Frequency of verbal bullying and physical bullying (Teachers report)

Statements	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	SD
Students flout other students to make them mad.	11 (13.8)	16 (20.0)	16 (20.0)	17 (21.3)	20 (25.0)	3.24	1.39
A student jeers other students	3 (3.8)	22 (27.5)	16 (20.0)	18 (22.5)	21 (26.3)	3.40	1.25
A students fight with other students	30 (37.5)	37 (46.3)	7 (8.8)	6 (7.5)	0 (0.00)	1.86	0.87
A student calling bad names on other students	3 (3.8)	26 (32.5)	22 (27.5)	14 (17.5)	5 (18.8)	3.15	1.18
A student threatening to hit and to injure other students	38 (47.5)	35 (43.8)	3 (3.8)	4 (5.00)	0 (0.00)	1.66	0.78
A students hurt other students feelings	1 (1.3)	25 (31.3)	22 (27.5)	19 (23.8)	13 (16.3)	3.23	1.10
A students beating other students	23 (28.8)	38 (47.5)	11 (13.8)	7 (8.8)	1 (1.3)	2.06	0.95
A student pushing other students	22 (27.5)	26 (32.5)	19 (23.8)	11 (13.8)	2 (2.5)	2.31	1.10
A student hitting other students	12 (15.0)	35 (43.8)	20 (25.0)	12 (15.0)	1 (1.3)	2.44	0.97
A student slapping other students	47 (58.8)	26 (32.5)	3 (3.8)	4 (5.0)	0 (0.00)	1.56	0.79
A student kicking other students	41 (51.3)	28 (35.0)	5 (6.3)	6 (7.5)	0 (0.00)	1.70	0.89

\* **Total Mean score frequent of verbal bullying = 2.76**      **Standard Deviation = 0.84**      **n= 80**

\* **Total Mean score frequent of physical bullying = 2.01**      **Standard Deviation = 0.78**      **n= 80**

1=never (don't have)

2= rare (1 to 2 times a year)

3 = seldom (1 to 2 times a month)

4 = often (1 to 2 times a week)

5 = always (everyday)

SD = Standard Deviation

Teachers agreed with students that classroom is the most locations happened bully, followed by during recess time, on the way to and from school.

**Table 12:** Frequent bullying happened in 4 locations in school (students report)

Statements	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	SD
In classroom	15 (18.8)	22 (27.5)	23 (28.8)	8 (10.0)	12 (15.0)	2.75	1.30
Recess time	13 (16.3)	39 (48.8)	18 (22.5)	9 (11.3)	1 (1.3)	2.33	0.92
On the way to school	50 (62.5)	24 (30.0)	4 (5.0)	2 (2.5)	0 (0.00)	1.48	0.71
On the way from school	51 (63.8)	20 (25.0)	7 (8.8)	2 (2.5)	0 (0.00)	1.50	0.76

\***total Mean score = 2.01**      **Standard Deviation = 0.67**      **n = 80**

1=never (don't have)

2 = rare (1 to 2 times a year)

3 = seldom (1 to 2 times a month)

4 = often (1 to 2 times a week)

5 = always (everyday)

SD = Standard Deviation

### (iii). Teachers perceptions on bullying

Both students and teachers agree that bullying act should be discouraged from happening (Mean score = 4.31, Standard Deviation = 0.53). Most teachers (95.3 percent) said that teachers and students have to cooperate to stop bully in school. The finding shows that teachers have positive perception towards discouraging bullying in school.

**Table 13:** Teachers' perception of bully

Statements	STS	TS	TP	S	SB	Mean	SD
Teachers and students have to realize to stop bully	1 (1.3)	0 (0.00)	2 (2.5)	32 (40.0)	45 (56.3)	4.50	0.68
Teachers have to try to stop bully	1 (1.3)	0 (0.00)	3 (3.8)	37 (46.3)	39 (48.8)	4.41	0.69
Students have to stop bully	1 (1.3)	1 (1.3)	4 (5.0)	31 (38.8)	43 (53.8)	4.43	0.76
You have to stop bully when it happened	2 (2.5)	3 (3.8)	7 (8.8)	39 (48.8)	29 (36.3)	4.13	0.91
Teachers and students have to cooperate to stop bully	1 (1.3)	0 (0.00)	2 (2.5)	27 (33.8)	50 (62.5)	4.56	0.67
Students can get help to stop bully	4 (5.0)	3 (3.8)	7 (8.8)	40 (50.0)	26 (32.5)	4.01	1.01
You are interested to talk on bully in school with other students to stop bully	0 (0.00)	4 (5.0)	7 (8.8)	45 (56.3)	24 (30.0)	4.11	0.76

**\*total Mean score = 2.01                      Standard Deviation = 0.53                      n= 80**  
 STS =really not agree TS = not agree TP= not sure S = agree SB= really agreed  
 SD = Standard Deviation

According to the teachers, reprisal is the main reason for bullying to repeat itself. In addition, other reasons are abusing others emotion, display of authorities, pleasures, weaklings, imitating others as well as financial wise. In contrast to students’ perception they stated that “somebody had hurt my feelings” is the most reason given by them. The differences between these perceptions show that teachers have less experience in confronting and handling this sort of problem. Douglas et. Al. (1999), found that teachers have realize bully. Hazler et. al. (2001), suggest the professional especially teachers have to be train to understand the behavior.

**Table 14:** Teacher perception on bully

Statements	STS	TS	TP	S	SB	Mean	SD
For fun	5 (6.3)	4 (5.0)	16 (20.0)	42 (52.5)	13 (16.3)	3.68	1.02
Because they hurt my feelings	3 (3.8)	3 (3.8)	19 (23.8)	45 (56.3)	10 (12.5)	3.70	0.88
Because they are coward	16 (20.0)	16 (20.0)	37 (46.3)	7 (8.8)	4 (5.0)	2.59	1.06
To get money	8 (10.0)	9 (11.3)	26 (32.5)	33 (41.3)	4 (5.0)	3.20	1.05
To show power	2 (2.5)	7 (8.8)	16 (20.0)	44 (55.0)	11 (13.8)	3.69	0.91
Because others is doing it	3 (3.8)	7 (8.8)	27 (33.8)	41 (51.3)	2 (2.5)	3.40	0.84
To get revenge	0 (0.00)	3 (3.8)	16 (20.0)	54 (67.5)	7 (8.8)	3.81	0.64

**\* total Mean score=3.44                      Standard Deviation=0.49                      n=80**  
 STS =really not agree                      TS = not agree TP= not sure S = agree  
 SB= really agreed                      SD = Standard Deviation

**(iv). Intervention program done by school management to overcome bully**

As a whole, research found that there is a successful intervention program that can overcome this problem at district level, although it is moderately recorded. Smith and Ananiadou (2003) found that school-based intervention program has multi effect to reduce the level of bully in school. In this research, most of the teachers believe that updating the school regulation and discipline board is the

most effective intervention program in order to overcome bully in school. However, only a few of the intervention programs which train students to manage their anger and conflict resolution technique has fail to overcome bully in school. Only 48.8 percent of teachers stated that intervention program has effectively managed their anger in order to reduce bullying in school. Whereas, 52.2 percent of them stated that conflict resolution program effectively could overcome the problem in school. This is further supported by Trump and Kenneth (1999) who found that the two programs will not entirely guarantee the school's safety.

Furthermore, school involvement and collaboration with outside party such as police department will help the school to reduce as well as to prevent bully in school. The findings found teachers (80.1 percent) believe ‘adopted school’ collaboration with the police is effective to overcome bully. Parents’ involvements in intervention program help to overcome bully are also crucial.

53 teachers (66.3 percent) said that full involvement of parents towards school program also help to overcome bully. This is further supported by Banks and Stephanie (2000), who found that collaboration between school communities, parents and society will successfully ensure the safety of the environment.

**Table 15:** Teachers perception on the effective of intervene program to overcome Bully

Statements	STB	TB	TP	B	SB	Mean	Sd
Implantation of dismiss students from schooling when they founded guilty	2 (2.5)	5 (6.3)	21 (26.3)	46 (57.5)	6 (7.5)	3.61	0.82
Train students the technique of anger management	1 (1.3)	6 (7.5)	34 (42.5)	33 (41.3)	6 (7.5)	3.46	0.79
Train students conflict resolution and within teenagers	1 (1.3)	10 (12.5)	27 (33.8)	40 (50.0)	2 (2.5)	3.40	0.79
Train students to accept multi racial and culture	1 (1.3)	5 (6.3)	20 (25.0)	44 (55.0)	10 (12.5)	3.71	0.81
Existence of policies that not tolerate with drugs, alcohol and weapons in school	2 (2.5)	6 (7.5)	25 (31.3)	39 (48.8)	8 (10.0)	3.56	0.87
Counselor to help and observe students	3 (2.5)	9 (7.5)	14 (31.3)	39 (48.8)	8 (10.0)	3.56	0.87
Mentor for new teachers	5 (6.3)	6 (7.5)	31 (38.8)	35 (43.8)	3 (3.8)	3.31	0.91
Complete involvement of parent in school program	2 (2.5)	10 (12.5)	15 (18.8)	43 (53.8)	10 (12.5)	3.61	0.95
Multi co- curriculum activities	1 (1.3)	10 (12.5)	8 (10.0)	51 (63.8)	10 (12.5)	3.74	0.88
Healthy school program	1 (1.3)	9 (11.3)	18 (22.5)	43 (53.8)	9 (11.3)	3.63	0.88
Social skills	1 (1.3)	8 (10.0)	24 (30.0)	38 (47.5)	9 (11.3)	3.58	0.87
Train students on Leadership	0 (0.00)	8 (10.0)	12 (15.0)	48 (60.0)	12 (15.0)	3.80	0.81
Discipline school board	0 (0.00)	4 (5.0)	6 (7.5)	55 (68.8)	15 (18.8)	4.01	0.68
School regulation	1 (1.3)	4 (5.0)	8 (10.0)	51 (63.8)	16 (20.0)	3.96	0.79
Teacher observation at the bus stop or outside school compound	4 (5.0)	7 (8.8)	19 (23.8)	42 (52.5)	8 (10.0)	3.54	0.97
Adopted school program	2 (2.5)	1 (1.3)	13 (16.3)	51 (63.8)	13 (16.3)	3.90	0.77

**\*total Mean score = 3.65                      Standard Deviation = 0.55**

STS =really not agree TS = not agree TP= not sure S = agree

SB= really agreed SD = Standard Deviation

## **Suggestion**

Based on the findings, discussion and conclusion done, researcher likes to give few suggestion for Education Ministry, Education State Department, principal, teachers and parents especially Batu Pahat district.

- (i) Ministry of Education can make a plan of model program anti bully to discourage bully in school. The model can be reference to all school in Malaysia. It can be the sample plan to discourage bully
- (ii) Ministry of Education plans a program to train new teachers how to handle bully in school. It will help the teacher to identify bully symptom from the start and take action to discourage bully so that no students will experience bully. Teachers should sensitive toward the earliest stage of bully and students report on bully. They have to take fast and wisely actions.
- (iii) Existence of clear school regulations that stop students from bully or become the victim of bully. A clear safety procedure has to be made to free the environment from bullies' influences. Realization on bully is to avoid bully. They should be train with skills that can be identify and stop bully.
- (iv) Parents involvement in every intervene program held by the schools. Collaboration such as the communities, police, and state district department should be observed to stop bully during to and from school.

## **Suggestion for Future Research**

Findings have approved the early findings and assumptions towards students and teachers perception on bully in secondary school. However continuous findings need to be further approved to find other factors that influence this behaviour. Further research can be done through:

- (i) Research on teachers and students perception on bully in eight secondary schools of Batu Pahat district. Continuing research should involve all the secondary school in Batu Pahat district (25 schools) to get more information to approve the findings. Respondents of each school best represent 50 percent of the population.
- (ii) The research on teachers and students perception on bully among secondary students in Batu Pahat district is based on quantitative. It is best if the research can combine quantitative with qualitative. It will give more meaning than the earlier findings.
- (iii) The research just based on the perception on teachers and students. It will be meaningful if it is also finding out the parents perception on bully. The findings can be understood on parents' perception towards their children experience on bully.
- (iv) The research does not conquer victims experience totally. It is meaningful if researcher can find out victims perception on bully. Effect on their emotional and physically
- (v) Findings show that victims not go to counselors for help. Therefore in future research should find out why this happened.

## **Conclusion**

Teachers and students were agreed about the fact that they should together be concerned and helping each other to stop bullying in school. Students bullying desire were at low level. There is no significant difference between male and female students on their perception on bullying behaviour in secondary schools. Vandalism or destroying schools properties were the serious safety issues in school reported by the students. When having problems about bullying, friends were the most frequently referred to by the students compared to others in schools. Intervention programs indicated significant association with the prevalence of bullying in schools at moderate level. School based intervention programs such as school regulation and school's board of discipline were the most efficient programs to stop and to handle these problems in secondary schools. Full participation from parents and community can help to

stop bullying in schools. Results also showed that the role of the school's counselor should be increased.

## References

- [1] Azizi Yahaya, Shahrin Hashim, Jamaludin Ramli, Yusof Boon & Abdul Rahim Hamdan (2006). *Mastering Research Method*. Kuala Lumpur: PTS Professional Publishing Sdn. Bhd. ISBN 983-3585-83-3
- [2] Azizi Yahaya & Jaafar Sidek Latif (2005). *Development of Self Concept*, Pahang: PTS Publishing Sdn Bhd.
- [3] Azizi Yahaya., & Kamaliah Nordin. (2006). *Relationship Between Self Concepts, Motivation And Parenting Styles Effected Students Achievements*. Unpublished article, Universiti Technology Malaysia.
- [4] Azizi Yahaya, Jamaludin Ramli, Shahrin Hashim, Mohd. Ali Ibrahim and Zurihanmi Zakaria *The Correlation between School, Class and Co-Curriculum Truancy on the Academic Performance of Students from Selected Secondary Schools of Skudai District, Johor Bahru* *Journal of Social Sciences* 5 (4): 362-369, 2009 ISSN 1549-3652 2009 Science Publications
- [5] Borg, M. G. 1998. The emotional reactions of school bullies and their victims. *Educational Psychology*. 18: 433-444.
- [6] Borg, M. G. 1999. The Extent and Nature of Bullying Among Primary and Secondary School Children. *Educational Research*. 41:137-153.
- [7] Boulton M.J., M. Trueman and I. FleMeangton 2002. Associations between Secondary School Pupils' Definitions of Bullying, Attitudes towards Bullying, and Tendencies to Engage in Bullying: age and sex differences. *Educational Studies*. 28(4):353-370
- [8] Charach, A., D.J. Pepler and S. Ziegler 1995. Bullying at School: A Canadian Perspective. *Education Canada*. 3: 12–18.
- [9] Crozier W.R. and E. Skliopidou 2002. Adult Recollections of Name-calling at School. *Educational psychology*. 22(1), 13-124
- [10] Dawkins J. 1995. Bullying in schools: doctors' responsibilities. *British Medical Journal*. 310:274-5.
- [11] Douglas N., I. Warwick, G. Whitty, P. Aggleton and S. Kemp 1999. Homophobic bullying in secondary schools in England and Wales - teachers' experiences. *Health Education*. 99(2):53-60
- [12] Greenbaum, S., B. Turner, and R.M. Stephens 1989. *Set straight on bullies*. Malibu, CA: National School Safety Center.
- [13] Gumpel, T.P., and H. Meadan 2000. Children's Perception of School-Based Violence. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*. 70: 391-404.
- [14] Haynie, D. L., T.R. Nansel, P. Eitel, A.D. Crump, K. Saylor, K. Yu and B. Simons-Morton 2001. Bullies, Victims, and Bully/Victims: Distinct Groups of At-Risk Youth. *Journal of Early Adolescence*. 21(1): 29-49.
- [15] Hazler R. J., D.L Miller, J.V. Carney and S. Green 2001. Adult recognition of school Bullying situations. *Educational Research*. 43(2):133-146
- [16] Henson, K., O. Massey, and K. Armstrong 2002. *Student Perceptions of School Safety: Results of the 20001 Omnibus Survey*. Tampa, FL: The Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute, University of South Florida. FMHI Publication
- [17] LagerSDetz, K.M., K. Bjorqvist and T. Peltonen 1988. Is Indirect Aggression More Typical of Females? Gender Differences in Aggressiveness in 11 and 12-Year Old Children. *Aggressive Behavior*. 14: 403-414.
- [18] Massey, O.T., K. Armstrong, G. Santoro 2000. *School Safety Survey*. Tampa, FL: The Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute, University of South Florida. FMHI Publication.

- [19] Nansel, T. R., M. Overpeck, R.S. Pilla, W.J. Ruan, B. Simons-Morton, and P. Scheidt, 2001. Bullying behaviors among US youth: Prevalence and Association with Psychosocial Adjustment. *Journal of the American Medical Association*. 285: 2094-2100.
- [20] Olweus, D., and S. Limber 1999. Bullying prevention program. In D. S. Elliot (Ed.), *Blueprints for violence prevention*. Denver, CO: C&M Press.Orpinas P and S. Kelder 1995. *Students for Peace Project*. Second student evaluation. Houston, TX: University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston, SchoolOf Public Health.
- [21] Perry, D. G., J. Williard, and L.C. Perry 1990. Peers' Perceptions of the Consequences that Victimized Children Provide Aggressors. *Child Development*. 61: 1310–1325.
- [22] Rigby, K. and P.T. Slee 1995. *Manual for the Peer Relations Questionnaire*. Underdale: University of South Australia.
- [23] Salmivalli, C. 2001. Peer-Led Intervention Campaign against School Bullying: Who Considered it Useful, Who Benefited? *Educational Research*. 43: 263-278.
- [24] Smith P.K. and K. Ananiadou 2003. The Nature of School Bullying and the Effectiveness of School-Based Interventions. *Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies*. 5(2):189-209
- [25] Smith, P. and S. Sharp 1994. The Problem of School Bullying. In P.K. Smith & S. Sharp (Eds.) *School Bullying Insights and Perspectives*. London: Routledge.Trump and S. Kenneth 1999. Scared or Prepared: Reducing Risks with School Security Assessments. *High School Magazine*. 6(7):18-23
- [26] Wilson, A. 1992. Preventing and Responding To Bullying In School. *The Canadian School Executive*, 5:9-12.
- [27] Ziegler, S. and M. Rosenstein-Manner 1991. *Bullying at School: Toronto in an International Context*. Toronto: Toronto Board of Education, Research Services.