

Anna Alajbeg

Correlation between the level of victimization and the quality of family interaction, school attachment, and social self-efficacy

Abstract: The aim of this paper is to analyze and explain the correlations between the level of victimization and the quality of family interaction, school attachment, and social self-efficacy. The study included 715 students (54% girls and 46% boys) from both seventh ($N = 370$) and eighth ($N = 345$) grades from different regions of the Republic of Croatia; the average age was 13.22 years ($SD = 0.664$). Along with the General Data Questionnaire, measuring instruments used for this paper were the Quality of Family Interaction Scale (KOBI), the School Bonding Scale, the School Anxiety Scale, the Social Self-Efficacy Scale, and the adapted Participant Role Questionnaire (PRQ). A descriptive analysis showed that the largest number of victims experienced verbal (occasionally: 48.8%; often: 18.6%) and relational violence (occasionally: 30.6%; often: 12.3%). The correlation analysis showed a weak but statistically significant negative correlation between the quality of family interaction and the level of victimization, a negative correlation between school bonding and fear of school with the level of victimization, and a negative correlation between social self-efficacy and the level of victimization. The results of this research may serve as a great starting point for further research and may pose important implications for creating preventive programs to reduce and prevent both bullying and cyberbullying nationwide.

Keywords: victimization, peer violence, quality of family interaction, school bonding, social self-efficacy

UDC: 37.015.4

Scientific article

Introduction

Violence among children has always existed, both inside and outside school; however, awareness regarding the seriousness of this problem as well as the adverse consequences for participating children has only recently increased.

The terms “bullying” and “peer violence” first started being used in the United Kingdom during the 1990s and were considered types of aggressive behavior (Rivers et al. 2007). Regarding peer violence, Dan Olweus (1998) stated that a student is abused or victimized when repeatedly and permanently exposed to negative actions by one or more peers, and that a victimized child has difficulties when trying to defend himself from violent behavior. Due to a higher incidence of violent behavior, peer abuse is a more difficult form of bullying than peer violence and implies a lower occurrence of attacks (occasionally [1-3 times in the last few months] or less frequently) (Olweus 1999). Recently, another form of violent behavior emerged, which is currently known as cyberbullying (Hinduja and Patchin 2008). Cyberbullying implies violent behavior through the use of electronic devices (text messages, e-mail, websites, online games, social networks). Research shows that many children and young people are involved in both traditional and electronic forms of peer violence. Although different researchers use different methodologies, most studies have found that most children are exposed to more verbal violence, which occurs in 53% (Wang et al. 2009; Vieno et al. 2011) to 76% of children (Stockdale et al. 2002), than both relational violence (disruption of relationships, gossiping, etc.), which occurs in 51% (Wang et al. 2009; Vieno et al. 2011) to 77.6% of children (Rajhvajn Bulat and Ajduković 2012), and physical violence, which occurs in 20% (Wang et al. 2009) to 66% of children (Stockdale et al. 2002). Cyberbullying also shows considerable variability in victimization rates, ranging from 4% (Ybarra and Mitchell 2004) to 72% (Juvonen and Gross 2008). Levels of committing cyberbullying also vary along the range from 3% (Kowalski and Witte 2006) to 55% (Li 2006). Raskauskas and Stoltz (2007) stated that victims of traditional peer violence are more likely to also become victims of cyberbullying. Previous research has found that children who have experienced peer violence possess more health-, emotion-, and school-related problems than those who have not been victimized. The most

frequent consequences of perceived peer violence are anxiety (Fekkes et al. 2004) and depression (Wang et al. 2011). It was also discovered that victims of peer violence have a significantly greater risk of experiencing psychosomatic problems (Gini and Pozzoli 2009). Experienced peer violence is also reflected in educational achievements. Victims often avoid classes, do not like going to school, and receive bad grades (Kowalski and Limber 2013; Wang et al. 2014).

Regarding the gender of victims of traditional and electronic peer violence, research results are ambiguous. According to some research (Beckman et al. 2013), there is no gender preference regarding traditional peer violence victims, while other research (Wang et al. 2009) found that boys are more often victims of physical and verbal violence and girls are more often victims of relational violence. Furthermore, some authors (Underwood and Rosen 2011) found that there are no gender differences among victims of electronic violence, while others (Wang et al. 2009) state that girls are much more frequently victims of electronic violence than are boys. Such results may be interpreted in a way that implies authors conduct their research among different age groups of respondents, use different measuring instruments and methods of data processing, and therefore fail to obtain consistent results. In terms of age, previous researchers (Kowalski and Limber 2007, Vandebosch and Van Cleemput 2009) found that younger children are more frequently victims of traditional violence, while older children are more frequently victims of electronic violence; this disparity exists because adolescents generally possess more advanced social and communicative skills than younger children but are still emotionally immature, which is why they more commonly use indirect forms of violence.

Recent research also links socioeconomic status of the family with the occurrence of peer violence. Tippett and Wolke (2014) conducted a systematic review of 28 studies that concerned the socioeconomic status and role of both bullies and victims and concluded that victims are more likely to originate from a family of low socioeconomic status. Sušac et al. (2016) conducted a survey of 3,470 students in both fifth and seventh grades of primary school and second grade of secondary school. They found that victims in all age groups are more frequently from below average material status compared to children who do not experience violence. With gender, age, school achievement, and socioeconomic status of the family being the most commonly investigated variables of peer violence, some research (Jansen et al. 2012) also mentions the role of parent education. The study by Jansen et al. (2012), conducted in the Netherlands on a sample of 6,379 pre-school children, found that a lower level of parental education was associated with victimization. Peer violence is also greatly affected by family interactions, where the relationship between children and parents is particularly important (Veenstra et al. 2005; Georgiou 2008).

The role of quality family interaction

The role of parents in child development is extremely important. According to Ronald Rohner's parental acceptance-rejection theory (1999), the basic dimension of parental behavior is emotionality; this dimension consists of two poles: accep-

tance and rejection from parents. However, the basic objection to the concept of acceptance/rejection is that there is apparently only a continuum from acceptance to rejection. Acceptance implies greater mutual intimacy, trust, and understanding between the child and the mother/father. Rejection means that a child experiences more prohibition, coercion, and neglect by the mother/father. Parental acceptance is what is implied by quality family interactions (Vulić Prtorić 2002).

Previous research (Georgiou 2008) shows that parental rejection is connected to the of experience of peer victimization. In their research, Sušac et al. (2016) stated that, in most age groups (fifth and seventh grades of primary school and second grade of secondary school) and types of domestic violence, perpetrators/victims is the group with the largest number of those who experience violence in the family, followed by the victims group, and then followed by the perpetrators group. The same authors pointed out that the difference between victims and perpetrators (indicating greater exposure of victims to domestic violence) is the most obvious factor regarding the experience of psychological abuse in the family. Contrary to negative attitudes of parents toward children or parental rejection, Georgiou (2008) pointed out that a child's excessive attachment to one or both parents and an exceptionally protective relationship between a parent and a child may limit the development of the child's social skills as well as the child's ability to effectively solve peer problems, often transforming the child into a passive and obedient individual and a consequently easy target for the perpetrator. Victimization is also associated with greater involvement of parents in the child's educational responsibilities, which can be reflected in the lack of the child's self-confidence as he develops the perception of being unable to perform his school responsibilities independently (Nansel et al. 2004).

Given that children spend most of their time in a family environment, patterns of their behavior are most often associated with different family interactions. School is the environment in which children spend the most time away from home, so school variables should also be examined.

The role of school bonding

The school environment is where the child is influenced by various factors that can significantly contribute to his development either in a positive or negative way, and thus greatly determines the direction of developmental outcomes. Osher et al. (2014) stated that school bonding, following family affiliation, is the most important protective factor for the healthy emotional development of the child. School bonding is first mentioned in the Social Control Theory of Travis Warner Hirsch (1969) and is subsequently mentioned in the Social Development Model by Catalano and Hawkins (1996), the latter of which represents an upgrade from Hirsch's theories (Roviš and Bezinović 2011). In the aforementioned theory and model, school bonding is categorized by attachment, commitment, and involvement. Roviš and Bezinović (2011, p. 187) pointed out that inclusion is a prerequisite for bonding with school, and it can only be observed through dimensions of attachment

and commitment. The same authors described attachment as what an individual feels for his school and his teachers, such as how much he cares about the school and the relationships he forms within it, while commitment to school implies a level of willingness to invest time and effort into activities that arise from school relationships and requirements (i.e., regularity of studying and doing homework, good time organization and efficient study plans, and the effort invested in achieving better academic success).

Recent studies (Cunningham 2007; Schneider et al. 2012) found that low school attendance is also associated with the experience of victimization and violent behaviors. According to research by Schneider et al. (2012) conducted on 20,406 American students in ninth and twelfth grades, victims of traditional violence (20.6%) are least attached to school, followed by perpetrators/victims of traditional violence (14.9%), followed by victims of electronic violence (7.9%). In her survey conducted on a sample of 1,012 Belgrade students in the higher grades of elementary school, Popović Čitić (2012) arrived at the conclusion that non-violent students are most strongly invested in school, while poor attachment to school is a characteristic observed in victimized students. In a Croatian study conducted on a sample of 1,927 high school students, Roviš and Bezinović (2011) found that experiencing physical peer violence has a strongly negative effect on feeling attached to school and causes victims to perceive school as a dangerous and repulsive place. The authors claim that physical abuse has proven to be significant for attachment, but not for commitment, which points to conceptual differences in dimensions of commitment and attachment. Fear of school is also connected to attachment to school, but fear of school was found to be a statistically insignificant predictor of school attachment and a significantly positive predictor for school commitment. A great expression of fear of school is associated with a higher level of commitment and effort for meeting school requirements.

While some students enjoy attending school to learn and socialize with peers, going to school is a fear for others that often leads to various behavioral, emotional, and psychosomatic problems. Fear of school is most commonly associated with the educational process, but the influence of student relationships must also be taken into account. In this regard, special attention is paid to students' exposure to peer violence or victimization (Astor et al. 2006); children who have experienced peer violence may develop a fear of school because they perceive it as an unsafe place (Olweus 1998). Fear of school can manifest itself in a variety of ways, including: the child is reluctant to go to school, the child forgets his homework, the child fears being tested, and the child is afraid of a teacher or a parent (Brajša-Žganec et al. 2009). Along with the fear of school, there also exists the fear of possible exposure to peer violence, which is reflected in greater absenteeism, less motivation for studying, and consequently poorer educational achievements (Juvonen et al. 2000).

Recently, studying the role of family and school in different behaviors of children has been expanded with research on the role of peers regarding child development. Bandura (1977) stated that peers also affect on the development of the child's self-efficacy, which is particularly important for peer violence.

The role of social self-efficacy

Social self-efficacy refers to the perceived ability to initiate social contacts and develop new friendships as well as develop assertiveness (Bandura 1977, Vulić-Prtorić, and Sorić 2006). Children with greater self-confidence also have more social self-efficacy and often achieve a higher status in their peer group. Puckett et al. (2008) stated that social self-efficacy is positively associated with perceived popularity. Popular children are often involved in peer groups of similar levels of self-efficacy and prosocial behavior that model and mutually reinforce prosocial behavior. Bandura (1977) stated that one of the sources of self-efficacy assessment is the child's perception of how others behave, and peers are undoubtedly a natural comparison group in which the child can perceive which actions they are capable of performing. The success or failure of a child's varying behavior in relation to his peers can affect the estimation of self-efficacy. Children with higher levels of self-efficacy choose more challenging tasks and situations, invest more effort, are more persistent, and experience less anxiety than children with lower levels of self-efficacy (McCormick and McPherson 2003). Self-efficacy can be affected by various physical and emotional states such as tiredness, pain, or moods that can temporarily decrease these levels (Puckett et al. 2008). In previous research (Erozkan and Deniz 2012), it has been consistently indicated that children who are more lonely, depressive, and socially anxious exhibit lower levels of social self-efficacy. Victims of peer violence have low self-esteem, low self-respect, and weak social skills, and are therefore more frequently exposed to victimization (Brajša-Žganec et al. 2009); however, due to these characteristics, they also often possess lower levels of social self-efficacy (Benight and Bandura 2004).

In the research conducted thus far, the correlation between family interactions and school bonding with victimization was analyzed individually, but there is insufficient research that examines the connection between victimization and some family, school, and peer factors, which was the ultimate purpose of this paper.

Methodology

The aim of this paper is to analyze and explain the correlation between the level of victimization and the quality of family interaction, school attachment, and social self-efficacy. In accordance with the research purpose, the following research questions and hypotheses have been set:

Research question 1: Is there a correlation between the level of victimization and the quality of family interactions?

H1: There is a negative correlation between the level of victimization and acceptance from mother and father as well as family satisfaction, and a positive correlation with the rejection from mother and father.

Research question 2: Is there a correlation between the level of victimization and school bonding?

H2: There is a negative correlation between the level of victimization and school bonding.

Research question 3: Is there a correlation between the level of victimization and the fear of school?

H3: There is a positive correlation between the level of victimization and the fear of school.

Research question 4: Is there a correlation between the level of victimization and social self-efficacy?

H4: There is a negative correlation between the level of victimization and social self-efficacy.

Participants

The study was conducted on 715 students from seven primary schools in different regions of the Republic of Croatia (Central Croatia, Northwestern Croatia, Eastern Croatia, Istria, Primorje, and Dalmatia). Gender structure was balanced (54% of girls [N = 386] and 46% of boys [N = 329]). 51.7% (N = 370) were students in seventh grade and 48.3% (N = 345) were students in eighth grade. Respondents' average age was 13.22 years (SD = 0.664).

Method

The survey was conducted through an in-class group examination in autumn of 2015. Prior to the survey, students were given instructions for filling out the questionnaire and were notified that participation was voluntary, anonymous, and they were permitted to abandon the questionnaire at any point in time without incurring any consequences.

Measuring instruments

Along with the General Data Questionnaire that included questions about gender, age, class, school achievement, parent education, parent income, and socioeconomic status of the family, measuring instruments used were:

Adapted Participant Role Questionnaire (PRQ) (Connections between attitudes, group norms, and behaviors associated with bullying in schools, Salmivalli and Voeten 2004).

The original scale for the various roles of children regarding traditional peer violence consisted of a total of five subscales (bully, active assistant, passive assistant, defender, bystander, and victim), and each subscale was consisted of three items. For the purpose of this paper, the victim subscale was used and was expanded with two additional items related to electronic violence (for example: *I experienced being offended and having rumors spread about me on social networks, forums,*

blogs, etc.). Respondents used a three-step scale to assess how much they agreed with the statements (1: never, 2: occasionally, and 3: often). Cronbach's alpha, for the subscale "victim", was 0.733.

Quality of Family Interaction Scale (Vulić Prtorić 2004). For the purpose of this paper, the original Quality of Family Interaction Scale was used, and it was consisted of 55 items and five subscales: family satisfaction (eleven items, for example: *My family gets on my nerves*), mother's acceptance (ten items, for example: *I can always confide in my mother*), father's acceptance (ten items, for example: *I can always confide in my father*), mother's rejection (twelve items, for example: *My mother often shouts at me*), and father's rejection (twelve items, for example: *Sometimes I do not know what I did wrong for my father to punish me*). On Likert's scale (from 1: not true at all, up to 5: yes, completely true), students evaluated how much they agreed with the statements. Cronbach's alpha for the subscale of "family satisfaction" was 0.866, 0.878 for mother's acceptance, 0.910 for father's acceptance, 0.867 for mother's rejection, and 0.888 for father's rejection.

School Bonding Scale (Questionnaire for School Bonding and School Impact, Roviš and Bezinović 2011). The study used the original School Bonding Scale, which consisted of seventeen items and two subscales: school attachment (ten items, for example: *School encourages me to think and create new ideas*) and school commitment (seven items, for example: *When an oral or written exam is announced, I plan when and how to study*), which comprised students' assessment of emotional attachment to school and success in performing school responsibilities. Respondents used a four-degree scale to assess how much they agreed with the statements (from 1: never, to 4: very often). Cronbach's reliability coefficient was 0.898 for "school attachment" and 0.830 for "school commitment".

School Anxiety Scale (Questionnaire for School Bonding and School Impact, Roviš and Bezinović 2011). The School Anxiety Scale was originally taken from the Questionnaire for School Bonding and School Impact and consisted of six items examining fear from teachers, exams, poor grades, and parental reactions (for example: *I'm scared of oral examinations*). Respondents used a four-degree scale to assess how much they agreed with the statements (from 1: never, to 4: very often). Cronbach's reliability coefficient for the School Anxiety Scale was 0.812.

The Self-Efficacy Scale (Self-Efficacy Questionnaire for Children, Vulić Prtorić et al. 2006) was originally taken from the Self-Efficacy Questionnaire for Children, examining social, academic, and emotional self-efficacy. For the purposes of this paper, only the Social Self-Sufficiency Scale was used (for example: *I can easily express my opinion even when other children disagree with me*). This scale measures the perceived ability for relationships with peers. Respondents used a five-degree scale to assess how much they agreed with the statements (from 1: not at all, to 5: yes, completely). Cronbach's alpha was 0.81.

Results

Descriptive analysis was used to examine the percentage of children experiencing various forms of traditional and electronic violence, and the results are presented in Table 1.

		Never	Occasionally	Often
		(%)		
Traditional violence	I experienced being beaten by my peers.	80.3	15.4	4.3
	I experience being mocked and called bad names by my peers.	32.6	48.8	18.6
	I experienced my peers wanting to exclude me from their group, in order for me to feel lonely in school, on practice, etc.	57.1	30.6	12.3
Cyber bullying	I experienced my peers insulting me and spreading lies about me on social networks, forums, blogs, etc.	67.6	25.5	7
	I experienced being humiliated and mocked on social networks, forums, blogs, etc.	71.2	22.1	6.7

Table 1: Descriptive indicators of experiencing peer violence

For this study, we used a descriptive analysis to examine the average school achievement, socioeconomic status, level of mother's and father's education, and financial income. The results are presented in Table 2.

	M	SD	Min.	Max.
School achievement	4.33	0.726	1	5
Socioeconomic status	3.43	0.687	1	5
Mother's financial income	2.09	0.290	1	3
Father's financial income	2.10	0.307	1	3

Table 2: Descriptive statistics of variables school achievement, socioeconomic status, and level of parent education

The self-reported average school achievement was 4.33 (SD = 0.726). The highest number of participants possessed excellent (46.7%) and very good (41%) school achievement, while 11.5% of participants possessed good school achievement and 0.4% of participants possessed fair school achievement. According to self-assessed respondents, the majority considered their socioeconomic status average (58.6%) and above average (31.7%), and a considerably smaller number considered their socioeconomic status very high (7.1%) and below average (1.7%), while no respondent considered their socioeconomic status very low. Considering the level of parent education, the highest number of mothers (37.9%) and fathers (41.1%) received a college education, while 48.9% of mothers and 51% of fathers

finished high school. There were significantly fewer parents who received a master’s of science (4.9% of mothers and 2% of fathers) and a doctorate of science (4.3% of mothers and 3.1% of fathers), and a similarly low percentage of parents who only completed elementary school (3.9% of mothers and 2.9% of fathers). According to the self-assessed respondents, 90.8% of mothers and 89.5% of fathers had an average financial income.

This research also examined children’s perceptions of the quality of family interactions. Table 3 shows descriptive statistics for the perception of the quality of family interaction.

	M	SD	Min.	Max.
Family satisfaction	4.384	0.591	1.27	5.00
Mother’s acceptance	4.352	0.685	1.00	5.00
Mother’s rejection	1.798	0.697	1.00	4.67
Father’s acceptance	4.064	0.850	1.00	5.00
Father’s rejection	1.737	0.727	1.00	4.83

Table 3: Descriptive statistics for the quality of family interaction

It was found that most children are satisfied with their families (M = 4.384; SD = 0.591) and feel accepted by their mothers (M = 4.352; SD = 0.685) and fathers (M = 4.065; SD = 0.850). We note that, according to the respondents’ self-assessments, acceptance from the mother was somewhat higher than acceptance from the father. The number of respondents experiencing rejection from the mother (M = 1.798; SD = 0.697) and rejection from the father (M = 1.737, SD = 0.727) was significantly lower. Table 4 shows descriptive statistics for the perception of school bonding, school fear, and social self-efficacy.

	M	SD	Min.	Max.
Commitment to school obligations	3.169	0.530	1.00	4.00
Attachment to school	2.789	0.642	1.00	4.00
Fear of school	2.491	0.730	1.00	4.00
Social self-efficacy	3.871	0.683	1.44	5.00

Table 4: Descriptive statistics of school bonding, school fear, and social self-efficacy

According to the respondents’ self-assessments, they were more committed to school obligations (M = 3.169; SD = 0.530) than they were attached to school (M = 2.789; SD = 0.642). More than half of the students felt some fear of school (M = 2.491; SD = 0.730). The results obtained indicate that more than half of the participants considered themselves as possessing good social self-efficacy (M = 3.871; SD = 0.683).

In accordance with the research questions and hypotheses for establishing a correlation between the level of victimization and the sociodemographic, family, and school variables with social self-efficacy, the correlation analysis was conducted using the Pearson correlation coefficient. Table 5 shows the results of the correlation between the level of victimization and the sociodemographic factors.

	School achievement	Mother's income	Father's income
Level of victimization	-0.122**	0.059	0.128**

Note: ** $p < 0,01$; * $p < 0.05$.

Table 5: Correlation between the level of victimization and the sociodemographic factors

The correlation analysis found that there is a weak, but statistically significant, negative correlation between the level of victimization and school achievement ($r = -0.122$, $p < 0.01$). It has also been found that there is a weak, statistically significant positive correlation between the level of victimization and father's financial income ($r = 0.128$, $p < 0.01$), but no statistically significant correlation between the level of victimization and mother's income.

In accordance with the first research question and the first hypothesis, we analyzed the correlation between the level of victimization and the quality of family interactions, and the results are presented in Table 6.

	Family satisfaction	Mother's acceptance	Mother's rejection	Father's acceptance	Father's rejection
Level of victimization	-0.246**	-0.141**	0.215**	-0.229**	0.257**

Note: ** $p < 0.01$; * $p < 0.05$.

Table 6: Correlation between the level of victimization and variables of quality family interaction

These results indicate that there is a weak negative correlation between the level of victimization and acceptance ($r = -0.141$, $p < 0.01$) from the mother and father ($r = -0.229$, $p < 0.01$). The results indicate that a weak positive correlation was found between the level of victimization and rejection from the mother ($r = 0.215$, $p < 0.01$) and father ($r = 0.257$, $p < 0.01$). Also, it was found that the level of victimization negatively correlated with family satisfaction ($r = -0.246$, $p < 0.01$).

The correlation results between the level of victimization and the variables of school bonding, school fear, and social self-efficacy are presented in Table 7.

	Commitment to school obligations	Attachment to school	Fear of school	Social self-efficacy
Level of victimization	-0.039	-0.075**	0.165**	-0.160**

Note: ** $p < 0,01$; * $p < 0.05$.

Table 7: Correlation between the level of victimization and the variables of school bonding, fear of school, and social self-efficacy

The correlation analysis results indicate a weak negative correlation between the level of victimization and attachment to school ($r = -0.075$, $p < 0.01$). The analysis also indicates a positive correlation between the level of victimization and fear of school ($r = 0.165$, $p < 0.01$). There is a weak negative correlation between levels of victimization and social self-efficacy ($r = -0.160$, $p < 0.01$).

Discussion

This research sought to examine the correlation between the level of victimization and the chosen sociodemographic variables. There was a weak, statistically significant negative correlation between the level of victimization and school success. This result is consistent with the results found by other studies (Kowalski and Limber 2013; Wang et al. 2014). It is possible that victims are less concentrated on schoolwork and lose their will to excel, which is why they obtain worse grades, while peer violence may lead to distractions or fears of new violence (Olweus 1998). It is also possible that students are subjected to mockery by peers due to poor school achievements. Since children often point out that victims are different than other children, it is also possible that a more favorable financial status of victims' parents in relation to their peers' parents contributes to distinguishing victims from other students, which is obviously a cause for provocation by perpetrators because they are often envious of their victims. And, in previous research (Ajduković and Rajhvajn Bulat 2012), it has been found that the lowest incidence of peer violence involves children who perceive that material circumstances of their families are similar to those of their peers' families.

In accordance with the first hypothesis, expectations were confirmed, and statistically significant weak correlations were found between the level of victimization and the variables of quality family interaction. Previous research has also found that victims are less satisfied with their families and experience more rejection from their parents (Spriggs et al. 2007; Moore et al. 2012). Possible causes of a victim's family dissatisfaction may include negative parenting behavior toward the child, disagreements or open fights among adult family members in the presence of the child, poor communication between the parents and the child, and parents' lack of love, intimacy, and child support (Olweus 1998); all of these factors may lead to the child withdrawing into himself, becoming shy and insecure, and thus becoming the target for victimization because perpetrators recognize these weaknesses.

The second hypothesis was also confirmed, as there was a weak, statistically significant negative correlation between the level of victimization and attachment to school. This result can be explained by the fact that victims experienced rejection from their peers. Furthermore, if the victims experienced a lack of adult protection, the school was perceived as a dangerous place and these children, therefore, did not feel close to such a system (Cunningham 2007; Roviš and Bezinović, 2011). A positive correlation between the level of victimization and fear of school may be explained by the fear of being tested, criticized by teachers and parents, punished

by parents for poor achievements, and mocked by peers (Brajša-Žganec et al. 2009). Roviš and Bezinovic (2011) stated that a more profound fear of school correlates with a higher level of commitment for students to fulfill their obligations and meet school requirements. Fear of school can also be a result of experienced victimization, as the victim often perceives school as a dangerous and unsafe place (Olweus 1998; Roviš and Bezinović 2011). At the same time, fear of school can also be reflected in a greater number of absences, less motivation for studying, and, consequently, fewer educational achievements (Juvonen et al. 2000; Rigby 2007). The third hypothesis was also confirmed by the study's results.

The correlation analysis revealed a weak, statistically significant correlation between the level of victimization and social self-efficacy. The results may be explained by a lack of confidence, optimism, and social support (Benight and Bandura 2004), the feeling of being powerless, being lonely, facing isolation, and not trusting in one's own abilities (Andreou 2004), and poor social skills relative to dealing with conflict situations (Andreou et al. 2015).

Based on these results, we conclude that all hypotheses have been confirmed: there is a negative correlation between the quality of family interactions and the level of victimization, a negative correlation between school bonding and fear of school with the level of victimization, and a negative correlation between social self-efficacy and the level of victimization.

We observe that these factors play a significant role in explaining victimization, which is one of the advantages posed by this paper. The disadvantage of this paper is that the correlation plan does not allow us to make causal conclusions and the results are based on the self-assessments of the respondents. At the same time, it would be beneficial to examine the contribution of some other contextual factors and include respondents belonging to other age groups.

Conclusion

This research illustrates that there is a negative correlation between the quality of family interactions with the level of victimization, a negative correlation between school bonding and fear of school with the level of victimization, and a negative correlation between social self-efficacy and the level of victimization. These results serve as a great starting point for further research especially relative to predicting the role of victimization and peer violence. The results of this study confirm the set hypotheses and may be used to design preventive programs aimed toward reducing and preventing both traditional and electronic forms of violence among children.

References

- Andreou, E. (2004). Bully/victim problems and their association with Machiavellianism and self-efficacy in Greek primary school children. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74, issue 2, pp. 297-309.
- Andreou, E., Didaskalou, E. and Vlachou, A. (2015). Bully/victim problems among Greek pupils with special educational needs: associations with loneliness and self-efficacy for peer interactions. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 15, issue 4, pp. 235-246.
- Astor, R. A., Benbenishty, R., Vinokur, A. D. and Zeira, A. (2006). Arab and Jewish elementary school students' perceptions of fear and school violence: understanding the influence of school context. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76, issue 1, pp. 91-118.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological review*, 84, issue 2, pp. 191-215.
- Beckman, L., Hagquist, C. and Hellström, L. (2013). Discrepant gender patterns for cyberbullying and traditional bullying—An analysis of Swedish adolescent data. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29, issue 5, pp. 1896-1903.
- Benight, C. C. and Bandura, A. (2004). Social cognitive theory of posttraumatic recovery: The role of perceived self-efficacy. *Behaviour research and therapy*, 42, issue 10, pp. 1129-1148.
- Brajša-Žganec, A., Kotrla Topić, M. and Raboteg-Šarić, Z. (2009). Povezanost individualnih karakteristika učenika sa strahom od škole i izloženosti nasilju od strane vršnjaka u školskom okruženju. *Društvena istraživanja*, 18, issue 4-5, pp.717-738.
- Catalano, R. F. and Hawkins, J. D. (1996). The social development model: A theory of antisocial behavior. In: J. D. Hawkins (Ed.). *Delinquency and crime: Current theories*, New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 149-197.
- Cunningham, N. J. (2007). Level of Bonding to School and Perception of the School Environment by Bullies, Victims, and Bully Victims. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 27, pp. 457-478.
- Erozkan, A. and Deniz, S. (2012). The influence of social self-efficacy and learned resourcefulness on loneliness. *The Online Journal of Counselling and Education*, 1, pp. 57-84.
- Fekkes, M., Pijpers, F. I. and Verloove-Vanhorick, S. P. (2004). Bullying: Who does what, when and where? Involvement of children, teachers and parents in bullying behavior. *Health education research*, 20, issue 1, pp. 81-91.
- Georgiou, S. N. (2008). Bullying and victimization at school: The role of mothers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 78, issue 1, pp. 109-125.
- Gini, G. and Pozzoli, T. (2009). Association between bullying and psychosomatic problems: A meta-analysis. *Pediatrics*, 123, issue 3, pp. 1059-1065.
- Hinduja, S. and Patchin, J. W. (2008). Personal information of adolescents on the Internet: A quantitative content analysis of MySpace. *Journal of adolescence*, 31, issue 1, pp. 125-146.
- Jansen, P. W., Verlinden, M., Domisse-van Berkel, A., Mieloo, C., van der Ende, J., Veenstra, R. and Tiemeier, H. (2012). Prevalence of bullying and victimization among children in early elementary school: Do family and school neighbourhood socioeconomic status matter? *BMC Public Health*, 12, issue 1, p. 494.
- Juvonen, J. and Gross, E. F. (2008). Extending the school grounds?—Bullying experiences in cyberspace. *Journal of School health*, 78, issue 9, pp. 496-505.
- Juvonen, J., Nishina, A. and Graham, S. (2000). Peer harassment, psychological adjustment, and school functioning in early adolescence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 92, issue 2, pp. 349-359.

- Kowalski, R. M. and Limber, S. P. (2007). Electronic bullying among middle school students. *Journal of adolescent health*, 41, issue 6, pp. 22-30.
- Kowalski, R. M. and Limber, S. P. (2013). Psychological, physical, and academic correlates of cyberbullying and traditional bullying. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 53, issue 1, pp. 13-20.
- Kowalski, R. M. and Witte, J. (2006). Youth internet survey. *Unpublished manuscript, Clemson University*.
- McCormick, J. and McPherson, G. (2003). The role of self-efficacy in a musical performance examination: An exploratory structural equation analysis. *Psychology of Music*, 31, issue 1, pp. 37-51.
- Moore, P. M., Huebner, E. S. and Hills, K. J. (2012). Electronic bullying and victimization and life satisfaction in middle school students. *Social Indicators Research*, 107, issue 3, pp. 429-447.
- Nansel, T. R., Craig, W., Overpeck, M. D., Saluja, G. and Ruan, W. J. (2004). Cross-national consistency in the relationship between bullying behaviors and psychosocial adjustment. *Archives of pediatrics & adolescent medicine*, 158, issue 8, pp. 730-736.
- Olweus, D. (1998). *Nasilje među djecom u školi: Što znamo i što možemo učiniti*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Osher, D., Kendziora, K., Spier, E. and Garibaldi, M. L. (2014). School influences on child and youth development. *Defining Prevention Science, Springer US*, pp. 151-169.
- Popović-Čitić, B. (2012). Vežanost za školu kod učenika koji imaju različite uloge u vršnjačkom nasilju. *Specijalna edukacija i rehabilitacija*, 11, issue 4, pp. 547-564.
- Puckett, M. B., Aikins, J. W. and Cillessen, A. H. (2008). Moderators of the association between relational aggression and perceived popularity. *Aggressive Behavior*, 34, issue 6, pp. 563-576.
- Rajhvajn Bulat, L. and Ajduković, M. (2012). Obiteljske i psihosocijalne odrednice vršnjačkoga nasilja među mladima. *Psihologijske teme*, 21, issue 1, pp. 167-194.
- Raskauskas, J. and Stoltz, A. D. (2007). Involvement in traditional and electronic bullying among adolescents. *Developmental psychology*, 43, issue 3, pp. 564.
- Rigby, K. (2007). *Bullying in schools: And what to do about it*. Victoria: ACER Press.
- Rivers, I., Duncan, N. and Besag, V. E. (2007). *Bullying: A handbook for educators and parents*. Westport: Praeger Publishers.
- Rohner, R. P. (1999). Acceptance and rejection. *Encyclopedia of human emotions*, 1, pp. 6-14.
- Roviš, D. and Bezinović, P. (2011). Vežanost za školu—analiza privrženosti školi i predanosti školskim obvezama kod srednjoškoolaca. *Sociologija i prostor*, 49, issue 2, pp. 185-208.
- Salmivalli, C. and Voeten, M. (2004). Connections between attitudes, group norms, and behaviour in bullying situations. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 28, issue 3, pp. 246-258.
- Schneider, S. K., O'Donnell, L., Stueve, A. and Coulter, R. W. (2012). Cyberbullying, school bullying, and psychological distress: A regional census of high school students. *American Journal of Public Health*, 102 issue 1, pp. 171-177.
- Spriggs, A. L., Iannotti, R. J., Nansel, T. R. and Haynie, D. L. (2007). Adolescent bullying involvement and perceived family, peer and school relations: Commonalities and differences across race/ethnicity. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 41, issue 3, pp. 283-293.

- Stockdale, M. S., Hangaduambo, S., Duys, D., Larson, K. and Sarvela, P. D. (2002). Rural elementary students', parents', and teachers' perceptions of bullying. *American Journal of Health Behavior*, 26, issue 4, pp. 266-277.
- Sušac, N., Ajduković, M. and Rimac, I. (2016). Učestalost vršnjačkog nasilja s obzirom na obilježja adolescenata i doživljeno nasilje u obitelji. *Psihologijske teme*, 25, issue 2, pp. 197-221.
- Tippett, N. and Wolke, D. (2014). Socioeconomic status and bullying: a meta-analysis. *American journal of public health*, 104, issue 6, pp. 48-59.
- Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Underwood, M. K. and Rosen, L. H. (2011). Gender and bullying. In: D. L. Espelage and S. M. Swearer (Eds.). *Bullying in North American schools*. New York: Routledge, pp. 13-22.
- Vandebosch, H. and Van Cleemput, K. (2009). Cyberbullying among youngsters: Profiles of bullies and victims. *New media & society*, 11, issue 8, pp. 1349-1371.
- Veenstra, R., Lindenberg, S., Oldehinkel, A. J., De Winter, A. F., Verhulst, F. C. and Ormel, J. (2005). Bullying and victimization in elementary schools: a comparison of bullies, victims, bully/victims, and uninvolved preadolescents. *Developmental psychology*, 41, issue, p. 672.
- Vieno, A., Gini, G. and Santinello, M. (2011). Different forms of bullying and their association to smoking and drinking behavior in Italian adolescents. *Journal of School Health*, 81, issue 7, pp. 393-399.
- Vulić-Prtorić, A., Sorić, I., Kramar, V. and Macuka, I. (2006). Upitnik samoefikasnosti za djecu – SEQ-C. V. Čubela Adorić et al. (eds.). *Zbirka psihologijskih skala i upitnika – III*. Zadar: Odjel za psihologiju Sveučilišta u Zadru
- Vulić-Prtorić, A. (2002). Strahovi u djetinjstvu i adolescenciji. *Suvremena psihologija*, 5, issue 2, pp. 271-293.
- Vulić-Prtorić, A. (2004). The Quality of Family Interaction Scale (KOBI). In: *Zbirka psihologijskih skala i upitnika*. Zadar: Sveučilište u Zadru.
- Vulić-Prtorić, A. and Sorić, I. (2006). Self-Efficacy Questionnaire for Children. In: *Zbirka psihologijskih skala i upitnika*. Zadar: Sveučilište u Zadru.
- Wang, J., Iannotti, R. J. and Nansel, T. R. (2009). School bullying among adolescents in the United States: Physical, verbal, relational, and cyber. *Journal of Adolescent health*, 45, issue 4, pp. 368-375.
- Wang, J., Nansel, T. R. and Iannotti, R. J. (2011). Cyber and traditional bullying: Differential association with depression. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 48, issue 4, pp. 415-417.
- Wang, W., Vaillancourt, T., Brittain, H. L., McDougall, P., Krygsman, A., Smith, D. and Hymel, S. (2014). School climate, peer victimization, and academic achievement: Results from a multi-informant study. *School psychology quarterly*, 29, issue 3, pp. 360-377.
- Ybarra, M. L. and Mitchell, K. J. (2004). Online aggressor/targets, aggressors, and targets: A comparison of associated youth characteristics. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 45, issue 7, pp. 1308-1316.

Anna ALAJBEG (Univerza v Splitu, Hrvaška)

POVEZANOST MED VIKTIMIZACIJO TER KAKOVOSTJO DRUŽINSKE INTERAKCIJE, NAVEZANOSTJO NA ŠOLO IN ZMOŽNOSTJO NAVEZOVANJA SOCIALNIH STIKOV

Povzetek: Namen prispevka je analizirati in pojasniti statistično povezanost med ravniyo viktimizacije učencev ter kakovostjo njihove družinske interakcije, navezanostjo na šolo in njihovo socialno učinkovitostjo. Predstavljamo rezultate raziskave, v katero je bilo vključenih 715 učencev (54 % deklic in 46 % dečkov) sedmega (N = 370) in osmega (N = 345) razreda osnovne šole v različnih hrvaških regijah. Učenci so bili v povprečju stari 13,22 let (SD = 0,664). Podatke smo pridobivali z naslednjimi vprašalniki: vprašalnikom za pridobivanje splošnih podatkov o anketirancih, Lestvico kakovosti družinske interakcije (Quality of Family Interaction Scale – KOBİ), Lestvico povezanosti s šolo (School Bonding Scale), Lestvico šolske anksioznosti (School Anxiety Scale), Lestvico socialne učinkovitosti (Social Self-Efficacy Scale) ter prilagojenim vprašalnikom o vlogi udeležencev (Participant Role Questionnaire – PQR). Deskriptivna analiza podatkov je pokazala šibko, toda statistično pomembno negativno korelacijo med kakovostjo družinske interakcije in ravniyo viktimizacije učencev, negativno korelacijo med povezanostjo s šolo in ravniyo viktimizacije ter med slednjo in med šolsko anksioznostjo. Negativna je bila tudi korelacija med socialno učinkovitostjo ter ravniyo viktimizacije. Rezultati raziskave so lahko pomembno izhodišče za nadaljnje raziskave in imajo lahko pomembne implikacije pri snovanju preventivnih programov za preprečevanje in zmanjševanje šolskega in spletnega nasilja.

Ključne besede: viktimizacija, vrstniško nasilje, kakovost družinske interakcije, druženje v šoli, navezovanje socialnih stikov

Elektronski naslov: anna.alajbeg@gmail.com