

3 ICLEHI-44 Lee Jun Choi

Dealing With Bullying Among Secondary School Students in Malaysia: Deputy Principal's Self-Efficacy

Lee Jun Choi*, Nik Adzrieman bin Abdul Rahman, Mohd. Syawal Bin Narawi
School of Education and Modern Languages

UUM College of Arts and Sciences, UUM Sintok, Kedah Darul Aman, Malaysia.

*Corresponding Author: junchoi@uum.edu.my

ABSTRACT

Deputy Principals are second in command structure of secondary schools and remain as one of the least understood role in the schools of contemporary education systems. Scant attention has been paid especially to their self-efficacy regarding bullying and what actually are their ability when they deal with this type of problem, particularly in Malaysia. There also relatively little is known about sources that have an impact on deputy principals' self-efficacy regarding dealing with bullying in school, in the local context or probably in the international arena. The purpose of this study was to identify the overall source of influence that contributes to deputy principals' self-efficacy and what are the levels of their self-efficacy in terms of dealing with bullying in secondary schools. This quantitative research utilizes a correlation method in order to examine the relationship between various sources of influence and teacher sense of efficacy when dealing with bullying among students in secondary schools. Based on the standardized regression coefficients (β s) indices of direct effects of each predictor variable on teacher self-efficacy in dealing with bullying among students, Mastery Experience contributed the highest direct effect or influence on deputy principals self-efficacy in dealing with bullying among students, followed by Verbal Persuasion. Based on the finding of this study, the level of deputy principals' self-efficacy in terms of dealing with bullying in secondary school was moderately high ($M = 3.68$, $SD = 0.94$). This implies that majority of the in-service deputy principals were somewhat confident of themselves in having the ability to successfully perform their duty or responsibility in dealing with bullying among students in secondary school. The findings of this study showed that mastery experience is a crucial source of influence on deputy principals' self-efficacy in dealing with bullying among students.

Keyword : Self-Efficacy, Bullying, Secondary School, Deputy Principals,

Introduction

Whenever parents choosing a secondary school for their so called just graduated primary school children, among other things that they want to know is whether or not the school provides students with safe and conducive environment. School administrators (principal and deputy principals) as well as all the teachers in school are trying their very best to make classrooms and school compounds safe, conducive and supportive for learning environments (Goryl, Neilsen-Hewett, & Sweller, 2013). The thing is that, whether they like it or not, as a matter of fact, most secondary schools are facing a number of challenges related to disruptive and antisocial students. One of the factors that contribute to teacher burnout is dealing with disruptive behavior such as bullying among students in school (Kendziora & Osher, 2009). Failure to deal effectively with bullying behavior among students will eventually contributes to poor individual, school, as well as community outcomes (Conoley & Goldstein, 2004).

Literature Review

In recent years, bullying among students in schools has become recognized as an important educational problem (Carney, 2008; Cornell & Mehta, 2011; Hinduja & Patchin, 2013; Swearer *et al.*, 2010). Bullying remains a topic often in the news, which highlights the ongoing public concern and continual need for anti-bullying work in schools (Cheng *et al.*, 2010; Mavroveli & Sánchez-Ruiz, 2011). In early research, Olweus (1978) observed that a considerable number of students suffer from harassment by peers in their school especially in the classroom. He called this phenomenon ‘bullying’ and since then, this definition of ‘bullying’ has guided much of later research. Bullying is defined as “a form of aggression in which one or more children intend to harm or disturb another child who is perceived as being unable to defend himself or herself” (Smokowski & Kopasz, 2005, p.101). Bullying has been identified as the current leading form of low-level violence, meaning underlying forms of violence, in schools (Rigby & Thomas, 2010). Over the past 30 years, clinicians and researchers have come to the agreement that bullying in schools is a serious threat to the healthy development of children, in addition to being a cause of school violence (Rigby, 2010; Rigby, 2012). Bullying has been linked to future antisocial and violent behaviours. The most chronic form of criminality has been shown to correlate with early-onset aggressive behaviours in childhood. The prevalence of bullying, as well as the harm it causes, are seriously underestimated by many children and adults. It harms the intended victims, perpetrators, and the climate of the school. Bullying has been linked to future antisocial and violent behaviours. The most chronic form of criminality has been shown to correlate with early-onset aggressive behaviours in childhood. The prevalence of bullying, as well as the harm it causes, are seriously underestimated by many children and adults. It harms the intended victims, perpetrators, and the climate of the school.

Bullying phenomenon in schools is actually everyone’s business and whenever teachers (class or academic teachers) are facing or dealing with bullying cases in school, besides counselling and discipline teachers, the next person that they would normally approach would be the deputy principals of that particular school. In Malaysian secondary school, the deputy principals are responsible for dealing as well as reporting to the principal about current issues or challenges happening in school. They are also responsible for other routine jobs such as teaching and evaluation, marking exercise book or exam papers, carry out their own administrative portfolio, and sometimes representing the principal on other administrative work and so on. Deputy Principals in public secondary schools of Malaysia are usually appointed from the mainstream of regular teachers, heads of departments and senior teachers. Some of them are appointed by the current principal based on their current performances, than officially appointed by the Ministry Of Education of Malaysia (MOE). Besides that, some deputy principals are appointed from other schools by the ministry and then send to schools that have vacancies for the post of deputy principal. Interviewing is the most common method used to vet and select the deputy principals and it is usually conducted by educational officers at the state level educational offices around the country. A number of factors are usually considered ranging from teaching experience, academic and professional qualifications and experience in the related field. Deputy principals are second in command structure of secondary schools. They are professionally qualified teachers deployed to a school in order to assist the principal. There are four deputy principals or known as senior assistants in every secondary school in Malaysia; deputy principal in-charge of academic/curriculum (PKI), deputy principal in-charge of student affairs (PK HEM), deputy principal in-charge of co-curriculum activities (PK KK), and deputy principal in-charge of the afternoon session (PP-Afternoon Supervisor) for secondary school that has afternoon session. Even though

each deputy principal had his or her own portfolio/specific administrative duty, the school community considers them as the second important figure after the principal. Therefore, regardless of whatever their portfolio or things they are in-charge of, as long as they hold the so called “Deputy Principal” titled, they are expected to be the most suitable second person to be approached whenever any case (such as bullying and other disciplinary problems) occurs outside or inside the school compound. Most probably, any serious case that could not be solved by teachers or other personnel such as discipline or counselling teachers, will be referred to any deputy principal available.

In order to deal with any disciplinary problem in secondary school such as bullying or any other destructive behaviors, normally the steps taken by the school concerned is to give first warning, second warning, third warning, last warning, school suspension and expulsion. For each warning, the parents of the students will be notify and a formal letter signed by the school principal will be issued and send to them. Parents of the students will have to go to the school and meet the school’s disciplinary committee (consists of principal, deputy principals, discipline teachers, guidance and counselling teachers, class teacher, Parent and Teacher Association’s representative) if the case is quite serious and needs immediate attention as well as solution. Whenever the first warning is issued, students will be referred to “Guidance and Counselling” unit for counselling session. Normally, there will be at least three counselling sessions carried out by the school counsellor hopefully to change or modify the destructive behaviors of the students. For recurring cases, the second warning letter will be issued and the parent will be called up to discuss and ratify an agreement to assure their children will behave well and do not repeat the offence. Students will again be referred to “Guidance and Counselling” unit for counselling session. If behavior (bullying) continues, student will be most probably facing a corporal punishment (caned on the buttock) with the concerned of the parent and approval from the principal. Only the school principal is allowed to carry out the punishment in his office or designated room and must be witnessed by the members of the disciplinary committee of the school. On the other hand, the school principal is allowed to appoint (authorization letter must be issued and signed by principal) any deputy principals or discipline teachers to carry out the punishment. After the punishment the student will be referred to “Guidance and Counselling” unit for counselling sessions as usual. The student will be suspended from school for one week (first suspension) and two weeks (second suspension) if he/she does not changed. Only the principal of the school is given the authority to suspend the student. Each time any student being suspended from school, the parents will be notify and have to sign a consent or agreement letter guaranteeing that their son or daughter will not repeat the same offence (bullying) in future. The student will have to undergo several counselling sessions after the suspension. Expulsion with the approval of the principal will be only the last resort after student undergone all the above mentioned processes, but still not encourage by the ministry of education.

Statement of the Problem

Bullying among secondary school students has become one of the most disturbing global issues in recent times (Okoli *et al.*, 2012) and there is no exception for Malaysia as well. Several studies (e.g., Khalim, 2014; Wan Salwina *et al.*, 2014) carried out regarding bullying behavior in Malaysian school particularly secondary schools showed that, it is a serious disciplinary problem that must be addressed by everybody. Even though evidences from a number of studies suggest that generally school administrators and teachers were not effectively addressed or dealt with cases of bullying in school (Fekkes *et al.*, 2005; Rigby & Barnes, 2002), it does not necessarily mean that they did not try their very best. It is no doubt

that teachers as well as school administrators especially the deputy principals play a crucial role in preventing and managing the widespread problem of bullying (Rigby, 2011; Rigby & Smith, 2011). As the deputy principals remain as one of the least understood role in the schools of contemporary education systems, there is no literatures on how deputy principals actually feel and think whenever they are dealing with cases of bullying in school. Research hardly expresses the self-efficacy of a deputy principal when dealing with bullying cases in school particularly the secondary school. Many researchers have provided suggestions for important components of bully prevention and intervention programs, but few have actually collected data with regard to deputy principals' self-efficacy in dealing with bullying and what actually are their ability when they deal with this type of problem, particular in Malaysia.

There also relatively little is known about sources that have an impact on deputy principal self-efficacy regarding dealing with bullying in school, in the local context or probably in the international context. Henson (2001) stated that prior attempts to conceptualize teacher efficacy "have all but ignored these sources of information and their relationships to efficacy and ultimate behaviour"(p.7). Much still remained to be explored, especially in the local culture and educational context. As efficacy sources especially regarding dealing with bullying in school, may vary across different cultural and educational settings, and the development of self-efficacy is believed to be situation-specific (Pajares, 1997), the need to undertake a systematic empirical study in the Malaysian context is very important. With the understanding of relevant or pertinent sources that could contributing to deputy principals' self-efficacy regarding dealing with bullying in secondary school, educational effort can be aimed towards fostering positive sense of deputy principals' self-efficacy regarding this matter.

Objectives

- 1) To identify the sources of influence according to the level of importance that contribute to deputy principals' self-efficacy in dealing with bullying in secondary school
- 2) To determine the level of deputy principal' self-efficacy (behavioural, cognitive, emotional) in dealing with bullying in secondary school.

Theoretical Framework of the Study

According to Bandura (1986a), self-efficacy is people's judgement of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances. Therefore, self-efficacy has important influence on human behaviour and affect in goal setting, effort expenditure and the level of persistence in facing daily tasks. Self-efficacy helps determine what individuals do with knowledge and skills they possess in order to produce desirable outcomes. Bandura (1997) added "unless people believe they can produce desire effects by their actions, they have little incentive to act" (page 3). In this respect, even when individuals perceived that certain actions are likely to bring about a desired behaviour, they may not engage in the behaviour or persist after initiating the behaviour if they believe that they do not possess the required knowledge or skills. In other words, self-belief is related to actions and with knowledge of that matter it will eventually easier to work it out. Thus, beliefs about one's ability to effect change will likely result in the use of behaviours that will bring about that desired change. In its application to school bullying, teachers who

believe that they can have an impact on students and are confident in their ability to deal with bullying, are likely to be effective in reducing bullying.

Bandura (1997) proposed that because self-efficacy beliefs were explicitly self-referent in nature and directed toward perceived abilities given specific tasks, they were powerful predictors of behaviour. Educationally, self-efficacy beliefs are related to academic performance and self-regulated learning (Pajares, 1996; Schunk & Zimmerman, 1989). Bandura observed: "People regulate their level and distribution of effort in accordance with the effects they expect their actions to have. As a result, their behaviour is better predicted from their beliefs than from the actual consequences of their actions" (1986, p. 129). From the social cognitive theory perspective, because human agency is mediated by our efficaciousness, self-efficacy beliefs influence our choices, our effort, our persistence when facing adversity, and our emotions (Pajares, 1997). In short, self-efficacy theory is a common theme in current views of motivation (Graham & Weiner, 1996), primarily because of its predictive power and application or practically any behavioural task.

Beliefs about their efficacy can be developed by four main sources of influence. The most influential source of these beliefs is the mastery experience (Bandura, 1977, 1997). When a person believes they have what it takes to succeed, they develop a resilient sense of efficacy. If faced with difficulties or setbacks, they know that they can be successful through perseverance. The perception that one's task (dealing with any bullying case) has been successful increases efficacy beliefs raising expectations that future performances will be successful. In contrast failure, especially if it occurs early in the process of dealing with bullying experience, undermines one's sense of efficacy.

Limitation of the Study

As expected this particular study had several limitations. In terms of the number of the participants that involved in this study, it is only limited to 960 in-service deputy principals from 240 secondary schools which had been randomly selected from 6 out of 13 states in Malaysia. Ideally, participants of this study should consist of the entire population. However, due to limited time and cost or budget constraints, purposive and simple random of the individuals sample had been exercised.

In order to determine level of deputy principal' self-efficacy in dealing with school bullying in secondary school, it is only limited to three criteria; behavioural, cognitive, and emotional. To fully understand the factors or elements that account for the variance in deputy principals' self-efficacy regarding dealing with bullying in secondary school, the scenario could be or definitely more complex. In future it is hope that other elements or factors that are relevant could be included in this study.

Methodology

Research Design

A survey design had been chosen for this study in order to determine the major sources of influence that contributes to deputy principals' self-efficacy regarding dealing with bullying in secondary school, among in-service school counsellors. The survey design is highly developed technique because it is actually the most common descriptive methodology as when the researchers summarize the characteristics (e.g. abilities, preferences, behaviours) of individuals or groups (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2007). It is also a method for measuring attitudes and orientations in large population.

Subjects

The targeted population for this study consisted of all in-service deputy principals currently serving in secondary schools in West and East Malaysia. *Stratified Random Sampling* had been used in order to select a sample of individuals from the accessible population of this study. Using the *stratified random sampling* the researcher had selected six states (Kedah, Pahang, Selangor/Wilayah Persekutuan, Johor, Sarawak and Sabah) randomly from the population of thirteen states in Malaysia. Then, the researcher randomly selected 40 schools from each state. After that, 4 deputy principals (deputy principal in-charge of academic/curriculum (PK1), deputy principal in-charge of student affairs (PK HEM), deputy principal in-charge of co-curriculum activities (PK KK), and deputy principal in-charge of the afternoon session (Afternoon Supervisor) from each school had been selected using *purposive sampling* techniques.

Instrument

A questionnaire was utilized in this study in order to gather necessary data or relevant information. There are three sections in the questionnaire. **Section A** consisted of the *Sources of Influence on Deputy Principals' Self-Efficacy Scale Regarding Dealing with Bullying in Secondary School* with 40 self-constructed items. **Section B** comprised the *Deputy Principals Sense Of Efficacy Scale Regarding Dealing with Bullying*, with 18 self-constructed items (to determine the participants' level of self-efficacy regarding dealing with bullying in secondary school). The last section, that is **section C**, aimed to get several relevant demographic information of the participants.

For sources of influence on deputy principals' self-efficacy, participants were asked to circle a response corresponding (1-strongly disagree, 2-disagree, 3-neutral, 4-agree, 5-strongly agree) to their beliefs about each statement. In order to response to deputy principals self-efficacy scale regarding dealing with bullying, participants were asked to circle a response corresponding (1-nothing, 2-very little, 3-some influences, 4- Quite a bit, 5-A great deal).

Thought-listing questionnaire from 100 deputy principals during the pilot test had been carried out. Principal Component Analysis (PCA) had also been carried out on all the variables (the questions) of sources of influence and self-efficacy scale on deputy principals' self-efficacy regarding dealing with bullying in secondary school. Based on the factor analysis, the sources of influence on deputy principals' self-efficacy have been grouped into five factors (mastery experience, verbal persuasion, contextual climate, physiological arousal, and vicarious experience). The deputy principals' self-efficacy scale regarding dealing with bullying in secondary school had been categorized into three criteria: i) **behavioural self-efficacy**, ii) **cognitive self-efficacy**, and (iii) **emotional self-efficacy**. Principal Component Analysis has been chosen because the nature of the factor to be extracted and the common error variance are not known yet.

In order to describe the various sources that could be influencing deputy principals' self-efficacy regarding dealing with bullying in secondary school and the levels of deputy principals' self-efficacy regarding dealing with bullying in secondary school, descriptive statistic such as frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations had been used to report the level of agreement of the respondents.

Findings

Sources of Influence on Deputy Principals' Self-efficacy in Dealing With Bullying

Table 1.0 shows the overall mean scores and standard deviations comparison of the five sources of influence on deputy principals' self-efficacy regarding dealing with bullying in secondary school. A mean score of 3.00 represents neutral influence on deputy principals' self-efficacy regarding dealing with bullying; a score less than 3.00 indicates weak influence and a score of more than 3.00 represents strong influence.

Table 1.0

Overall Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for each Subscales of the Sources of Influence on deputy principals' Self-Efficacy Regarding Dealing With Bullying in Secondary School.

Subscale	<i>M</i>	<i>Influence</i>	<i>SD</i>
Mastery Experience	3.88	Strong	0.90
Verbal Persuasion	3.45	Strong	0.92
Contextual Climate	2.34	weak	0.86
Physiological Arousal	2.28	weak	0.77
Vicarious Experience	2.25	weak	0.85

N = 960

Cronbach's Alpha = .83

Based on the above finding, all the five mean scores fell between the range of 2.25 up to 3.88. This showed only two factors generally contributed positively as strong sources of influence on deputy principals self-efficacy in dealing with bullying in secondary school. Mastery Experience showed the highest source of influence on deputy principals' self-efficacy in dealing with bullying for the participants in this study followed by Verbal Persuasion. There were seven statements that reflected Mastery Experience as a source of influence on school counsellor self-efficacy in dealing with bullying in secondary school. The results regarding agreement and disagreement for these seven items have been compiled into Table 1.1 Scales 1 and 2 were shrunk to show general disagreement and scale 4 and 5 were shrunk to show general agreement for each of the statement regarding Mastery Experience as a source of influence on teacher self-efficacy in dealing with bullying in secondary school. The middle scale (scale 3) represents neutrality.

Table 1.1

General Agreement and Disagreement on Mastery Experience as A Source of Influence on Deputy principals' Self-Efficacy in Dealing With Bullying in Secondary School: Collapsed Columns

Item #	Disagree	Neutral Frequency (Percentage)	Agree	M	SD
1. The experiences gained when I was an ordinary teacher has adequately prepared me to face the challenges of dealing with bullying among students in school.	160 (16.67)	156 (16.25)	644 (67.08)	3.98	0.82
10. My experiences handling several bullying cases in school helped enhance my self-efficacy regarding dealing with bullying.	42 (4.38)	68 (7.08)	850 (88.54)	4.38	1.09
11. During my school days (secondary), I received praises from my teacher for informing him/her about bullying incident among my classmates or others students in my school.	275 (26.65)	170 (17.71)	515 (53.65)	3.55	1.01
16. When I came across a difficult bullying case, I never gave up and dealt with it successfully.	69 (7.19)	189 (19.68)	702 (73.13)	4.08	1.07
26. I have previously received award/recognition due to my outstanding performance especially regarding dealing with problematic students in my school.	316 (32.91)	170 (17.71)	474 (49.38)	3.39	1.02
30. When I was a student in secondary school, I was usually at ease when facing with bullying incident or when someone wanted to bully me.	360 (37.50)	199 (20.73)	401 (41.77)	3.51	1.01
36. My experiences dealing with certain bullying cases made me know and understand more about bullying phenomena in school and I feel confidence to deal with it.	60 (6.25)	72 (7.50)	828 (86.25)	4.29	1.07
<hr/>					
<i>Mastery Experience</i> Mean = 3.88 (<i>SD</i> = 0.90)		<i>N</i> = 960		<i>Cronbach's Alpha</i> = .83	

On the basis of findings presented in Table 1.1, there seemed to be a general agreement that mastery experience contributed a strong influence towards teacher self-efficacy in dealing with bullying among students in secondary school. An analysis of data revealed that experiences dealing with certain bullying cases have the strongest influence among all mastery experiences with quite a high mean of 4.38 (*SD*=1.09). The participants experiences dealing with certain bullying cases which made them know and understand more about bullying phenomena in school as well as made them feel confidence to deal with it, also yielded a high mean of 4.29 (*SD* = 1.07). More than fifty percent of the participants (*N*=960) agreed that: (1)The experiences gained when they were an ordinary teacher has adequately prepared them to face the challenges of dealing with bullying among students in school (67.08%); (2)whenever they came across a difficult bullying case, they never gave up and dealt with it successfully(73.13%); (3)during their school days (secondary), they received praises from their teachers for informing him/her about bullying incident among my classmates or others students in their school (53.65%)

When all the variables were entered into the equation of multiple regression analysis, only Mastery Experience, and Verbal Persuasion, significant positive regression weights (Table 1.2), indicating that all these two variables significantly predicted deputy principals'

self-efficacy in dealing with bullying among students. Vicarious experience, contextual climate and physiological arousal did not contribute to the multiple regression model.

The standardized regression coefficients (β s) are indices of direct effects of each predictor variable on deputy principals in dealing with bullying among students. As can be seen from Table 1.2, results indicate that Mastery Experience accounted for the highest direct effect on deputy principal self-efficacy in dealing with bullying among students, with beta weight of .523 at $p < .001$ ($t = 28.860$). The second direct effect on teacher self-efficacy in dealing with bullying among students is Verbal Persuasion, with beta weight of .412 at $p < .001$ ($t = 23.826$). With beta weight of .145 at $p < .001$ ($t = 9.305$) Contextual Climate yielded the third direct effect on teacher self-efficacy in dealing with bullying among students in secondary school.

Table 1.2

Coefficients

Predictors Variables	<i>B</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>	β	<i>t</i>	sig.
Constant	.783	.051		17.935	.000
Verbal Persuasion	.254	.012	.412	23.826	.000
Vicarious Experience	.043	.013	.066	4.523	.000
Contextual Climate	.128	.012	.145	9.305	.000
Physiological Arousal	.052	.012	.084	5.448	.000
Mastery Experience	.432	.012	.523	28.860	.000

$N = 960$; $R^2 = .747$; Adjusted $R^2 = .746$ $p < .001$

Dependent Variable: DPSEDWB(Deputy Principal Self-Efficacy In Dealing With Bullying)

Deputy Principals' Self-efficacy Level Regarding Dealing With Bullying Among Students in Secondary School.

Table 1.3 displays data concerning the frequencies and percentages distributions of participants perceived level of self-efficacy regarding dealing with bullying among students in secondary school. The possible scores ranged from 1.00 to 5.00. Based on the frequency of the data collected from the participants, a mean score from scales 1.00 to 2.33 indicates low level of self-efficacy in dealing with bullying; 2.34 to 3.67 indicates moderate level, and 3.68 to 5.00 indicates high level.

Table 1.3

Deputy Principals' Self-efficacy Level Regarding dealing with bullying among students in secondary school: Frequency and Percentage Response on Likert Scale .

Scores Range	Level	Frequency	Percentage	Mean
1.00 – 2.33	Low	77	8.02	1.87
2.34 – 3.67	Moderate	305	31.77	3.56
3.68 – 5.00	High	578	60.21	4.58
Overall Mean = 3.68 (SD= 0.94)		N = 960	Cronbach's Alpha = .86	

Table 1.4

Overall Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for each Subscales of Level of Behavioural Self-efficacy (BSE), Level of Cognitive Self-efficacy (CSE), and Level of Emotional Self-efficacy (ESE,) for Deputy Principals Regarding Dealing With Bullying in Secondary School.

Subscale	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Behavioural Self-Efficacy	4.03	0.83
Cognitive Self-efficacy	3.63	0.89
Emotional Self-efficacy	3.38	0.95
Overall Mean = 3.68 (<i>SD</i> =0.94) <i>N</i> = 960		<i>Cronbach's Alpha</i> = .86

Looking at Table 1.4, all the three (Behavioural, Cognitive and Emotional self-efficacy) mean scores fell between the range of 3.38 up to 4.03. Behavioural Self-Efficacy has the highest overall mean among them all with an overall mean of 4.03 (*SD* = 0.83), then followed by Cognitive Self-efficacy and Emotional Self-efficacy.

There were six statements that reflected Deputy Principals' Behavioural self-efficacy in dealing with bullying in secondary school (Table 1.5). Item 1 yielded the highest mean score of 4.78 (*SD*= 0.89) whereby more than three quarter (91.35%) of the deputy principals (*N*=960) were most confident that they could control bullying behavior among students in the school. This study also showed that more than eighty percent of all the deputy principals have high self-efficacy level that they can; improve the self esteem of victim of bullying, calm any student in the school should he/she been bullied badly, establish a system or a strategy in their school to avoid bullying among students, respond to difficult situation (e.g. suicide attempt, depression) involving bullying, and help students to overcome their feeling of helplessness following the bullying incident. In terms of designated post hold by the deputy principals, this study showed that PK HEM and PP have high level of behavioural self-efficacy compared to PKI and PK KK. Both PKHEM and PP also have high level of self-efficacy in cognitive and emotional when dealing with bullying among students in secondary school (Table 1.6)

Table 1.5

Level of Behavioural Self-efficacy (BSE) of Deputy Principal Regarding dealing with bullying among students in secondary school

Item #	Low	Moderate Frequency (Percentage)	High	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. How confident are you in controlling bullying behavior in the school ?	30 (3.13)	53 (5.52)	877 (91.35)	4.70	0.93
5. How much can you do to make the students to overcome their feeling of helplessness following the bullying incident ?	32 (3.33)	123 (12.81)	805 (83.85)	3.59	0.86
6. How well can you respond to difficult situation (e. g suicide attempt, depression) involving bullying?	56 (5.83)	79 (8.23)	825 (85.94)	3.79	0.64
8. How much can you do to calm a student	43	100	817	4.03	0.91

who had been bullied badly ?	(4.48)	(10.42)	(85.10)		
9. How well can you establish a system or a strategy in your school to avoid bullying among students ?	25 (2.60)	95 (9.90)	840 (87.50)	3.79	0.72
12. How much can you do to improve the self esteem of victims of bullying ?	30 (3.13)	87 (9.06)	843 (87.81)	4.30	0.71
<hr/>					
Behavioural Self-efficacy Mean = 4.03, SD = 0.87 N = 960 Cronbach's Alpha = .86					

Table 1.6

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Level of Behavioural Self-efficacy (BSE), Level of Cognitive Self-efficacy (CSE), and Level of Emotional Self-efficacy (ESE) for Different Deputy Principal (designated post) Regarding Dealing With Bullying in Secondary School.

Designated Overall	Behavioural Self-efficacy	Cognitive Self-efficacy	Emotional Self-efficacy
Mean			
PK I - in-charge of academic	3.38 (SD =0.83)	2.67 (SD =0.88)	2.02 (SD =0.92)
PK HEM - in-charge of student affairs	4.78 (SD=0.89)	4.54 (SD =0.75)	4.82 (SD =0.74)
PK KK- in-charge of co-curriculum	3.11 (SD=0.97)	2.77 (SD =1.04)	2.08 (SD =0.81)
PP - in-charge of the afternoon session	4.83 (SD=0.72)	4.52 (SD =0.78)	4.60 (SD =0.92)
			4.65 (SD =0.88)
<hr/>			
* PK –Penolong Kanan PP – Penyelia Petang N = 960 Cronbach's Alpha = .86			

Discussion

Of all the sources of influence on deputy principals' self-efficacy when dealing with bullying in secondary school, Mastery Experience has the highest overall mean scores of 3.88 ($SD = 0.90$). Based on multiple regression analysis, Mastery Experience has the highest direct effect on deputy principal self-efficacy in dealing with bullying among students in secondary school. This result is in line with Bandura's finding (1977, 1997) where he had identified that mastery experience as the most important determinant of self-efficacy. This findings appeared to be congruent with the findings did by Anderson and Betz (2001) when they found only mastery experience had significant incremental variance on social self-efficacy. Similarly, the study on Math self-efficacy by Lopez and Lent (1992) revealed that only mastery experience explained unique variance.

In the present study, more than half of the deputy principals (60.21%) were reported to fall into the high sense of deputy principals' self-efficacy in dealing with bullying among students in secondary school, category (3.68 – 5.00). This suggests that most of the in-service deputy principals were very confidence of themselves in having the ability to successfully perform their duty or responsibility in dealing with bullying cases among students in secondary school. The overall mean score was 3.68, with a standard deviation of 0.94, which indicated moderately high level of deputy principals' self-efficacy in dealing with bullying among students, among the participants in this study. This can be considered

as a healthy level of self-efficacy in dealing with bullying in secondary school for our in-service deputy principals particularly in Malaysia.

Implications and Suggestions for Educational Practice

Findings from this study can be used as a reference or extra input for the design of educational interventions in deputy principals preparation programs (e.g. the National Professional Qualification for Educational Leaders (NPQEL) conducted by the Ministry of Education Malaysia) as well as deputy principals development programs that support and strengthen the development of deputy principals' self-efficacy especially in dealing with bullying among students. As noted earlier, the findings of this study show that mastery experience consistently remained a crucial source of influence on deputy principals' self-efficacy in dealing with bullying among students. Therefore, should there any courses or seminars conducted either by the Ministry of Education, the District Education Department or any Non-governmental organization such as National Teachers Union, Parent Teacher Association etc., which involving the deputy principals, it should be focusing more on acquiring self-regulatory competence so that deputy principals are able to monitor their own performances. This would provide an important mastery building opportunity for self-efficacy enhancement. Self-regulated learning is a deliberate planning and monitoring of cognitive, affective and behavioural processes to successfully complete a given task (Pintrich & De Groot, 1990). It involves taking charge of one's own learning, making accurate assessments of how one is doing and how one might improve. In keeping with Bandura's (1986, 1997) triadic view that personal processes, environmental and behavioural events operate interactively, learners who use self-regulatory strategies are actively involved in regulating three different types of processes : (i) regulating personal processes involved goal setting and planning, managing time, selecting and organizing information (Zimmerman, 1994); (ii) learners consciously regulate their own behaviour by doing self-evaluation, self-monitoring and self-reaction (Bandura, 1986; Schunk, 1990); and (iii) learners actively interact with their learning environment such as seeking peer or adult assistance and social environmental structuring in order to optimize acquisition of skills (Zimmerman & Martinez-Pons, 1990).

Conclusion

Based on the results of the multiple regression, mastery experience made most independent contribution to deputy principals' self-efficacy in dealing with bullying among students. This means that enactive experience appeared to have the strongest impact on in-service deputy principals' perceptions of their self-efficacy in dealing with bullying among students, independently. In this particular study, in-service deputy principals' preconceptions of their capabilities in dealing with bullying cases among students, mainly drawn from their experiences dealing with certain bullying cases, which also involving different type of students (problematic, defiant, rebellious, and stubborn students) before. These deputy principals especially the PKHEM and PP were actually engage in the process of handling or dealing with several bullying cases among students compared to PKI and PKKK and this could be the reason why both PKHEM and PKKK have high level of self-efficacy for Behavioral, Cognitive and Emotional subscales. When in-service deputy principals are convinced that they have what it takes to succeed, they are more resilient and flexible of adversity of bullying phenomena involving students, and hopefully they will quickly rebound from setbacks or any obstacles that they had faced before. This finding is in keeping with Bandura's (1986,1997) theoretical framework and previous empirical

studies that enactive mastery experience consistently makes the largest contribution to self-efficacy beliefs (Betz & Hackett, 1981; Lopez & Lent, 1992; Zeldin, 2000).

References

- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191-215.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W.H. Freeman & Co. bullying. *The Elementary School Journal*, 108(5), 362-375.
- Betz, N. E., & Hackett, G. (1981). The relationship of career-related self-efficacy expectations to perceived career options in college women and men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 28, 399-410.
- Carney, J. V. (2008). Perceptions of bullying and associated trauma during adolescence. *Professional School Counseling*, 11, 179-187.
- Cheng, Y., Newman, I., Qu, M., Mbulo, L., Chai, Y., Chen, Y., & Shell, D. (2010). Being bullied and psychological adjustment among middle school students in China. *Journal of School Health*, 80(4), 193-199.
- Conoley, J. C., & Goldstein, A. P. (2004). *School violence intervention: A practical handbook* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford.
- Cornell, D., & Mehta, S. B. (2011). Counselor confirmation of middle school student self-reports of bullying victimization. *Professional School Counseling*, 14(4), 261-270.
- Fekkes, M., Pijpers, F. I. M., & Verloove-Vanhorick, S. P. (2005). Bullying: Who does what, and where? Involvement of children, teachers, and parents, in bullying behaviour. *Health Education Research*, 20, 81-91.
- Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2007). *How to design and evaluate research in education*, 6th ed. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Goryl, O., Neilsen-Hewett, C., & Sweller, N. (2013). Teacher education, teaching experience and bullying policies: Links with early childhood teachers' perceptions and attitudes to bullying. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, 38(2), 32-40.
- Healey, J. (2001). Bullying and youth violence. *Issues in Society*. Volume 154.
- Henson, R. K. (2001). Teacher Self-Efficacy: Substantive implications and measurement. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Educational Research Exchange, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas, January.
- Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. W. (2013) Social influences on cyberbullying behaviours among middle and high school students. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 42(5), 711-722.
- Kendziora, K., & Osher, D. (2009). *Starting to turn schools around: The academic outcomes of the Safe Schools, Successful Students initiative*. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research.
- Khalim, Z. (2014). *Pengurusan disiplin pelajar sekolah*. Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia: Bangi.
- Lopez, F. G., & Lent, R. W. (1992). Sources of mathematics self-efficacy in high school students. *Career Development Quarterly*, 41, 3-12.
- Mavroveli, S., & Sánchez-Ruiz, M. (2011). Trait emotional intelligence influences on academic achievement and school behavior. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 81(1), 123.
- Midgely, C., Feldlaufer, H., & Eccles, J. S. (1989). Change in teacher efficacy and student self- and task related beliefs in mathematics during the transition to junior high school. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 81 (2), 247-258.
- Okoli, Enuma, C., Ettu, & Ucheoma, T. (2012). Effects of treatments on attitude to and involvement in bullying among senior secondary students in Owerri, Nigeria. *Journal of Educational Review*, 5(2), 81.
- Olweus, D. (1978). *Aggression in the schools: Bullies and whipping boys*. Washington, DC: Hemisphere.

- Pajares, F. (1996). *Current directions in self research: Self-efficacy*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York. Retrieved Jan, 18, 2015, from <http://www.emory.edu/EDUCATION/mfp>
- Pajares, F. (1997). Self-efficacy beliefs in academic setting. *Review of Educational Research*, 66(4), 543-578.
- Pintrich, P. R. & De Groot, E. V. (1990). Motivational and self-regulated learning components of classroom academic performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82, 33-40.
- Rigby, K., & Barnes, A. (2002). To tell or not to tell: the victimised student's dilemma. *Youth Studies Australia*, 21, 33-36.
- Rigby, K. & Thomas, E.B. (2010) *How schools counter bullying: policies and procedures in selected Australian schools* (Revised edition). Camberwell: ACER.
- Rigby, K. (2011). What can schools do about cases of bullying? *Pastoral Care in Education*., 29(4), 273-285.
- Rigby, K., & Smith, P.K. (2011). Is school bullying really on the rise? *Social Psychology of Education*. 14(4), 441-455.
- Rigby, K. (2012) Bullying in Schools: Addressing Desires, Not Only Behaviours. *Educational Psychology Review*, 24, 339-348.
- Schunk, D. H., & Zimmerman, B. J. (1989). *Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: Theory, research and practice*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Schunk, D. H. (1990). Goal setting and self-efficacy during self-regulated learning. *Educational Psychologist*, 25(1), 71-86.
- Swearer, S. M., Espelage, D. L., Vaillancourt, T., & Hymel, S. (2010). What can be done about school bullying?: Linking research to educational practice. *Educational Researcher*, 39, 38-47.
- Wan-Salwina, W. I., Nik, R. N. J., Hatta, S., Marhani, M., & Shamsul, A. S. (2014). Why do young adolescents bully? Experience in Malaysian schools. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 55, 114-120.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (1994). Dimensions of academic self-regulation: A conceptual framework for education. In D. H. Schunk & B. J. Zimmerman (Eds.). *Self-regulation of learning and performance: Issues and educational implications*, (pp. 3 – 21). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Martinez-Pons, M. (1990). Students differences in self-regulated learning: Relating grade, sex, and giftedness to self-efficacy and strategy use. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82(1), 51-59.