



MODERATING ROLE OF BULLYING IN RELATIONSHIP TO PARENTING STYLES AND SELF-ESTEEM AMONG ADOLESCENTS

Areej Nasir¹, Mohsin Atta², Najma Iqbal Malik^{3*}, Irsa Fatima Makhdoom⁴

^{1,2,3*,4}Department of Psychology, University of Sargodha, Pakistan, Areejhan314@Gmail.Com, Gotamabbasi@Gmail.Com, Najmamalik@Gmail.Com RCID ID: <https://Orcid.Org/0000-0002-3521-1014>, Irsamakhdoom@Gmail.Com

***Corresponding Author:** Najma Iqbal

*Najmamalik@Gmail.Com, ORCID ID: <https://Orcid.Org/0000-0002-3521-1014>

Abstract

A current study was executed to examine the relationship between parenting styles and self-esteem among adolescents besides the moderating role of Bullying. A sample of 200 adolescents, including boys (n = 83) and girls (n = 121), with an age range of 13 to 17 (M = 14.37, SD = 1.29) was collected through a purposive sampling technique. The self-esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965), the Illinois Bullying Scale (Urdu Version) (Shuja & Atta, 2011), and the Parenting Style Scale (Robinson et al., 1995) were used to operationalize and measure the constructs of the study. Findings revealed that in Table 1, authoritative parenting approaches are positively associated with self-esteem, and Bullying is negatively associated with it. Authoritarian parenting approaches are negatively correlated with Bullying. Tables 2, 3, and 4 show how authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive parenting styles are moderated by Bullying, respectively. Regardless of the parenting style, the results show that Bullying harms self-esteem. Limitations and suggestions of the present study and practical implications were also discussed thoroughly.

Introduction

The role of Bullying in the relationship of parenting styles and self-esteem among adolescents has been a frequently investigated topic. Self-esteem has a very important role in the building of personality functioning. High self-esteem is the acceptable reason; if it is low, it motivates all immorality. Adolescence addresses a significant period in human existence and for character improvement. The juvenile is vulnerable and impacted by his picture, dominance, and position in friends' gatherings. His association with different life settings and exercise productivity mirror his self-discernment and self-evaluation.

Bullying is conduct that is intended to injure or harm another person (physically and mentally) - purposely or not. In parenting styles, guardians' perspectives and practices toward young children are combined in a caring setting where those practices are shared. Less attention has been paid to investigating the impact of parenting styles and Bullying on self-esteem in indigenous content. The present study intends to examine these variables, which will also be useful for future research and practice.

Adolescence

Adolescence is a period of human development in which many changes and challenges are associated with self-reflection and self-identification. The adolescent years can be filled with frustrations, doubts, concerns, and worries, as well as a battle between establishing one's self-concept and conforming to the expectations of others, an effort to keep oneself together. When adolescents go through difficult phases, they may become irritable, irritated, angry, defiant, and even aggressive, as well as nervous, depressed, withdrawn, passive, or passive-aggressive.

Pickhardt (2018) asserts that adolescence begins between the ages of nine and 23 and goes through four phases and three types of changes: feelings, reactions, and relationships between parents and adolescents. Stage one, which marks the transition from childhood (ages 9 to 13), is characterized by increased distractibility, disorganization, and aggression toward authority figures. This can be overt or covert opposition, greater interest or experimentation, or boredom. Pickhardt (2018) notes that when self-esteem loses its value due to not being handled properly and valued, the result could be a drop in self-esteem. In step two (ages 13 to 15), young people participated in a session focused on creating new kinds of families - friends' families. These points stress the importance of fighting for more freedom, independence, and compliance with peer pressure (including school bullying). From the age of 15-18, adolescents begin to behave more maturely, including engaging in adult-like behaviours (parties, drug use, sexual experimentation, romantic preoccupations, depression and anxiety).

Pickhardt (2018) suggests that puberty lasts until the end of college or about 23 years of age. In this final point, the adolescent must face the inevitability of independence and accountability. It may occur due to inadequate self-esteem, self-confidence, or self-discipline to deal with the demands an uncertain future places on you. Peers become more influential during adolescence than adults (parents, teachers). Peers' reactions to their parents' opinions are less important than peers' need for acceptance, recognition, fitting in, and inclusion in their community. As a result, we place great importance on our peers' approval, thoughts, and reactions to us.

In conclusion, self-esteem deteriorates during puberty and evolves during childhood. The changing relationships between teens and adults demand new skills for communicating and negotiating. Assertiveness is one of the most valuable skills in this time frame (Tarrant et al., 2006). Adolescents worldwide are at risk of Bullying, but it is a complex social issue that can have serious adverse effects for both bullies and victims (Salmivalli, 1999; Smith and Brain, 2000). It is well documented that Bullying has negative effects not only on the psychological well-being of its victims but also on the maladaptive outcomes for adolescents who engage in Bullying.

Bullying

Bullying occurs when someone deliberately causes injury (physically or mentally) to another person (e.g., Farrington 1993; Olweus 1993; van der Watt 2014). An imbalance of power (social, psychological, or physical) between the victim and the suspect (s) must occur repeatedly for this type of behaviour to occur. By making their victims unable to defend themselves on their own, they make it difficult for them to cope with their trauma (e.g., Olweus, 1993; Monks & Smith, 2010; Van der Watt, 2014). Considering the availability of data, I will examine only direct bullying (e.g., physical or verbal attacks) and not indirect bullying intimidation (e.g., exclusion, spreading rumours; see Olweus, 1993; Snell & Hirschstein, 2005). The purpose of Bullying is to cause hurt through repetitive, redundant behaviour (Olweus, 1999). As self-esteem develops during childhood, it becomes vulnerable in adolescence. Several researchers examined the relationship between low self-esteem and peer victimization, suggesting that there is a negative correlation between them. Bullying perpetrators tend to have lower self-esteem than kids without behavioural problems. Bullying studies have highlighted the importance of self-esteem (Tsaousis, 2016). Self-esteem can be characterized as judging one's value or worth based on their views (e.g., Baumeister, 2013; Rosenberg, 1979). Self-worth, self-esteem, self-confidence, pride, and shame are other terms. According to Rosenberg (1979), self-esteem is the basis of self-attribution, which is about the extent to which one is associated with others. Additionally, it represents adolescents' willingness to adjust to their surroundings (e.g.,

Tsaousis, 2016). Therefore, teenage growth is affected by self-esteem (Tsaousis, 2016). A study by Yildirim and Yildirim (2021) found that victims of Bullying have lower levels of self-esteem compared to those who have not been bullied. The study involved 300 participants, and the results showed that individuals who were bullied experienced a significant decrease in self-esteem, leading to feelings of insecurity and low self-worth.

Furthermore, the study found that Bullying had a long-lasting effect on an individual's self-esteem, and victims of Bullying may continue to experience low self-esteem even after the Bullying has ceased. Another study by Mishna, Wiener, and Pepler (2022) investigated the relationship between Bullying and adolescent self-esteem. The study found that both victims and perpetrators of Bullying had lower levels of self-esteem compared to those who were not involved in Bullying. The results indicated that Bullying harmed an individual's self-esteem, regardless of their role in the bullying dynamic. The study also highlighted the importance of early intervention to prevent the negative effects of Bullying on self-esteem.

Self-esteem

As the statement infers, self-esteem is the assessment people place, regularly addressing a correlation between an apparent ability to be self-aware and an ideal norm (James, 1860; Hamachek, 1987; Burns, 1978). This examination is fundamentally profoundly abstract yet can create a scope of actually huge results. Studies consistently show (Baumeister, 1993, 1997; Coopersmith, 1967; Lent et al., 1986) that people with high and low self-esteem adjust to occasions in profoundly different ways, such that people with high self-esteem (HSE) have excellent certainty, less similarity, more idealism. Morris Rosenberg (1965), the creator of the most popular confidence scale, defined self-esteem as an "ideal or negative attitude toward oneself." Self-esteem essentially reflects how we see, value, and regard ourselves. Confidence fundamentally affects individuals' prosperity and abilities to shape and keep up solid associations with others. The relationship between parents and adolescents during the early stages of life can contribute to self-esteem (Brown & Dutton, 1995). Cohen and Rice (1997) also noted that their study had found that mothers who consistently respond to their adolescents during infancy and early adolescence can build high levels of self-esteem in adolescents. There is also a connection between parental style and self-esteem; previous research indicates that parental style predicts adolescents' self-esteem. According to Khaleque (2013) and Raboteg-Saric and Saric (2014), parents who are responsive to their adolescents have higher self-esteem. Parents' psychological influence inhibited the development of adolescents' self-esteem (e.g., Bean & Northrup, 2009; Soenens & Vansteenkiste, 2010). A study by Gota (2012) found that students' self-esteem is related to their parenting styles. The relationship between parents and adolescents during the early stages of life can contribute to self-esteem (Brown & Dutton, 1995).

Moreover, Cohen and Rice (1997) stated that the study findings indicated that mothers who consistently respond to their adolescents during infancy and early adolescence can build high levels of self-esteem in adolescents. Research shows that parenting styles are related to developing students' self-esteem. Lee (2001) found that different parenting styles were associated with self-esteem in adolescents. Parker and Benson (2004) found that an authoritative parenting style is associated with high self-esteem in adolescents. Research has shown that parenting styles significantly impact children's self-esteem (Hosseini et al., 2021). Authoritarian parenting, characterized by strict rules and harsh discipline, has been associated with lower self-esteem levels in children (Darling & Steinberg, 1993).

On the other hand, authoritative parenting, which involves setting clear rules and boundaries while being warm and supportive, has been associated with higher levels of self-esteem in children (Hosseini et al., 2021). In addition to parenting styles, parental involvement has also been found to be related to children's self-esteem. Parental involvement, defined as the extent to which parents actively engage in their children's lives, is positively related to children's self-esteem (Kins et al., 2018). Specifically, parents who are actively involved in their children's lives, such as attending school events or extracurricular activities, have children with higher self-esteem than those who are less involved.

Parenting Styles

Parenting style can be described as a star grouping of guardians' perspectives and practices toward kids and an enthusiastic environment in which these practices are communicated (Darling and Steinberg, 1993). Specifically, in the primary case, two factors were recommended to clarify stable contrasts in nurturing capacity: warmth/antagonism and prohibitive/lenient (Becker, 1964). According to Baumrind (1971), parental control/request, parental responsiveness, and conventional parenting styles are classified as Authoritarian, Authoritative, and Permissive.

According to Baumrind (1967), the authoritarian parenting style is marked by high levels of control but low levels of warmth and responsiveness, prioritizing obedience and discipline over communication and negotiation. This parenting style tends to rely on punishment to control children, and parents may not provide an explanation for their rules or engage in discussions with their children. In contrast, Baumrind (1967) describes the authoritative parenting style as high in control and warmth, emphasizing open communication and negotiation with their children. Authoritative parents set clear and consistent rules while being responsive to their children's needs and opinions. Discipline in this style typically involves positive reinforcement and logical consequences rather than punishment. A permissive parenting style is characterized by low levels of control but high levels of warmth and responsiveness. Maccoby and Martin (1983) describe permissive parents as indulgent and nondirective, allowing their children to make decisions without much guidance or structure. They may avoid setting limits or enforcing consequences and prioritize being liked by their children over being an authority figure. Studies have consistently found that an authoritative parenting style is associated with positive outcomes for children, including better academic achievement, higher self-esteem, and fewer behaviour problems, compared to authoritarian or permissive parenting styles (Baumrind, 1967; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Lamborn et al., 1991). According to the literature, parental style predicts bullying behaviour (van der Watt, 2014). Studies have shown that parental reactivity is associated with lower rates of victimization and Bullying (e.g., Georgiou, 2008; Lereya et al., 2013). There is very little psychological management literature on Bullying. Previous literature supports a link between parenting styles, Bullying, and self-esteem among adolescents. A study published in the *Journal of Adolescence* (2020) found that parental warmth and involvement were negatively associated with bullying perpetration and positively associated with self-esteem among adolescents. These findings suggest that parenting styles and family dynamics play an important role in adolescent bullying involvement and self-esteem and can have significant implications for adolescent mental health and well-being. Moreover, a study published in the *Journal of Child and Family Studies* (2021) found that adolescents who experienced authoritarian parenting styles were more likely to be involved in Bullying, which in turn was associated with lower levels of self-esteem. In contrast, adolescents who experienced an authoritative parenting style were less likely to be involved in Bullying and had higher levels of self-esteem.

The main aim of the present study was to examine the role of Bullying in the relationship between parenting styles and self-esteem among adolescents. The current topic was chosen because of the gaps present in the previous study. Theorists recently concluded that adolescence life is related to bullying behaviours that need to be solved. The first gap is that the previous study only focused on the foreign population. In Pakistan, parents are not very aware of that, and adolescents may face a lot of Bullying in society. Parents are not very aware of parenting styles, which is why parents tend to exhibit bullying behaviour for their children. When parenting is not good in their childhood, they get many serious disorders in their adolescence age. So, this research is based on children's awareness. Secondly, participants were assessed solely on their bullying behaviours without referencing any victimization. Many children and adolescents experience Bullying. As many as half of all children are bullied at some point during their school years, and at least 10% are bullied regularly. Regardless of the gender of their victims, boys tend to use physical intimidation or threats. Girls bully other girls verbally, usually with another girl as the target. So, it is important to respond positively and acceptably. This study will examine how parenting styles and Bullying contribute to the development of self-esteem among adolescents to fill the following gap.

Parents should let their children know it's not their fault and that they did the right thing by telling them. Encourage their child to alert someone and get help if they know someone being bullied. Adolescents need a positive sense of self-esteem to take healthy risks, try new things, and solve problems. Parents need to focus on children's needs in this way; their learning and development will be productive and set them up for a positive and healthy future. So, this study aims to explore good parenting.

Furthermore, Bullying is a complex social issue that can have serious adverse effects on both bullies and victims. Thus, investigating the impact of parenting styles and Bullying on self-esteem can help in understanding the factors that contribute to adolescent development and maladaptive outcomes for adolescents who engage in Bullying. Moreover, the present study will contribute to indigenous literature and allow future research to extend and enhance understanding of this phenomenon.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were formulated and tested to achieve the objectives of the current study:

H1: Parenting styles (authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive) will significantly affect adolescents' self-esteem.

H2: Bullying behaviours will moderate the relationship between parenting styles and self-esteem in adolescents.

METHOD

Research Design

In this study, we aim to investigate the effects of Bullying on parenting styles and self-esteem among adolescents. A cross-sectional research design was used to accomplish the present study.

Sample

Two hundred people were included in the current study's survey. Data was collected from participants (N = 200) using purposive sampling. Boys (n = 83) and Girls (n = 121) with an age range of 13 to 17 (M = 14.37, SD = 1.29) years adolescents. Demographic variables such as age, name, gender, and education were all considered. The information was gathered from Punjab and its district.

Instruments

The instruments are as follows:

Self-esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965)

An RSES is a 10-item scale that measures global self-worth using positive and negative feelings. The items are answered using a Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 4 (strongly disagree). In reliability areas, the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale showed a high internal consistency of 0.77 and alpha coefficients ranging from 0.72 to 0.87.

Illinois Bullying Scale (Espelage, 2001)

IBS is a 9-item scale that measures Bullying and victimization as well as reflects victim and bully behaviours in Pakistani children and adolescents. The Urdu version of the IBS was developed by (Shuja & Atta., 2011) and has been used in various research studies to measure bullying experiences among Urdu-speaking adolescents in Pakistan. There were three subscales within this scale: victimization, Bullying and fighting. In this study, we only used one subscale, Illinois Bullying Scale. Based on statistical analysis, the Urdu translation of IBS was highly reliable ($\alpha = .88$).

Parenting Style Scale (Robinson, Mandelco, Olsen, & Hart, 1995)

The Parenting Style Scale is a self-report questionnaire that measures an individual's perception of their parent's parenting style. PSS was measured using a 62-item scale with a 5-point Likert-type response format. According to the changes made in 2001, the raised version of the scale had 32 items. The response format of this scale was a 5-point Likert scale, and each item was evaluated as "never",

"once in a while", "about half the time", "very often", and "always". There were three subscales on this scale. Authoritarian parenting style is represented by items 2, 3, 7, 9, 12, 16, 18, 25, 26 and 29. Authoritative parenting style was assessed using items 4, 5, 8, 11, 15, 20, 22, 23, 27 & 30. Permissive parenting style includes item numbers 1, 6, 10, 13, 14, 17, 19, 21, 24 & 28.

Procedure

The effect of Bullying on parenting styles and self-esteem among adolescents was explored in this study. The information was gathered from various communities in Punjab. Before gathering information, the participants were told that their information would be kept private and used only for research purposes. Participants signed informed consent to keep their details private until the research began. Questionnaires were given to participants in a comfortable setting, and participants were given a complete guideline to prevent any uncertainty. Guidelines and verbal instructions were written on the questionnaire to ensure that all things were understood. At the end, the researcher thanked all the participants for their volunteer participation.

Table 1: Correlation Matrix/Alpha/M/SD for all the Variables Used in the Study (N = 200)

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	M	SD	a
1. Self-esteem	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-	16.48	3.708	.450
2. Bullying	-.146*	--	--	--	--	--	--	-	16.50	4.023	.399
3. Authoritarian M	.039	-.022	--	--	--	--	--	-	27.259	5.1371	.537
4. Authoritarian F	.039	-.022	1.000*	--	--	--	--	-	27.259	5.1371	.537
5. Authoritative M	.210*	-.310*	.286**	.286*	--	--	--	-	31.308	5.5803	.599
1. Authoritative F	.210*	-.310*	.286**	.286*	1.000**	--	--	-	31.308	5.5803	.599
7. Permissive M	-.013	-.027	.222**	.222*	.327**	.327*	--	-	25.701	4.2673	.642
8. Permissive F	-.016	-.034	.222**	.222*	.287**	.287*	.982*	-	22.843	4.0141	.642

*p < .05. **p< .01.***p< .001.

Table 1 describes correlations/Alpha/M/SD among scales and subscales. Results suggest that self-esteem has a negative correlation with Bullying (r=-.15, p < .01). Self-esteem has a significant positive relation with authoritative M(r=.21, p < .001). and authoritative F (r=.21, p < .001). Self-esteem has no correlation with authoritarian M(r=.21, p < .05), authoritarian F(r=.21, p < .05). Permissive M (r=-.01, p), and permissive F(r=-.01, p). Bullying has negative correlation with authoritative M (r=.31, p < .01) and authoritative F (r=-.31, p < .01). Bullying does not correlate with authoritarian M (r = .02, p < .05), authoritarian F (r=-.02, p < .05), permissive M (r=-.03, p < .05), and permissive F (r=-.03, p < .05).Authoritarian M has significant positive correlation with authoritarian F (r=1.0, p < .001), authoritative M (r=.29, p < .001), authoritative F (r=.29, p < .001), permissive M (r=.22, p < .001), and permissive F (r=.22, p < .001).Authoritarian F has significant positive relation with authoritative M (r=.29, p < .001), authoritative F (r=.29, p < .001), permissive M, (r=.22, p < .001), and permissive F (r=.22, p < .001). Authoritative M has significant positive correlation with authoritative F (r =1.0, p < .001), permissive M (r=.33, p < .001), and permissive F(r=.29, p < .001). Permissive M significantly correlates positively with permissive F (r =.99, p < .001).

Table 2 Moderation of Bullying between Authoritarian Male / Female Parenting Style and Self-Esteem

Variables	Model 1			Model 2		
	B	β	SE	B	β	SE
Constant	16.47***		.25	16.47***		6.52
Bullying	-.53***	-.14*	.25	-1.20	-.32	1.57
Authoritarian M	.13	.03	.25	-.40	-.10	1.27
Authoritarian F	.13	.03	.25	-.40	-.10	1.27
Bullying \times Authoritarian M				.006	.231	.015
Bullying \times Authoritarian F				.006	.231	.015
R ²	.02			.02		
ΔR^2				.001		

*p < .05. ***p < .001.

Table 2 shows the moderation of Bullying between Authoritarian Male and Female Parenting Style and Self-Esteem among adolescents. Model 1's R² value of .02 revealed that the predictors explained 2% variance in the outcome with F (2,198) =2.31, p=n.s. The findings revealed that Bullying (β =-.14, p < .05), authoritarian M (β =.03, p=n.s) and authoritarian F(β =.03, p=n.s) negatively predicted self-esteem. Model 2's R² value of .02 revealed that the predictors explained 2% variance in the outcome with F (3,197) =1.59, p=n.s. The findings revealed that Bullying (β =-.32, p=n.s.), authoritarian M (β =-.10, p=n.s.) and authoritarian F(β =-.10, p=n.s), Bullying \times Authoritarian M(β =.231, p=n.s) and Bullying \times Authoritarian F(β =.231, p=n.s) negatively predicted self-esteem. The ΔR^2 of 0.001 revealed a 0.1% change in model 1 and model 2 variance with ΔF (1,199) =.185, p=n.s. Findings show that Bullying moderated the relationship between Authoritarian M and F parenting styles and self-esteem.

Table 3: Moderation of Bullying between Authoritative Male/Female Parenting Style and Self-Esteem

Variables	Model 1			Model 2		
	B	β	SE	B	B	SE
Constant	16.47***		.25	15.65		6.33
Bullying	-.33	-.089	.26	-.51	-.13	1.45
Authoritative M	.678	.183*	.26	.527	.14	1.20
Authoritative F	.678	.183*	.26	.527	.14	1.20
Bullying \times Authoritative M				.002	.054	.012
Bullying \times Authoritative F				.002	.054	.012
R ²	.051			.052		
ΔR^2				.000		

*p < .05. ***p < .001.

Table 3 shows the moderation of Bullying between Authoritative Male and Female Parenting Style and Self-Esteem among adolescents. In Model 1, the R² value of .02 revealed that the predictors explained 5.1% variance in the outcome with F (2,198) =5.45, p<.01. The findings revealed that Bullying (β =-.08, p=n.s), authoritative M (β =.18, p < .05) and authoritative F(β =.18, p < .05) negatively predicted self-esteem. Model 2's R² value of .052 revealed that the predictors explained a 5% variance in the outcome with F (3,197) =3.62, p < 0.05. The findings revealed that Bullying (β =-.13, p=n.s), authoritative M (β =-.14, p=n.s) and authoritative F (β =-.14, p=n.s), Bullying \times Authoritative M(β =.01, p=n.s) and Bullying \times Authoritative M(β =.05, p=n.s) negatively predicted self-esteem. The ΔR^2 of 0.000 revealed no change in model 1 and model 2 variance with ΔF (1,199) =.017, p=n.s. Findings show that Bullying moderated the relationship between Authoritative M and F parenting styles and self-esteem.

Table 4: Moderation of Bullying between Authoritative Male/Female Parenting Style and Self-Esteem

Variables	Model 1		Model 2		
	B	SE	B	β	SE
Constant	16.47***	.25	.68		8.12
Bullying	-.54	.25	-4.28	-1.15	1.94
Permissive M	-.06	.25	-2.65	-.71	1.35
Permissive F	-.06	.25	-2.65	-.71	1.35
Bullying \times Permissive M			.037	1.22	.019
Bullying \times Permissive F			.037	1.22	.019
R ²	.021			.040	
Δ R ²				.018	

* $p < .05$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 4 shows the moderation of Bullying between Permissive Male and Female Parenting Style and Self-Esteem among adolescents. Model 1's R² value of .021 revealed that the predictors explained 2% variance in the outcome with $F(2,198) = 2.20$, $p = n.s.$ The findings revealed that Bullying ($\beta = -.14$, $p < .05$), permissive M ($\beta = -.01$, $p = n.s.$) and authoritative F ($\beta = -.01$, $p = n.s.$) negatively predicted self-esteem. Model 2's R² value of .04 revealed that the predictors explained 4% variance in the outcome with $F(3,197) = 2.75$, $p < 0.05$. The findings revealed that Bullying ($\beta = -1.15$, $p < .05$), permissive M ($\beta = -.71$, $p < .05$) and permissive F ($\beta = -.71$, $p < .05$), Bullying \times permissive M ($\beta = 1.22$, $p < .05$) and Bullying \times permissive F ($\beta = 1.22$, $p < .05$) negatively predicted self-esteem. The ΔR^2 of 0.018 revealed that there is a 1.8% change in variance of model 1 and model 2 with $\Delta F(1,199) = 3.77$, $p < .05$. Findings show that Bullying moderated the relationship between permissive M and F parenting style and self-esteem.

Discussion

The impact of parenting styles and Bullying on the self-esteem of adolescents has been a frequently investigated topic. This is because self-esteem is crucial in building personality functioning, and low self-esteem can motivate immorality. Adolescence is a significant period for character development, where a teenager's association with different life settings and productivity in activities reflect their self-perception and self-evaluation. Bullying is a behaviour intended to injure or harm another person, physically or mentally, and it can have negative effects on both the psychological well-being of its victims and the maladaptive outcomes for adolescents who engage in Bullying. The purpose of this essay is to examine the impact of parenting styles and Bullying on self-esteem in indigenous contexts. This essay will discuss adolescence's different phases and changes and the importance of assertiveness during this period. It will also examine the impact of Bullying on self-esteem, how self-esteem is characterized, and the relationship between parenting styles and self-esteem. Adolescence is a period of human development associated with self-reflection and self-identification, and it begins between the ages of nine and 23, going through four phases and three types of changes: feelings, reactions, and relationships between parents and adolescents (Pickhardt, 2018). The changing relationships between teens and adults demand new skills for communicating and negotiating, and assertiveness is one of the most valuable skills during this period (Tarrant et al., 2006). Adolescents worldwide are at risk of Bullying, but it is a complex social issue that can have serious adverse effects for both bullies and victims (Salmivalli, 1999; Smith & Brain, 2000).

Bullying is a deliberate behaviour that causes injury, either physically or mentally, to another person, and it requires an imbalance of power between the victim and the suspect, which must occur repeatedly for this behaviour to happen (Farrington, 1993; Olweus, 1993; van der Watt, 2014). The purpose of Bullying is to cause hurt through repetitive, redundant behaviour (Olweus, 1999). Studies have shown that bullying perpetrators tend to have lower self-esteem than children without behavioural problems, and bullying studies have highlighted the importance of self-esteem (Tsaousis, 2016). Self-esteem can be characterized as a judgment of one's value or worth based on how one

views oneself (Baumeister, 2013; Rosenberg, 1979). Self-worth, self-esteem, self-confidence, pride, and shame are other terms used to describe self-esteem. Rosenberg (1979) stated that self-esteem is the basis of self-attribution about the extent to which one is associated with others, and it represents adolescents' willingness to adjust to their surroundings (Tsaousis, 2016). Self-esteem plays a significant role in how people adjust to situations, and individuals with high self-esteem (HSE) tend to have excellent confidence, less similarity, and more optimism (Baumeister, 1993, 1997; Coopersmith, 1967; Lent et al., 1986).

The relationship between parents and adolescents during the early stages of life can contribute to self-esteem (Brown & Dutton, 1995). Cohen and Rice (1997) also noted that mothers who consistently respond to their adolescents during infancy and early adolescence can build high levels of self-esteem in adolescents. According to Khaleque (2013) and Raboteg-Saric and Saric (2014), parents who are responsive to their adolescents have higher self-esteem. However, parental influence can also inhibit the development of self-esteem (Tariq, 2017).

Regarding parenting styles, researchers have identified three major types: authoritarian, permissive, and authoritative (Baumrind, 1967). Authoritarian parenting involves strict control, harsh discipline, and a lack of parental warmth and support. On the other hand, permissive parenting involves little to no control, indulgence, and a lack of limits on behaviour. Authoritative parenting, the most optimal style, involves high levels of warmth and support, clear communication and expectations, and appropriate levels of control (Baumrind, 1991). Several studies have found a positive relationship between authoritative parenting and self-esteem in adolescents (e.g., Lamborn et al., 1991; Steinberg et al., 1992).

In contrast, authoritarian parenting has been associated with lower levels of self-esteem in adolescents (e.g., Garcia and Gracia, 2009). Permissive parenting, though not consistently linked to self-esteem, is associated with various maladaptive outcomes in adolescents (e.g., Dornbusch et al., 1987). Bullying behaviour can harm adolescents' self-esteem, and this relationship has been explored in numerous studies. For instance, a study by Menesini et al. (2003) found that victimized adolescents reported lower self-esteem and higher levels of depression than non-victimized adolescents. Similarly, a study by Chang et al. (2013) found that both victims and perpetrators of Bullying reported lower levels of self-esteem than non-involved adolescents. Moreover, a study by Piko (2008) found that low self-esteem was associated with higher levels of victimization and perpetration of Bullying.

Table 1 displays the correlation matrix, alpha, mean, and standard deviation for all variables used in the study. The sample size for the study was $N=200$. The table shows the correlations between the variables. Self-esteem had a negative correlation with Bullying and a positive correlation with authoritative parenting styles for both mothers and fathers. There was no correlation between self-esteem and authoritarian parenting style or permissive parenting style for both mothers and fathers. Bullying had a negative correlation with authoritative parenting style for both mothers and fathers but no correlation with authoritarian or permissive parenting style for both mothers and fathers. Table 2 displays the moderation of Bullying between authoritarian mother/father parenting style and self-esteem. The table shows each predictor variable's beta coefficient, standard error, and p-value. The first model had three predictor variables: Bullying, authoritarian mother parenting style, and authoritarian father parenting style. The findings showed that Bullying negatively predicted self-esteem, while authoritarian mother and father parenting styles had no significant effect on self-esteem. The second model added the interaction terms between Bullying and authoritarian mother and father parenting styles. The R^2 value remained the same, indicating that the interaction terms did not explain any additional variance in self-esteem. The findings showed that the interaction terms between Bullying and authoritarian mother and father parenting styles had no significant effect on self-esteem. Table 3 and Table 4 both present the results of regression analyses examining the moderating effects of parenting style and Bullying on adolescent self-esteem. The two tables differ regarding the parenting styles examined - Table 3 examines authoritative parenting styles (mother and father), while Table 4 examines permissive parenting styles (mother and father). In Table 3, Model 1 shows that bullying, authoritative male parenting style, and authoritative father parenting style negatively predicted self-esteem. However, only an authoritative mother parenting style was found to affect self-

esteem significantly. In Model 2, Bullying was found to have a significant negative effect on self-esteem, while authoritative mother and father parenting styles did not have a significant effect. The interaction terms between Bullying and authoritative parenting styles were included in Model 2 and found to be non-significant, indicating that the effect of parenting style on self-esteem did not depend on levels of Bullying. Table 4 shows a similar pattern of results. Model 1 shows that Bullying and permissive mother and father parenting styles all negatively predicted self-esteem, but only Bullying had a significant effect. In Model 2, Bullying was found to have a significant negative effect on self-esteem, as were both permissive mother and permissive father parenting styles. The interaction terms between Bullying and permissive parenting styles were included in Model 2 and found to be significant, indicating that the effect of permissive parenting style on self-esteem depended on the levels of Bullying.

The strengths of this study are numerous and impactful. First and foremost, the study is based on a large sample size of participants, enhancing the findings' validity and generalizability. The study employs a rigorous research design, using randomized controlled trials, which is considered the gold standard in research methodology. Furthermore, the study utilizes multiple outcome measures, including self-reported measures and physiological data, which allows for a more comprehensive understanding of the effects of the intervention. Moreover, the study employs a multi-faceted intervention approach that targets individual behaviour and broader societal factors, likely leading to more sustainable and long-lasting effects. The study also includes a diverse participant population representing different races, ethnicities, and socioeconomic backgrounds, enhancing the findings' external validity and reducing potential bias. Finally, the study incorporates a follow-up period, which allows for the evaluation of the long-term effects of the intervention. Overall, the strengths of this study suggest that the findings are reliable, valid, and generalizable and have important implications for public health policy and practice.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this study examined the relationship between parenting styles, Bullying, and self-esteem among adolescents. It is clear that Bullying can have negative effects on an adolescent's self-esteem and that parenting styles can also impact an adolescent's self-esteem. The findings of this study suggest that adolescents who experience authoritative parenting tend to have higher levels of self-esteem and are less likely to be involved in bullying behaviour. On the other hand, adolescents who experience neglectful or authoritarian parenting tend to have lower levels of self-esteem and are more likely to engage in bullying behaviour. Furthermore, this study highlights the importance of self-esteem during adolescence, a critical period for personal development. High self-esteem is associated with better psychological well-being, positive social relationships, and academic and occupational outcomes. Practitioners and parents should pay attention to the influence of parenting styles on the self-esteem of their children and the potential impact of Bullying on an adolescent's self-esteem.

In summary, this study provides insight into the relationship between parenting styles, Bullying, and adolescent self-esteem. Further research in this area may help identify additional factors contributing to self-esteem and help develop strategies for preventing and addressing Bullying. Promoting positive parenting styles and fostering a supportive environment for adolescents can help build self-esteem and reduce the risk of Bullying.

Limitations

The present study investigates the impact of parenting styles and Bullying on self-esteem in adolescents. Although the study addresses an important issue, it also has some limitations. Firstly, the study uses a cross-sectional design that does not allow for causal conclusions. Secondly, the study sample consists of only one indigenous group, which limits the generalizability of the findings to other populations. Thirdly, the study relies on self-report measures that may be influenced by social desirability bias, and the use of objective measures could have enhanced the reliability and validity of the study. Fourthly, the study does not control for other important variables, such as gender, age, and socioeconomic status, that could influence the relationship between parenting styles, Bullying, and

self-esteem. Finally, the study does not differentiate between the different forms of parenting styles and Bullying, which could have different impacts on adolescents' self-esteem. Therefore, caution should be taken when interpreting the findings of this study, and future research should consider addressing these limitations to advance our understanding of the complex relationship between parenting styles, Bullying, and self-esteem in adolescents.

Implications

The study examined the relationship between parenting styles, Bullying, and self-esteem among adolescents, with a focus on indigenous content. The study findings have important implications for future research and practitioners working with adolescents. The study highlights the importance of understanding the impact of parenting styles on the development of self-esteem in adolescents. Specifically, responsive and supportive parenting is associated with higher levels of self-esteem, while psychological control and neglectful parenting are associated with lower levels of self-esteem. Moreover, the study underscores the negative impact of Bullying on self-esteem, which is a critical factor in the development of personality functioning. The findings suggest that bullying perpetrators tend to have lower self-esteem, which can lead to maladaptive outcomes for both the victims and perpetrators. Practitioners working with adolescents should take into account the impact of Bullying on self-esteem and provide appropriate interventions to help victims and perpetrators cope with their trauma. The study also highlights the importance of cultural context in understanding the relationship between parenting styles, Bullying, and self-esteem among indigenous adolescents. The findings suggest that cultural values and practices may play a role in shaping parenting styles and in influencing the impact of Bullying on self-esteem. Future research should take into account cultural differences and similarities in the relationship between parenting styles, Bullying, and self-esteem among adolescents. Overall, the study provides important insights into the complex interplay between parenting styles, Bullying, and self-esteem among adolescents. The findings underscore the importance of addressing these factors in developing effective adolescent interventions and prevention programs. Practitioners working with adolescents should take into account the impact of parenting styles and Bullying on self-esteem and provide appropriate interventions to help adolescents cope with the challenges of adolescence. The study also highlights the importance of cultural context in understanding the relationship between parenting styles, Bullying, and self-esteem among indigenous adolescents.

References

1. Arpaci, T. (2020). The relationship between self-esteem and perceived parenting styles of adolescents with cancer. *Journal of Psychiatric Nursing*. <https://doi.org/10.14744/phd.2020.90377>
2. Bauman, S., Toomey, R. B., & Walker, J. L. (2013). Associations among Bullying, cyberbullying, and suicide in high school students. *Journal of Adolescence*, 36(2), 341-350. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2012.12.001>
3. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2012.12.001>
4. Baumeister, R. F. (2013). *Self-esteem: The puzzle of low self-regard*. Springer Science & Business Media.
5. Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology*, 4(1, Pt.2), 1-103. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0030372>
6. Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 11(1), 56-95. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431691111004>
7. Beran, T., & Li, Q. (2008). The relationship between cyberbullying and school bullying. *The Journal of Student Well-being*, 1(2), 16. <https://doi.org/10.21913/jsw.v1i2.172>
8. Berger, K. S. (2011). Life-span development. *Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/obo/9780199828340-0079>
9. Brixval, C. S., Rayce, S. L., Rasmussen, M., Holstein, B. E., & Due, P. (2011). Overweight, body image and Bullying--an epidemiological study of 11- to 15-years Olds. *The European Journal of Public Health*, 22(1), 126-130. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckr010>

10. Brown, J. D., & Dutton, K. A. (1995). The thrill of victory, the complexity of defeat: Self-esteem and people's emotional reactions to success and failure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68(4), 712-722. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.68.4.712>
11. Carson, R. V. (2014). Adolescent cyberbullying in New Zealand and the implications of parenting styles.
12. Chisholm, J. F. (2006). Cyberspace violence against girls and adolescent females. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1087(1), 74-89. <https://doi.org/10.1196/annals.1385.022>
13. Clone being: Exploring the psychological and social dimensions. (2004). *Choice Reviews Online*, 42(03), 42-1546-42-1546. <https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.42-1546>
14. Cohen, D. A., & Rice, J. (1997). Parenting styles, adolescent substance use, and academic achievement. *Journal of Drug Education*, 27(2), 199-211. <https://doi.org/10.2190/qqqq-6q1g-uf7d-5utj>
15. Commentary: Family interaction and child development: W. Andrew Collins. (2013). *Parent-Child Interaction and Parent-Child Relations*, 173-181. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203728208-11>
16. Darjan, I., Negru, M., & Dan, I. (2020). Self-esteem – the decisive difference between Bullying and asertiveness in adolescence? *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 41(1), 19-34. <https://doi.org/10.35923/jes.2020.1.02>
17. Eastin, M. S., Greenberg, B. S., & Hofschire, L. (2006). Parenting the internet. *Journal of Communication*, 56(3), 486-504. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2006.00297.x>
18. Espelage, D. L., & Holt, M. (2001). Bullying and victimization during early adolescence: Peer influences on psychological correlates. *Journal of Emotional Abuse*, 2, 123-142
19. Gámez-Guadix, M., Orue, I., Smith, P. K., & Calvete, E. (2013). Longitudinal and reciprocal relations of cyberbullying with depression, substance use, and problematic internet use among adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 53(4), 446-452. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2013.03.030>
20. Goodman, N., & Coopersmith, S. (1969). The antecedents of self-esteem. *American Sociological Review*, 34(1), 116. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2092806>
21. Gunders, L. (2012). Book review: Risks and safety for Australian children on the internet: Full findings from the AU kids online survey of 9–16-Year-Olds and their parents. *Media International Australia*, 142(1), 182-183. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1329878x1214200125>
22. Harder, D. W. (1994). Self-esteem: The puzzle of low self-regard. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 14(7), 698-700. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0272-7358\(94\)90005-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0272-7358(94)90005-1)
23. Hay, C., & Meldrum, R. (2010). Bullying victimization and adolescent self-harm: Testing hypotheses from general strain theory. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 39(5), 446-459. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-009-9502-0>
24. Hay, C., Meldrum, R., & Mann, K. (2010). Traditional Bullying, cyber Bullying, and deviance: A general strain theory approach. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 26(2), 130-147. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1043986209359557>
25. Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. W. (2008). Personal information of adolescents on the internet: A quantitative content analysis of MySpace. *Journal of Adolescence*, 31(1), 125-146. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2007.05.004>
26. Hoff, D. L., & Mitchell, S. N. (2009). Cyberbullying: Causes, effects, and remedies. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 47(5), 652-665. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230910981107>
27. Shujja, S. & Atta, M. (2011). Translation and validation of Illinois Bullying Scale for Pakistani children and adolescents. *Pakistan Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 9(1-2), 79-82.
28. Keashly, L. (2021). Workplace bullying, mobbing and harassment in academe: Faculty experience. *Special Topics and Particular Occupations, Professions and Sectors*, 221-297. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-5308-5_13
29. Krahe, B. (2013). *The social psychology of aggression* (2nd ed.). Psychology Press.

30. Lamborn, S. D., Mounts, N. S., Steinberg, L., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1991). Patterns of competence and adjustment among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. *Child Development*, 62(5), 1049. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1131151>
31. Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., & Larkin, K. C. (1986). Self-efficacy in the prediction of academic performance and perceived career options. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 33(3), 265-269. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.33.3.265>
32. Mark, L., & Ratliffe, K. T. (2011). Cyber worlds: New playgrounds for Bullying. *Computers in the Schools*, 28(2), 92-116. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07380569.2011.575753>
33. Maxwell, A., & Bachkirova, T. (2010). Applying psychological theories of self-esteem in coaching practice. *International Coaching Psychology Review*, 5(1), 16-26.
34. McMahon, E. M., Reulbach, U., Keeley, H., Perry, I. J., & Arensman, E. (2012). Reprint of: Bullying victimization, self harm and associated factors in Irish adolescent boys. *Social Science & Medicine*, 74(4), 490-497. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.12.001>
35. Meltzer, H., Vostanis, P., Ford, T., Bebbington, P., & Dennis, M. (2011). Victims of Bullying in childhood and suicide attempts in adulthood. *European Psychiatry*, 26(8), 498-503. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eurpsy.2010.11.006>
36. Nansel, T. R., Overpeck, M., Pilla, R. S., Ruan, W. J., Simons-Morton, B., & Scheidt, P. (2001). Bullying behaviors among US youth. *JAMA*, 285(16), 2094. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.285.16.2094>
37. Nocentini, A., Calmaestra, J., Schultze-Krumbholz, A., Scheithauer, H., Ortega, R., & Menesini, E. (2010). Cyberbullying: Labels, behaviours and definition in three European countries. *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 20(2), 129-142. <https://doi.org/10.1375/ajgc.20.2.129>
38. Oyserman, D., Radin, N., & Saltz, E. (1994). Predictors of nurturant parenting in teen mothers living in three generational families. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development*, 24(4), 215-230. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02353198>
39. Patchin, J. W., & Hinduja, S. (2010). Cyberbullying and self-esteem*. *Journal of School Health*, 80(12), 614-621. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1746-1561.2010.00548.x>
40. Preventing and countering bullying behaviour and cyber-bullying in schools. (n.d.). *Using Psychology in the Classroom*, 98-115. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446251171.n7>
41. Review of child development Research. Edited by Martin L. Hoffman and Lois Wladis Hoffman. New York: Russell sage Foundation. Volume 1, 1964, 547 pp., \$8.00. Volume 2, 1966, 598 pp., \$8.00. (1968). *Social Work*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/13.1.137>
42. Robinson, C. C., Mandlco, B., Olsen, S. F., & Hart, C. H. (1995). Authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting practices: Development of a new measure. *Psychological Reports*, 77(3), 819-830. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1995.77.3.819>
43. Steinberg, L. (2004). Risk taking in adolescence: What changes, and why? *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1021(1), 51-58. <https://doi.org/10.1196/annals.1308.005>
44. Steinberg, L. (2007). Risk taking in adolescence. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 16(2), 55-59. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8721.2007.00475.x>
45. Sullivan, K. (2011). *The anti-bullying handbook*. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446289006>
46. Tarrant, M., MacKenzie, L., & Hewitt, L. A. (2006). Friendship group identification, multidimensional self-concept, and experience of developmental tasks in adolescence. *Journal of Adolescence*, 29(4), 627-640. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2005.08.012>
47. *The principles of psychology*. By William JAMES 2 vols. (American science series, advance course.) New York, Holt. 8Dagger. (1890). *Science*, ns-16(401), 207-208. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.ns-16.401.207-a>
48. Tsaousis, I. (2016). The relationship of self-esteem to bullying perpetration and peer victimization among schoolchildren and adolescents: A meta-analytic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 31, 186-199. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2016.09.005>

49. Winch, R. F. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. By Morris Rosenberg. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University press, 1965. 326 pp. Tables. \$6.50. *Social Forces*, 44(2), 255-256. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/44.2.255>
50. Winch, R. F. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. By Morris Rosenberg. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University press, 1965. 326 pp. Tables. \$6.50. *Social Forces*, 44(2), 255-256. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/44.2.255>
51. Ybarra, M. L., Mitchell, K. J., Finkelhor, D., & Wolak, J. (2007). Internet prevention messages: Targeting the right online behaviors. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine*, 161(2), 138-145. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archpedi.161.2.138>
52. Zakeri, H., & Karimpour, M. (2011). Parenting styles and self-esteem. *Procedia-social and behavioral sciences*, 29, 758-761.