

How to Cite:

Nisa, A. U., Ahmed, J., Arif, M., Kazmi, S. M. A., & Mohsin, M. (2022). Self-control, moral disengagement, and bullying behaviors in adolescents. *International Journal of Health Sciences*, 6(S8), 6009–6025. <https://doi.org/10.53730/ijhs.v6nS8.13690>

Self-control, moral disengagement, and bullying behaviors in adolescents

Aziz Ul Nisa

MS in Clinical Psychology, Department of Psychology (LSPS), the University of Lahore, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan

Jawaad Ahmed

MS in Clinical Psychology, Department of Psychology (LSPS), the University of Lahore, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan

Corresponding author email: jawaadahmedofficial@gmail.com

Maham Arif

MS in Clinical Psychology, Department of Psychology (LSPS), the University of Lahore, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan

Syed Messum Ali Kazmi

Assistant Director Colleges, Higher Education, Punjab

Muhammad Mohsin

MS in Clinical Psychology, Department of Psychology (LSPS), the University of Lahore, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan

Abstract--This research work aimed to determine the correlation between self-control, moral disengagement, and adolescent bullying behavior. Data was collected from the Government and private colleges of Gujranwala, Punjab, Pakistan. The sample consisted of 200 boys and girls student. Co-relational research design and convenient sampling were used to collect data from students using tools, i.e., demographic information form, brief self-control scale, moral disengagement bullying scale, and Illinois bullying scale. The verdict indicated that self-control has significantly negative correlated with bullying behavior, and moral disengagement has significantly positive correlated with bullying behavior. The findings also showed that self-control does not correlate with moral disengagement. Furthermore, this study also examines many other factors that have significantly co-related with bullying behavior in adolescents, like gender, parental education, living status, educational center, educational level, drug abuse, relation with friends, and home environment. This research guides future researchers in developing culturally related intervention plans and policies for preventing adolescent bullying behavior.

Keywords---bullying behavior, moral disengagement, self-control.

Introduction

Bullying is a complex social problem around the world. Bullying behavior is considered a profound source of damage for victims (Anderson & Sturm, 2007). Bullying is frequently acknowledged as a form of anger characterized by repetitive behavior or domination of powerless individuals. Bullying primarily involves direct or indirect aggression like punching, calling someone's name, pushing, and using indirect forms such as gossip, rumors, rejecting someone, and harm to the victims (Khawar & Malik, 2018). Bullying is linked to violence or aggression that causes many incidents in later life (Corvo & deLara, 2010).

Bullying behavior is a common experience for students in education settings worldwide. However, this social problem severely impact victims' and bullies' psychological and physical health (Baldry, 2004; Hallberg & Strandmark, 2006). Identifying the factors that cause this social problem; exploring the factor before prevention is essential. Many vital factors can cause school bullying, like gender, age, residence, race, and ethnicity (Bachman et al., 2011). There is a constant need to investigate the predictor of bullying behaviors. Predictors are the fundamental cause of bullying behavior in educational settings.

Results of previous research shown that persons with stumpy self-control are additional chances to involve in bullying practices (Watson & Tharp, 2013). The drive of this study will examine the correlation amid self-control, moral disengagement, and bullying behavior. The current research investigates the association between self-control, moral disengagement, and bullying behavior. Moreover, identifying those factors would be the predictors of bullying behavior.

Operational Definitions

Self-Control

Self-regulatory capacities are directly linked with self-control (Smith-Donald et al., 2007).

Moral Disengagement

Moral disengagement is the moral self-regulatory process deactivated by the perception system (Bandura et al., 1996). According to Albert Bandura, moral development is accepted as seeing a mixture of civil and perceptual aspects, primarily those individuals with self-control. Individuals commit four significant steps of disengagement actions to accept unethical behavior (Bandura, 1999), such as cognitive re-construing, blaming, distortion of negative consequences, and minimizing agency (Bandura et al., 2001).

Bullies

Those who repeatedly and purposefully hurt others amount of time are often identified as expressing hateful and physical power. They are considered irritable, impulsive, dependable and, arrogant, somewhat anxious (Olweus, 1993).

Victims

Victims have frequent exposure to bullying two to three times a month. They have been viewed as more afraid, alone, distressed, nervous and apprehensive, and physically weaker than bullies. They lack confidence, are less assertive, and have low self-esteem. They are unable to defend themselves, and they have poor social skills (Olweus, 1993; 1997).

Bystanders

Bystanders are those who have not directly participated in bullying. There are three main types of bystander bullying, according to researchers:

- Those who do not directly participate in bullying but also join bullies' partners are named assistants of bullies.
- There is another group that does not participate in bullying behavior but supports bullies, and they may witness the act silently.
- Those who defend the target by providing direct help and also seeking the help of an adult

Bullying and Victimization

Bullying and victimization have different forms, such as physical, verbal, social, or relational (Wang et al., 2009).

Physical bullying

This term involved the use of physical power by the delinquent against the targeted individual. Such as (a) physically damaging behaviors such as punching, hitting, beating up, kicking, tripping, tripping, and shoving; (b) victims related destructive such as robbery, smattering, and misuse or injurious the books, money, lunch, or other goods; (c) forcing the target individual to act undesirable performance is a type of physical bullying (Groth & Birnbaum, 2013).

Verbal

Verbal bullying includes offensive behaviors like irritating, joking, name-calling, awful criticism, disgracing, blackmailing, hurtful commenting, humiliating or threatening body language, and assertive written conversation (Zhou et al., 2022).

Social/Relational

This form of bullying has been explained by actions proposed to hurt the target's social belongings and feelings by consciously avoiding him or her or eliminating him or her from the peer group (Welner et al., 2022).

Cyber Bullying

In recent years cyber bullying concerned more attention from researchers. This form of bullying involves digital technology bullies employing inward and outwardly ways to hurt their target (Field, 2018).

Literature Review

The present study aims to explore the correlation amid self-control, moral disengagement, and bullying behavior in adolescents. This part will discuss the previous literature describing the relationship among these variables. According to the Flouri and Buchanan (2003) researched adolescent bullying behavior and the role of father and mother involvement. The research aimed to identify parents' role in bullying behavior in adolescents. Sample-based on 1147 adolescents with an age range of 14 to 18. The measuring variables were bullying behavior and father involvement. Bullying behavior was measured on four items scale, a4 items measured as father involvement items. It was a 3-point Likert scale. In the same way, these items also measure mother involvement. The finding indicated that less involvement of father and mother was significantly related to adolescents bullying behavior.

Sijtsema et al. (2014) examined the effects of moral disengagement and selection of friends, defending, and bullying influence. The study aimed to explore the significant effects of friends by developing defending and bullying in childhood and early adolescents. These variables are also influenced by moral disengagement from using social networks. 369 participants were involved in this research. The variables were friendship network, bullying, and defending measured by participants' role questionnaire scale, moral disengagement 14 items of self-report. The finding indicated that late childhood and early adolescence have a significant difference in the process of socialization and also indicated early adolescent friends that affected the development of bullying and moral disengagement.

Also, Asif (2016) researched behavioral problems and bullying among adolescents and its effect on educational recital. The research marked to explore the association between bullying and behavioral problems and the influence of these variables on academic performance. The tester of the study was 200 students. The sample age was 13 to 18 years. The measuring tools were the Illinois Bullying Scale of 18 items for bullying and DASS for measuring related behavioral problems such as stress, anxiety, and depression. The finding of Pearson correlation indicated that these variables negatively correlated with academic achievement. Regression analysis showed that bullying predicted depression, anxiety, and stress.

Moreover, Kircaburun and Tosuntaş (2017) explored self-control and cyber bullying victimization among adolescents. This research aimed to explore predictive self-control factors of cyber victimization among teenagers. The study tester consists of 353 Turkish learners in secondary school. The measuring instruments of investigation were the scale of brief self-control and the scale of cyber victimization. A expressive relational model was used for predictive analysis to explore the predictive relationship between self-control and cyber victimization. Pearson correlation and structuring modeling was used to assess this correlation. This research's finding indicated a negative correlation between self-control and cyber victimization.

Furthermore, Wang et al. (2016) examined the longitudinal relationship amid moral disengagement and adolescent bullying. The study intended to investigate the longitudinal association between bullying behavior and moral disengagement. Variables were measured through 23 items of moral disengagement with eight mechanisms and bullying behavior measured by five items scale of bullying behavior. The results reveal that moral disengagement was the predictor of bullying behavior. Findings also suggested that the oldest students, male students, highly engage with moral disengagement compared to younger and female students.

Cho et al. (2017) sought bullying and parental attachment in adolescents in South Korea: effects of mediating factors unusual peer correlation, delinquency, and low self-control. The study aimed to explore two leading pathways of bullying, low self-control, parental attachment, and deviant peer association with low self-control. The study's sample was separated into two plans investigation one plan entailed of 4th-grade students in 2004 and 8th-grade students in 2008. The measuring instruments were deviant peer association, parental attachment, low self-control, and delinquency. Standard scales measure these variables. The finding indicated that higher rates of bullying behavior correlate with poor parent affection and low self-control.

Meter, and Bauman (2018) examined related parental monitoring and cyber bullying about moral disengagement, cyber bullying investigation of the effects of old-fashioned victimization and traditional bullying. For this research, 800 school students were selected from Elementary and middle school. Data was collected in the southwestern United States. The results of this study showed that cyber bullying behavior was higher among those students who were involved in moral disengagement.

Volk et al. (2018) researched adolescent bullying and personality. 440 adolescents were selected as a sample in two different schools in china. 293 boys and 147 girls. The age range of this sample participant was 14 to 19. Measure the personality, 60 items self-report questionnaire HEXACO personality inventory was revised. To measure bullying, used a bully questionnaire. The linear regression finding suggested that some personality domains, like honesty, humility, and conscientiousness, were significantly negatively correlated with bullying.

Nguyen et al. (2019) investigated the Impact of parent bullying on adolescent and mental health in Vietnamese cultural settings. The study aimed to explore

predictor factors such as parental bullying and mental health outcomes during adolescence. The sample was collected from 3331 students in grades 8th to 12th class. The age range of the sample was 12 to 17. The measuring variables were bullying, physically attacked, loneliness, and suicidal ideation. These variables indicated different factors, such as mental health, engaged loneliness, and suicide. The finding indicates that understanding parents and monitoring parents decreased the risk of bullying and mental health problems.

Rational of the study

The present study explores the relationship among adolescents' self-control, moral disengagement, and bullying behavior. Numerous studies in the literature review showed an association between bullying behavior and self-control and many other variables as victimization, peer pressure, peer bullying (Kim et al., 2022), psychological effects of bullying behavior (Reknes et al., 2019), parental ignorance, personality traits (Aran & Nayebkibir, 2018).

So limited indigenes researched these three variables self-control, moral disengagement, and bullying behavior. Moreover, most researchers on victimization learners participated from grades 5,6,7,8, and limited research on bullying and adolescence. The research on adolescents found a relationship between self-control, moral disengagement, and the bully's behavior. This research also explored the role of self-control and moral disengagement in bullying behavior in adolescents. Because adolescents show risky and careless behavior in this age period, it is essential to develop the insight of self-control and moral engagement that is helpful to prevent social problems such as bullying.

This research has social and clinical signs; as adolescents gain self-control awareness and engage in morality, they prevent social problems. Moreover, awareness programs can be conducted in colleges for awareness of self-control and moral engagement and prevention of bullying behavior for adolescence.

Objective of Study

- To explore the relationship among self-control, moral disengagement and bullying behavior in adolescences
- To identifying the predictors as self-control and moral disengagement of bullying behavior in adolescents

Hypothesis

- There would be a negative correlation between moral Disengagement and self-control
- There would be a positive correlation between moral disengagement and bullying behavior
- There would be a negative relationship between self-control and bullying behavior
- Self-control and moral disengagement are likely to predict bullying among adolescents.

Methodology

A set of methods that used in a particular area of study or activities is called methodology. Methodology consists of the data collection tool, research design, ways to collect data, population, sample population, participants, and instruments, psychometric properties of the scale according to this population and analysis and procedure.

Aims of Current Study

- To explore the relationship among self-control, moral disengagement and bullying behavior in adolescences
- To identifying the predictors as self-control and moral disengagement of bullying behavior in adolescents

Research Design

In current research a cross sectional research design was used. The research aims to exploring the relationship among self-control, moral disengagement and bullying behavior in adolescence.

Research setting

Current research was conducted on Government & private college's students.

Sample

In this present study convenient sampling strategy was used for sample selection. The sample of this study was calculated by G. power analysis. The study sample was 200 students from Gujranwala's government and private colleges.

Sample Characteristic

The sample size was 200 schoolboys and girls. Intermediate students aged 14 to 18 from both private and public sector colleges of Gujranwala were selected. The sample included both boys and girls. The student enrolled in (FA, FSC, ICOM, and ICS) will be included.

Inclusion Criteria

The student who fulfilled the following criteria was included in the study

- The students enrolled from intermediate classes, Students was selected with age ranging from 14 to 18 years.
- Student from both public and private colleges was selected

Exclusion Criteria

The student who meets the following criteria was rejected from the study

- Students were excluded if they did not meet age-ranging criteria was excluded
- A student with a physical and mental disability was excluded

Measuring Tools

The measuring tools were used in the present study as below;

Demographic sheet

It consisted of information about the participant's age, gender, education center, education level, family system, parents' education, home environment, drug abuse, close friends, and relationships with friends.

Brief Self-Control Scale

A German version (Bertrams & Dickhäuser, 2009) of the BSCS (Tangney et al., 2004) was used in this research. The scale's reliability with the sample was ($S: \alpha=.70$). A 5-point Likert scale is used to rate all items, such as 1 point 'not at all like me and 5 points 'very much like me. Items with inverse wording were recorded.

Moral Disengagement Scale

Bandura (1999) used a scale to measure moral disengagement. It has 18 items on moral disengagement behavior. Items divide into four categories minimizing agency, cognitive restructuring, blaming, and distortion of negative consequence. It was a 4-point Likert scale for rating all 18 items. One was "agree," and four was "completely disagree." The scale's reliability was ($\alpha=.68$).

Illinois Bullying Scale

To measure bullying behavior Illinois bullying scale (Espelage & Holt, 2001) was used. It has 18 items, and the scale has Subscales like fight, bullying, and victimizing. It is 4 points Likert scale where 0= Never, 1= 1 or 2 times, 2= 3 or 4 times, 3=5 or six times. 4= 7or more times. The reliability of the test was .92

Ethical Considerations

- Department-approved permission for research
- Permission to the author for tools used
- Approved permission for data collection from the head of the department
- Participants had ensured of the confidentiality of their information
- It allowed to participants to quit research at any time
- Data was collected with honesty and accuracy

Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to assess the demographic information of participants. Data were analyzed by statistical package for social science. Pearson

product-moment correlation analysis was used to evaluate the correlation of variables of the study. Multiple Regression analysis was used to evaluate the factors that affect the main variable.

Procedure

The approval for conducting research was approved by the university department. The tools were publicly and freely used. Urdu-translated questionnaires were used. The participants were given informed consent to ensure they were interested in participating in the study. All tools were self-administrative.

Results

In this part of the current study discussed the details of the results. Three scales and a demographic sheet were used for the main study. For measuring the first variable, self-control used a brief self-control scale. For measuring moral disengagement, Bandera moral disengagement bully scale was used. Moreover, for measuring bullying behavior, the Illinois bullying scale was used

Sample Description

In this section, following table shows the frequency distribution of the demographic characteristics of the sample participated in the current research.

Table 1
Frequency of the demographic characteristics of the participants (N = 200)

Variable	Boys <i>f</i>	Girls <i>f</i>	Total <i>f</i>
Gender	95	105	200
Age			
14 years	1	2	
15 years	2	12	
16 year	9	14	
17 years	39	50	
18 years	44	51	
	95	105	200
Education Center			
Government	75	65	
Private	20	40	200
Education Level			
First year	59	51	
Second year	36	54	200
Living Status			
Nuclear	35	40	200
Joint	58	63	
Hostel	2	2	
Parents Education			
Educated	67	59	200

Un-Educated	28	46	
Home Environment			
Satisfied	74	90	
Neutral	19	15	200
Unsatisfied	2	
Drug Abuse			
Yes	34	25	200
No	61	80	
Close Friends			
Yes	76	85	200
No	19	20	
Relation with Close Friends			
Satisfied	68	66	200
Neutral	9	22	
Unsatisfied	18	17	

Note: f = Frequency, % = Percentage

Table 1 shows the demographic frequency of variables. The participants of the current study were 200 Government and private college students. The sample was divided into two categories, i.e., boys and girls. Each category consisted of participants (105 girls and 95 boys) who were taken from government and private colleges. The participants included in the present study with age groups of adolescents from 14 to 18. There were (1 boy and two girls) participants who fell within the age range of 14 years, (2 boys and 12 girls) participants fell within the age range of 15 years, (9 boys and 14 girls) participants fell within the age range of 16 years, (39 boys and 50 girls) participants fall within the age range of 17 years, and (44 boys and 51 girls) participants fell within the age range of 18 years. The sample was conducted in two sectors, government and private such as (75 boys and 65 girls) from Government colleges and (20 boys and 40 girls) from private colleges. The sample was also selected from two levels of education. There were (59 boys and 51 girls) participants from 1st year and, (36 boys and 54 girls) participants from 2nd year. The sample was further divided into three categories of living status. 75 participants belonged to nuclear family systems, 121 participants belonged to the joint Family system and 4 participants belonged to the hostel.

In the current study, participants were divided into two categories of parents' status educated parents and uneducated parents. One hundred twenty-six participants belong to educated parents, and 74 belong to uneducated parents. The sample was divided into three groups of home environments satisfied, neutral, and unsatisfied. One hundred sixty-four participants belonged to a good home environment, 34 to a neutral home environment, and two to an unsatisfied home environment.

The sample was divided into two categories which abused drugs (Yes and No). Fifty-nine participants abused drugs, and 141 participants were not abused drugs. The sample was divided into two categories of participants with close friends (yes and no). One hundred sixty-one participants belonged to the yes category, and 39 belonged to the no category.

In the current study, participants were divided into three categories based on their relationship with friends satisfied, neutral, and unsatisfied. One hundred thirty-four participants had satisfying relationships with friends, 31 had neutral relations with friends, and 35 had unsatisfied ones.

Scales Reliability

Table 2
Checked the scales Reliability of Brief self-control scale, moral disengagement bullying scale and Illinois bullying scale

Variables	Items	α
BSCS	13	.70
MDBS	18	.68
IBS	18	.92

Note: α =corback alpha, BSCS= brief self-control scale, MD=moral disengagement bullying scale, IBS=Illinois bulling scale

Table 2 shows the reliability of the scales. BSCS had (.70) reliability that conducted the test had good reliability. MDBS had (.68), which showed the test had good reliability, and IBS had (.92), which also showed good test reliability.

Testing the Main Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1. It is hypothesized that there would be negative relationship among self-control, moral disengagement and bullying behavior.

Table 3
Pearson Correlation, Mean and Standard Deviation on self-control, moral disengagement and bullying behavior (N = 200)

Variable	SC	MD	BB
SC	---	.17	-.24
MD	---	---	.32
BB	---	---	---
Mean	39.24	49.31	73.13
SD	8.50	5.34	24.46

Note: SC = self-control, MD = moral disengagement, BB=bullying behavior
* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.

Table 3 shows Pearson Correlation among study variables. The results depicted that self-control was not correlated with moral disengagement. The results indicated that self-control has significantly negatively correlated with bullying behavior. The findings indicated that moral disengagement had correlated with bullying behavior. The findings indicated that self-control is not correlated with moral disengagement, but these two variables significantly correlate with bullying behavior.

Hypotheses 2. It is hypothesized that age, gender, education center, education level, family system, parents' education, home environment, close friends, relation

with friends and drug abuse, self-control, and moral disengagement will be predictors of bullying behavior in adolescents.

Table 4
Multiple Regression Analysis of Demographic Variables, self-control and moral disengagement and bullying behavior in adolescents (N=200)

Variables	B	SEB	B	t	P	
Step I (R= .45, $\Delta R^2= .16$)						
Age	-.818	1.36	-.040	-.60	.097(ns)	
Gender	2.47	2.21	.077	1.11	.265(ns)	
Education Center	-2.97	2.466	-.145	-2.01	.045	
Education Level	-3.63	2.14	-.133	-1.69	.092(ns)	
Family System	2.63	2.07	.085	1.26	.206(ns)	
Parents Education	-5.211	2.306	-.157	-2.26	.025	
Home Environment	-1.97	2.78	-.052	-.71	.479(ns)	
Close Friends	16.23	5.16	.402	3.14	.002	
Relation With Friends	9.09	2.75	.440	3.29	.001	
Drug Abuse	5.89	2.45	.402	2.40	.017	
Step II (R= .44, $\Delta R^2= .19$)						
Self-Control	-.908	.186	.316	-4.87	.000	
Moral Disengagement	1.73	.296	.379	5.85	.000	
Step III (R= .46, $\Delta R^2= .20$)						
Cognitive Restructuring	.659	.253	.195	2.60	.010	
Minimizing Agency	-.060	.313	-.013	-.192	.848(ns)	
Blaming	.227	.102	.144	2.22	.027	
Distortion	negative	.897	.243	.297	4.05	.000
Consequences						

Note. SEB= Standard Error of Beta, * $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < 0.001$, ns= non-significant

Table 4 shows that in model one from the demographics section education center, parent's education is the significant predictor of adolescent bullying behavior. Along with this, close friends, relationships with friends, and drug abuse are significant predictors of adolescent bullying behavior. Variables in model one are found to be significant predictors of bullying behavior in adolescents under the condition $F(10, 189) = 5.021$ as $p = .000$, i.e. $p < 0.001$. In step II, variables self-control and moral disengagement significantly predictors of bullying behavior under $F(7, 192) = 9.978$ $p = .000$ i.e. $p < 0.001$. In step III, variables cognitive restructuring, blaming, and distortion of negative consequences are the significant predictor of bullying behavior in adolescents under the condition $F(4, 195) = 13.50$ as $p = .000$ i.e. $p < 0.001$. Model three or step third variables are significant predictors of bullying behavior in adolescents under the condition $F(13, 286) = 20.55$ as $p = .000$, i.e. $p < 0.001$.

Discussion

The goals of education develop positive change in man's personality. It is developing abilities to choose the best alternative in any situation. It also develops to adopt the best option under challenging circumstances. So the definition of

education is the ability to of adjustment or change situations and environments. It is crucial for life, development, and survival. Everyone is responsible whether we are parents, adults, children, and teachers in any field or we liken in public or private sector educated to country.

For spreading education, education centers play an essential role in this regard. Education centers play a role in developing a positive sense of and supporting youth. It provides a platform where men shape their personalities and improve their abilities, skills, and engagements with positive and negative behaviors. Students exposed to much negative behavior in education centers, such as bullying. School bullying is a common form of bullying behavior in educational institutes. Several studies have been conducted on school and workplace bullying (e.g. Lester, 2009; Roscigno et al., 2009; Ferfolja, 2010).

Bullying behavior frequently occurs in school settings; according to a survey at the secondary school level, the rate of bullying behavior is higher than 10 to 11 % of students victimized by peers and 8 to 11% victimized by other persons (McDougall et al., 2001). Bullying behavior is a repeated practice for students in education settings throughout the world. However, this social problem adversely affects victims' and bullies' mental and bodily health (Smith and Brain, 2000). Identifying the factors that cause this social problem; exploring the factor before prevention is essential. Many vital factors can cause school bully, like gender, age, residence, race, and ethnicity (Alvarez & Bachman, 1997). There is a constant need to investigate the predictor of bullying behaviors. Predictors are the fundamental cause of bullying behavior in educational settings.

Results of previous research indicate that individuals with less control of self are more likely to engage in bullying behavior (Moon & Alarid, 2015). The current study explored the relationship between self-control, moral disengagement, and bullying behavior. The current study hypothesized a negative correlation between self-control and moral disengagement. The present research results indicated that self-control is not significantly correlated with moral disengagement. Previous research indicated that the factors that do not make the relationship between self-control and moral disengagement, such as goal setting, are gatekeepers for self-control (Inzlicht et al., 2014). Self-determination theory defines personal value in mind as leading to better self-control that can be achieved by goal designing. People with self-control do not engage in harmful activities because they focus on achieving their goals. Another factor that does not make the relationship between self-control and moral disengagement such personal factors affects self-control, and parental and family factors are also involved (Cullen et al., 2008). These variables no negatively correlated.

The present study hypothesized that age, gender, education center, education level, family system, parents' education, home environment, close friends, relationship with friends and drug abuse, self-control, and moral disengagement would predict adolescent bullying behavior. The current study's findings suggested that these factors among adolescents predict bullying behavior. The regression analysis of the present study showed that in the demographics section education center, parents' education is the significant predictor of bullying

behavior in adolescents. Along with this, close friends, relationships with friends, and drug abuse are significant predictors of adolescent bullying behavior.

Variables in model one are found to be significant predictors of bullying behavior in adolescents under the condition $F(10, 189) = 5.021$ as $p = .000$, i.e. $p < 0.001$. In step II variables, self-control and moral disengagement are significant predictors of bullying behavior under $F(7, 192) = 9.978$ $p = .000$ i.e. $p < 0.001$. In step III, variables cognitive restructuring, blaming, and distortion of negative consequences are the significant predictor of bullying behavior in adolescents under the condition $F(4, 195) = 13.50$ as $p = .000$ i.e. $p < 0.001$. Model three or step third variables are significant predictors of bullying behavior in adolescents under the condition $F(13, 286) = 20.55$ as $p = .000$, i.e. $p < 0.001$. The previous research above supports the results that these factors are predictors of bullying behavior.

Conclusion

In light of the current study outcome, low self-control and moral disengagement are predictors of bullying behavior in adolescents. It also discovered that self-control and moral disengagement are not correlated because of other factors, such as a goal-oriented personality having better self-control and not being involved in harmful activities. Previous researches also support this evidence. Parental and family patrons also might be the reason involved in self-control. The findings of the study also reported that many other factors could cause bullying behavior in adolescents, such as 1) gender, females have more bullying behavior as compared to males, 2) education centers, adolescents in private education center showed bullying behavior, 3) parents education, adolescents of uneducated parents showed more bullying behavior, 4) drug abuse, finding indicated that drug abuser has more bullying behavior as compared to a non-drug abuser, 5) MD, BB is higher in education level, adolescents in 1st-year level showed more bullying behavior.

Limitations and future suggestion

There are some limitations and suggestions in the present study. Bullying is a complex phenomenon; understanding the real meaning of bullying according to culture is challenging in this research. A restricted sample of 14 to 18 years was selected for this research. So the result should only be generalized in a broader population within the other age group. Data collected from just Gujranwala district should be extended to Punjab cities for more generalized results. Parents and teachers not involved in this research if they involved showed a clear picture of adolescent bullying behavior predictors. Cultural-related intervention plans and policies develop to prevent bullying behavior in adolescents.

Implications

Present findings help create awareness about the predictors of bullying behavior in adolescents for parents, counselors, policies, and intervention makers. This research also has social and clinical signs; adolescents who gain self-control awareness and engage in morality prevent social problems. Moreover, awareness

programs can be conducted in colleges for awareness of self-control, moral engagement, and prevention of bullying behavior for adolescence.

Conflict of Interest

The authors had no conflict of interest associated with the present research.

References

- Alvarez, A., & Bachman, R. (1997). Predicting the fear of assault at school and while going to and from school in an adolescent population. *Violence and Victims, 12*(1), 69-86.
- Anderson, T., & Sturm, B. (2007). Cyberbullying: From playground to computer. *Young Adult Library Services, 5*(2), 24-27.
- Aran, H., & Nayebkibir, M. (2018). Role of Parents in Religious and Social Education of Children. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding, 5*(3), 180-191.
- Asif, A. (2016). Relationship between Bullying and Behavior Problems (Anxiety, Depression, Stress) among Adolescence: Impact on Academic Performance. *Edmond: MedCrave Group LLC*.
- Bachman, R., Randolph, A., & Brown, B. L. (2011). Predicting perceptions of fear at school and going to and from school for African American and White students: The effects of school security measures. *Youth & Society, 43*(2), 705-726.
- Baldry, A. C. (2004). The impact of direct and indirect bullying on the mental and physical health of Italian youngsters. *Aggressive Behavior: Official Journal of the International Society for Research on Aggression, 30*(5), 343-355.
- Bandura, A. (1999). Moral disengagement in the preparation of inhumanities. *Personal and Social Psychology Review, 3*, 193-209.
- Bandura, A., Barbaranelli, C., Cahiprara, G. V., & Pastorelli, C. (1996). Mechanisms of moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*, 364-374.
- Bandura, A., Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Pastorelli, C., & Regalia, C. (2001). Socio cognitive self-regulatory mechanisms governing transgressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80*, 125- 135.
- Cho, S., Hong, J. S., Sterzing, P. R., & Woo, Y. (2017). Parental attachment and bullying in South Korean adolescents: Mediating effects of low self-control, deviant peer associations, and delinquency. *Crime & Delinquency, 63*(9), 1168-1188.
- Corvo, K., & deLara, E. (2010). Towards an integrated theory of relational violence: Is bullying a risk factor for domestic violence?. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 15*(3), 181-190.
- Cullen, F. T., Unnever, J. D., Wright, J. P., & Beaver, K. M. (2008). Parenting and self-control. *Out of control: Assessing the general theory of crime*, 61-74.
- Espelage, D. L., & Holt, M. K. (2001). Bullying and victimization during early adolescence: Peer influences and psychosocial correlates. *Journal of emotional abuse, 2*(2-3), 123-142.
- Ferfolja, T. (2010). Lesbian teachers, harassment and the workplace. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*(3), 408-414.

- Field, T. (2018). Cyberbullying: A narrative review. *Journal of Addiction Therapy and Research*, 2(1), 10-27.
- Flouri, E., & Buchanan, A. (2003). The role of mother involvement and father involvement in adolescent bullying behavior. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 18(6), 634-644.
- Groth, A. N., & Birnbaum, H. J. (2013). *Men who rape: The psychology of the offender*. Springer.
- Hallberg, L. R., & Strandmark, M. K. (2006). Health consequences of workplace bullying: experiences from the perspective of employees in the public service sector. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-being*, 1(2), 109-119.
- Inzlicht, M., Schmeichel, B. J., & Macrae, C. N. (2014). Why self-control seems (but may not be) limited. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 18(3), 127-133.
- Khawar, R., & Malik, F. (2018). Bullying Defined in Pakistani School Context: An Urdu Translation of Olweus Bully Victim Questionnaire. *Journal of Behavioural Sciences*, 28(2).
- Kim, J., Lee, Y., & Jennings, W. G. (2022). A path from traditional bullying to cyberbullying in South Korea: Examining the roles of self-control and deviant peer association in the different forms of bullying. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 37(9-10), 5937-5957.
- Kırcaburun, K., & Tosuntaş, Ş B. (2017). Cyberbullying perpetration among undergraduates: Evidence of the roles of chronotype and sleep quality. *Biological Rhythm Research*, 49(2), 247-265. doi:10.1080/02723646.2017.1352918
- Lester, J. (2009). *Organizing higher education for collaboration: A guide for campus leaders*. John Wiley & Sons.
- McDougall, P., Hymel, S., Vaillancourt, T., & Mercer, L. (2001). The consequences of childhood peer rejection. *Interpersonal rejection*, 213-247.
- Meter, D. J., & Bauman, S. (2018). Moral disengagement about cyberbullying and parental monitoring: Effects on traditional bullying and victimization via cyberbullying involvement. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 38(3), 303-326.
- Moon, B., & Alarid, L. F. (2015). School bullying, low self-control, and opportunity. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 30(5), 839-856.
- Nguyen, H. T. L., Nakamura, K., Seino, K., & Al-Sobaihi, S. (2019). Impact of parent-adolescent bonding on school bullying and mental health in Vietnamese cultural setting: evidence from the global school-based health survey. *BMC psychology*, 7(1), 16. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-019-0294-z>
- Olweus, D. (1997). Bully/victim problems in school: Facts and intervention. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 12, 495-510.
- Olweus, D. 1993. *Bullying at School: What We Know and What We can do About it*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Reknes, I., Visockaite, G., Liefoghe, A., Lovakov, A., & Einarsen, S. V. (2019). Locus of control moderates the relationship between exposure to bullying behaviors and psychological strain. *Frontiers in psychology*, 10, 1323.
- Roscigno, V. J., Lopez, S. H., & Hodson, R. (2009). Supervisory bullying, status inequalities and organizational context. *Social forces*, 87(3), 1561-1589.
- Sijtsema, J. J., Rambaran, J. A., Caravita, S., & Gini, G. (2014). Friendship selection and influence in bullying and defending: effects of moral disengagement. *Developmental psychology*, 50(8), 2093.

- Smith, P. K., & Brain, P. (2000). Bullying in schools: Lessons from two decades of research. *Aggressive Behavior: Official Journal of the International Society for Research on Aggression*, 26(1), 1-9.
- Smith-Donald, R., Raver, C. C., Hayes, T., & Richardson, B. (2007). Preliminary construct and concurrent validity of the Preschool Self-regulation Assessment (PSRA) for field-based research. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 22(2), 173-187.
- Tangney, J. P., Baumeister, R. F., & Boone, A. L. (2004). High self-control predicts good adjustment, less pathology, better grades, and interpersonal success. *Journal of Personality*, 72, 271-322. doi:10.1111/j.0022-3506.2004.00263.x
- Volk, A. A., Schiralli, K., Xia, X., Zhao, J., & Dane, A. V. (2018). Adolescent bullying and personality: A cross-cultural approach. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 125, 126-132.
- Wang, C., Ryoo, J. H., Swearer, S. M., Turner, R., & Goldberg, T. S. (2017). Longitudinal relationships between bullying and moral disengagement among adolescents. *Journal of youth and adolescence*, 46(6), 1304-1317.
- Wang, J., Iannotti, R. J., & Nansel, T. R. (2009). School bullying among adolescents in the United States: Physical, verbal, relational, and cyber. *Journal of Adolescent health*, 45(4), 368-375.
- Watson, D. L., & Tharp, R. G. (2013). *Self-directed behavior: Self-modification for personal adjustment*. Cengage Learning.
- Welner, M., DeLisi, M., Saxena, A., Tramontin, M., & Burgess, A. (2022). Distinguishing everyday evil: Towards a clinical inventory of extreme and outrageous behaviors, actions and attitudes. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, 154, 181-189.
- Zhou, H., Wang, Q., Yu, S., & Zheng, Q. (2022). Negative parenting style and perceived non-physical bullying at school: the mediating role of negative affect experiences and coping styles. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 19(10), 6206.