

Deputy Principals' Self-Efficacy in Dealing with Bullying in Malaysian Secondary Schools

J. C. Lee ^{*,1}, A. A. Nik ^{2,a} and N. Syawal ^{1,b}

¹School of Education and Modern Languages, UUM College of Arts and Sciences, 06010 UUM Sintok, Kedah Darul Aman, Malaysia.

²School of Multimedia, Media Technology and Communication, 06010 UUM Sintok, Kedah Darul Aman, Malaysia.

*junchoi@uum.edu.my, ^aadzrieman@uum.edu.my, ^bsyawal@uum.edu.my

Abstract - *With the increased use of the internet and social media, students are now being bullied in all locations, at all times. Bullying among students seems unstoppable. As second in command in the structure of secondary schools, the Deputy Principals have to face and deal with this problem. As Deputy Principals remain to be one of the least understood roles among schools of contemporary education systems, scant attention was paid to their self-efficacy regarding dealing with bullying. The purpose of this study is to identify the levels of secondary schools Deputy Principals' self-efficacy (Behavioral, Cognitive, and Emotional) in terms of dealing with bullying among students. 960 in-service Deputy Principals, 3748 students, and 798 parents from 240 secondary schools throughout Malaysia were involved in this study. Based on the finding of this study, Behavioral Self-Efficacy has the highest overall mean. However, the level of agreement towards Deputy Principals' Behavioral Efficacy in dealing with bullying, from both students and parents involved in this study is considered quite low. With better training opportunities and ongoing professional development for Deputy Principals in order to enhance their behavioral, cognitive, and emotional efficacy in dealing with bullying, hopefully will help to ease the problem of bullying among students in schools. Copyright © 2016 Penerbit Akademia Baru - All rights reserved.*

Keywords: self-efficacy, bullying, secondary school, deputy principals

1.0 INTRODUCTION

A few decades ago, most of bullying incidents normally took place at school or in the neighborhood at home, but now it is happening in more places than ever before. Today, with the increased use of the internet and social media, students are now being bullied in all locations and at all times. In recent years, bullying among students in schools has become recognized as an important educational problem [1-2]. Bullying remains a topic often in the news, which highlights the ongoing public concern and continual need for anti-bullying work in schools [3-4]. It is an acknowledged phenomenon worldwide [5-6] and still considered as one of the major social concerns in many part of the world which includes Malaysia.

One of the factors that contribute to teachers' burnout is dealing with disruptive behavior such as bullying among students in school [7]. Several studies [8-9] carried out regarding bullying behaviors in Malaysian schools showed that, it is a serious disciplinary problem that must be addressed by everybody. Among the consequences of being bullied is that the victims suffered from depression, have low self-esteem, anxiety, having psychosomatic symptoms such as

headaches, sleep or feed problems, having interpersonal difficulties, higher school absenteeism and lower academic competence [10]. Bullying behavior can also lead to serious injury or even death [9] and this is something that really worried the parents as well as the teachers in schools. Bullying has been identified as the current leading form of low-level violence, meaning underlying forms of violence, in schools [11]. Over the past 30 years, clinicians and researchers have come to the agreement that bullying in schools is a serious threat to the healthy development of children, in addition to being a cause of school violence [12-13]. This also in away has created an epidemic that must be stopped if students are to live a normal life be it in schools or at homes and hopefully develop into fully-functional adults.

Bullying phenomenon in schools is actually everyone's business and whenever teachers (class or academic teachers) are facing or dealing with bullying cases in school, besides counselling and discipline teachers, the next person that they would normally approach would be the Deputy Principals of that particular school. In Malaysian secondary school, the Deputy Principals are responsible for dealing as well as reporting to the Principal about current issues or challenges happening in school. Deputy Principals are second in command in the structure of secondary schools. They are professionally qualified teachers deployed to a school in order to assist the Principal. There are four deputy principals or known as senior assistants in every secondary school in Malaysia; Deputy Principal in-charge of academic/curriculum (PKI), Deputy Principal in-charge of student affairs (PK HEM), Deputy Principal in-charge of co-curriculum activities (PK KK), and Deputy Principal in-charge of the afternoon session (PP-Afternoon Supervisor) for secondary school that has afternoon session. Even though each Deputy Principal had his or her own portfolio/specific administrative duty, the school community considers them as the second important figure after the Principal. Therefore, regardless of whatever their portfolio or things they are in-charge of, as long as they hold the so called "Deputy Principal" title, they are expected to be the most suitable second person to be approached whenever any case (such as bullying and other disciplinary problems) occurs outside or inside the school compound. Sometimes any serious case that could not be solved by teachers or other school personnel such as discipline or counselling teachers, it will be most probably referred to any deputy principal available.

In order to deal with any disciplinary problem in secondary school such as bullying or any other destructive behaviors, normally the steps taken by the school concerned is to give first warning, second warning, third warning, last warning, school suspension and expulsion. For each warning, the parents of the students will be notified and a formal letter signed by the school principal will be issued and send to them. Parents of the students will have to go to the school and meet the school's disciplinary committee (consists of principal, deputy principals, discipline teachers, guidance and counselling teachers, class teacher, Parent and Teacher Association's representative) if the case is quite serious and needs immediate attention as well as solution. Whenever the first warning is issued, students will be referred to "Guidance and Counselling" unit for counselling session. Normally, there will be at least three counselling sessions carried out by the school counsellor hopefully to change or modify the destructive behaviors of the students. For recurring cases, the second warning letter will be issued and the parent will be called up to discuss and ratify an agreement to assure their children will behave well and do not repeat the offence. Students will again be referred to "Guidance and Counselling" unit for counselling session. If behavior (bullying) continues, student will be most probably facing a corporal punishment (caned on the buttock) with the concerned of the parent and approval from the principal. Only the school principal is allowed to carry out the punishment in his office or designated room and must be witnessed by the members of the disciplinary committee of the school. On the other hand, the school principal is allowed to

appoint (authorization letter must be issued and signed by principal) any deputy principals or discipline teachers to carry out the punishment. After the punishment, the student will be referred to “Guidance and Counselling” unit for counselling sessions as usual. The student will be suspended from school for one week (first suspension) and two weeks (second suspension) if he/she does not change. Only the principal of the school is given the authority to suspend the student. Each time any student being suspended from school, the parents will be notified and have to sign a consent or agreement letter guaranteeing that their son or daughter will not repeat the same offence (bullying) in future. The student will have to undergo several counselling sessions after the suspension. Expulsion with the approval of the principal will be only the last resort after student undergone all the above mentioned processes, but still not encourage by the ministry of education.

No doubt that there had been a lot of programs, preventions and interventions carried out in order to curb bullying among students in schools and although there is now quite a lot of literatures on how or what schools can do in dealing with cases of bullying, curiously enough there is little information available about what the Deputy Principals actually feel, think, and do when bullying is going on at their school. Many researchers have provided suggestions for important components of bully prevention and intervention programs, but few have actually collected data with regard to the Deputy Principals’ self-efficacy in dealing with bullying.

1.1 Purposes of the study

There are two primary purposes in this study. Firstly, the purpose of this study is to determine the level of deputy principals’ self-efficacy (behavioral, cognitive, emotional) in dealing with bullying in secondary school, among in-service deputy principals and secondly, is to determine the level of students’ and parents’ agreement towards deputy principals’ self-efficacy (behavioral, cognitive, emotional) in dealing with bullying in secondary school. It is hoped that the results may add to the present understanding of deputy principals’ involvement regarding bullying and by adding to this knowledge, help to reduce the insidious problem of bullying among students particularly in secondary schools.

1.2 Theoretical Framework of the Study

According to Bandura [14], self-efficacy is people's judgement of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances. Therefore, self-efficacy has important influence on human behavior and affect in goal setting, effort expenditure and the level of persistence in facing daily tasks. Self-efficacy helps determine what individuals do with knowledge and skills they possess in order to produce desirable outcomes. Bandura [15] added “unless people believe they can produce desired effects by their actions, they have little incentive to act”. In this respect, even when individuals perceived that certain actions are likely to bring about a desired behavior, they may not engage in the behavior or persist after initiating the behavior if they believe that they do not possess the required knowledge or skills. In other words, self-belief is related to actions and with knowledge of that matter it will eventually easier to work it out. Thus, beliefs about one’s ability to effect change will likely result in the use of behaviors that will bring about that desired change. In its application to school bullying, teachers who believe that they can have an impact on students and are confident in their ability to deal with bullying, are likely to be effective in reducing bullying. When a person believes they have what it takes to succeed, they develop a resilient sense of efficacy. If faced with difficulties or setbacks, they know that they can be successful through perseverance. The perception that one’s task (dealing with any bullying case) has been successful increases efficacy beliefs raising expectations that future performances will be

successful. In contrast failure, especially if it occurs early in the process of dealing with bullying experience, undermines one's sense of efficacy.

2.0 MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Participants

The sample consisted of a total of 960 in-service deputy principals from 240 secondary schools which had randomly selected from 6 states out of 14 states in Malaysia, mean age of 37.83 years, $SD = 11.23$ their ages spanning from 36 to 58 years. This study also involved 3748 secondary school students (Form One – Form Five) and 798 parents (mean age of 36.46, $SD = 9.56$) from the same schools involved in this study. They were all selected randomly.

2.2 Instruments

There are three types of questionnaires were utilized in this study in order to gather necessary data or relevant information. The first questionnaire is known as Deputy Principals' Self-Efficacy Scale in Dealing with Bullying (DPSEDB) which has two sections. Section A comprised the *Deputy Principals' Sense of Efficacy Scale Regarding Dealing with Bullying*, with 18 self-constructed items (to determine the participants' level of self-efficacy regarding dealing with bullying in secondary school). Section B, aimed to get several relevant demographic information of the participants. In order to response to Deputy Principals' Self-Efficacy Scale regarding dealing with bullying, participants were asked to circle a response corresponding (1-nothing, 2-very little, 3-some influences, 4- Quite a bit, 5-A great deal). Thought-listing questionnaire from 100 Deputy Principals during the pilot test had been carried out. Principal Component Analysis (PCA) had also been carried out on all the variables (the questions) of self-efficacy scale on Deputy Principals' self-efficacy regarding dealing with bullying in secondary school. Based on the factor analysis, Deputy Principals' self-efficacy scale regarding dealing with bullying in secondary school had been categorized into three criteria/sub-scales; i) Behavioral Self-Efficacy, ii) Cognitive Self-Efficacy, and (iii) Emotional Self-Efficacy. Internal consistency for each of the sub-scales was examined using Cronbach's alpha. The alphas were moderate: .68 for Behavioral Self-Efficacy (6 items), .60 for Cognitive Self-Efficacy (6 items), and .57 for Emotional Self-Efficacy (6 items).

The second questionnaire which is for the students in order to get their level of agreement towards Deputy Principals' efficacy (behavioral efficacy) in dealing with bullying in their schools. There are six self-constructed items (to determine the level of agreement towards Deputy Principals' behavioral efficacy in dealing with bullying) in this particular questionnaire, for example, "Deputy Principal is confident in controlling bullying behavior in the classroom". In order to response to this questionnaire, students were asked to circle a response corresponding (1-Strongly Disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Neither Agree or Disagree, 4-Agree, and 5-Strongly Agree). The internal consistency was Cronbach's alpha = .77, retest reliability was .78 ($n = 100$).

The third questionnaire is for the parents of the students in order to get their level of agreement towards Deputy Principals' efficacy (behavioral efficacy) in dealing with bullying in their children schools. There are six self-constructed items (to determine the level of agreement towards Deputy Principals' behavioral efficacy in dealing with bullying) in this particular questionnaire, for example, "Deputy Principals in that school are confident in controlling bullying behavior in the classroom". In order to response to this questionnaire, parents were

asked to circle a response corresponding (1-Strongly Disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Neither Agree or Disagree, 4- Agree, and 5- Strongly Agree). The internal consistency was Cronbach's alpha = .73, retest reliability was .68 ($n= 150$).

2.3 Procedure

Data were collected from the Deputy Principals, students, and parents whose children are studying in the schools involved in this study. All the respondents received oral instructions to complete the questionnaire. They were informed that the data would be used to help improve the general knowledge base regarding bullying and bullying prevention programs in the future. There were two phases of collecting data in this study. The first phase was only the Deputy Principals of the selected schools and then following by the second phase which involving students and their parents of the same schools two months after that. Based on the analysis on teachers' self-efficacy (after two months) which showed that Behavioral Self-Efficacy has the highest overall mean, the questionnaire for the students and parents were administered in order to get their level of agreement towards the Deputy Principals efficacy (behavioral efficacy) in dealing with bullying in their schools. After the students completed the questionnaires given to them (sealed in an envelope) and returned them to their teachers, they were given another set of questionnaires to bring back home and give them to their parents to answer. They were instructed to pass the questionnaire to their teachers the next day. Out of 1500 questionnaires given out to the parents through their children, only 798 parents responded.

In order to describe the levels of Deputy Principals' self-efficacy regarding dealing with bullying in secondary school among in-service Deputy Principals, as well as students and their parents level of agreement, descriptive statistic such as frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations had been used.

3.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Level of Deputy Principals' Self-Efficacy Regarding Dealing with Bullying Among Students in Secondary Schools

Table 1 displays data concerning the frequencies and percentages distributions of participants perceived level of self-efficacy regarding dealing with bullying among students in secondary school. The possible scores ranged from 1.00 to 5.00. Based on the frequency of the data collected from the participants, a mean score from scales 1.00 to 2.33 indicates low level of self-efficacy in dealing with bullying; 2.34 to 3.67 indicates moderate level, and 3.68 to 5.00 indicates high level.

Table 1: Level of Self-Efficacy of Deputy Principals Regarding Dealing with Bullying Among Students in Secondary Schools.

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

Table 2: Level of Behavioral Self-Efficacy (BSE), Cognitive Self-Efficacy (CSE), and Emotional Self-Efficacy (ESE) of Deputy Principals Regarding Dealing with Bullying in Secondary Schools.

Subscale	Level	M	SD
Behavioral Self-Efficacy	High	4.03	0.83
Cognitive Self-Efficacy	Moderate	3.63	0.89
Emotional Self-Efficacy	Moderate	3.38	0.95
Overall Mean=3.68 (SD=0.94) N=900 Cronbach's Alpha = .86			

Looking at Table 2, Behavioral Self-Efficacy has the highest overall mean among them all with an overall mean of 4.03 ($SD = 0.83$), then followed by Cognitive Self-Efficacy and Emotional Self-Efficacy. There were six statements that reflected Deputy Principals' Behavioral Self-Efficacy in dealing with bullying in secondary school (Table 3). Item 1 yielded the highest mean score of 4.70 ($SD= 0.93$) whereby more than three quarter (91.35%) of the deputy principals ($N=960$) were most confident that they could control bullying behavior among students in the school. This study also showed that more than eighty percent of all the deputy principals have high self-efficacy level that they can; improve the self-esteem of victim of bullying, calm any student in the school should he/she been bullied badly, establish a system or a strategy in their school to avoid bullying among students, respond to difficult situation (e.g. suicide attempt, depression) involving bullying, and help students to overcome their feeling of helplessness following the bullying incident. In terms of designated post hold by the deputy principals, this study also showed that PK HEM (in-charge of Students Affairs) and PP (in-charge of the afternoon session students) have high level of behavioral self-efficacy compared to PKI (in-charge of academic) and PK KK (in-charge of co-curriculum). Both PKHEM and PP also have high level of self-efficacy in cognitive and emotional when dealing with bullying among students in secondary school (Table 4).

Table 3: Deputy Principals' Behavioral Self-Efficacy (BSE) in Dealing with Bullying Among Students in Secondary Schools.

Item no.	Low	Moderate Frequency (%)	High	M	SD
1. How confident are you in controlling bullying behavior in the school?	30 (3.13)	53 (5.52)	877 (91.35)	4.70	0.93
5. How much can you do to make the students to overcome their feeling of helplessness following the bullying incident?	32 (3.33)	123 (12.81)	805 (83.85)	3.59	0.86
6. How well can you respond to difficult situation (e. g suicide attempt, depression) involving bullying?	56 (5.83)	79 (8.23)	825 (85.94)	3.79	0.64
8. How much can you do to calm a student who had been bullied badly?	43 (4.48)	100 (10.42)	817 (85.10)	4.03	0.91
9. How well can you establish a system or a strategy in your school to avoid bullying among students?	25 (2.60)	95 (9.90)	840 (87.50)	3.79	0.72
12. How much can you do to improve the Self-esteem of victims of bullying?	30 (3.13)	87 (9.06)	843 (87.81)	4.30	0.71
Overall Mean=4.03 (SD = 0.87) N = 960 Cronbach's Alpha=0.86					

Table 4: Level of Behavioral Self-Efficacy (BSE), Cognitive Self-Efficacy (CSE), and Emotional Self-Efficacy (ESE) for Different Deputy Principal (designated post) Regarding Dealing with Bullying in Secondary Schools.

Designated Post	Behavioral Self-efficacy	Cognitive Self-efficacy	Emotional Self-efficacy
PK I	Moderate (M=3.38, SD=0.83)	Weak (M=2.67, SD=0.88)	Weak (M=2.02, SD=0.92)
PK HEM	High (M=4.78, SD=0.89)	High (M=4.54, SD=0.75)	High (M=4.82, SD=0.74)
PK KK	Moderate (M=3.11, SD=0.97)	Weak (M=2.77, SD=1.04)	Weak (M=2.08, SD=0.81)
PP	High (M=4.83, SD=0.72)	High (M=4.52, SD=0.78)	High (M=4.60, SD=0.92)

*PK–Penolong Kanan PP–Penyelia Petang N = 960 Cronbach’s Alpha = 0.86

Table 5: Students’ Level of Agreement Towards Deputy Principals’ Behavioral Efficacy in Dealing with Bullying in Secondary Schools.

Item no.	Low	Moderate Frequency (%)	High	M	SD
1. Deputy Principal is confident in controlling bullying behavior in the classroom.	2599 (69.35)	767 (20.47)	382 (10.18)	2.36	1.03
2. Deputy Principal can make me overcome my feeling of helplessness following the bullying incident	2188 (58.37)	1398 (37.30)	162 (4.33)	2.32	0.96
3. Deputy Principal will respond very well to difficult situation (e.g. suicide attempt, depression) involving bullying.	2538 (67.72)	508 (13.55)	702 (18.73)	2.69	1.32
4. Deputy Principal is able to calm any student who had been bullied badly.	2188 (58.38)	1320 (35.22)	240 (6.40)	2.54	1.37
5. Deputy Principal can establish a system or a strategy in the school in order to avoid bullying among students, very well.	2065 (55.09)	588 (15.69)	1095 (29.22)	3.03	1.62
6. Deputy Principal can improve the self-esteem of victims of bullying very much.	2483 (66.25)	1089 (29.05)	176 (4.70)	2.43	1.27

Overall Mean=2.56 (SD=1.57) N=3748 Cronbach’s Alpha=0.79

Even though most of the Deputy Principals perceived their behavioral self-efficacy in dealing with bullying among students in secondary schools as moderately high with an overall mean = 4.38, $SD = 0.91$, respond or feedback from students and parents turned out slightly the otherwise. Based on result indicated in Table 5 and Table 6, more than half of students and parents participated in this study disagree that teachers ; (i) confident in controlling bullying behavior among students in the classroom, (ii) can calm any student in the school should he/she been bullied badly, (iii) have high confident in establishing a system or a strategy in their classroom in order to avoid bullying among students, (iv) confident that they are able to respond to difficult situation (e.g. suicide attempt, depression) involving bullying, (v) can make the students overcome their feeling of helplessness following the bullying incident, and (vi) improve the self-esteem of victims of bullying.

Table 6: Parents' Level of Agreement Towards Deputy Principals' Behavioral Efficacy in Dealing with Bullying.

Item no.	Low	Moderate	High	M	SD
		Frequency (%)			
1. Deputy Principal is confident in controlling bullying behavior in the classroom.	525 (65.76)	230 (28.78)	43 (5.46)	2.48	1.23
2. Deputy Principal can make me overcome my feeling of helplessness following the bullying incident	458 (57.45)	256 (32.10)	83 (10.45)	2.51	1.45
3. Deputy Principal will respond very well to difficult situation (e.g. suicide attempt, depression) involving bullying.	559 (70.05)	138 (17.29)	101 (12.66)	2.55	1.22
4. Deputy Principal is able to calm any student who had been bullied badly.	480 (60.15)	276 (34.58)	42 (5.27)	2.62	1.02
5. Deputy Principal can establish a system or a strategy in the school in order to avoid bullying among students, very well.	465 (58.27)	246 (30.83)	87 (10.90)	2.42	1.41
6. Deputy Principal can improve the self-esteem of victims of bullying very much.	499 (62.53)	132 (16.54)	167 (20.93)	2.79	1.16
Overall Mean=2.56 (SD=1.27) N=798 Cronbach's Alpha=0.83					

Table 7: Students and Parents Level of Agreement Towards Deputy Principals' Behavioral Efficacy in Dealing with Bullying Among Students prior to post they are holding.

Respondents	N	PK HEM		PP		PK I		PK KK	
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Students	3748	3.12	1.19	3.02	1.12	2.09	1.03	2.03	1.13
Parents	798	3.08	0.93	3.03	1.24	2.05	0.97	2.11	1.17
Cronbach's Alpha = 0.82									

3.2 Discussion

In the present study, all the three sub-scales (behavioral self-efficacy, cognitive self-efficacy, and emotional self-efficacy) in dealing with bullying considered as moderate. This suggests that in terms of behavioral cognitive, and emotional aspect, majority of the in-service Deputy Principals were quite confidence enough of themselves in having the ability to successfully perform their duty or responsibility in dealing with bullying cases among students in secondary school. Even though this can be considered as a healthy level of self-efficacy for our in-service Deputy Principals, hence, this does not mean that it is considered as sufficient enough. Therefore, in order to sustain the existing level or may be push it up to a better level of Deputy Principals' self-efficacy in dealing with bullying among students, focus should be given to nourish and encourage more professional development, physiological coping and establishing a social support system in the school as well as education organization. This is very important in order to equip themselves with the characteristics of high quality of educators because with strong identity, more committed to the profession they will face the challenges of increasingly demanding education [16].

Of all the three sub-scales, behavioral self-efficacy has the highest overall mean scores ($M=4.03$, $SD=0.83$). This result (moderately high level of the Deputy Principals' behavioral self-efficacy in dealing with bullying among students) also proved that the Deputy Principals in the present study are quite confidence and know what to do or what they are doing whenever

they are facing with bullying cases among students, particularly in secondary schools. Even though most of the Deputy Principals perceived their behavioral self-efficacy in dealing with bullying among students in secondary schools as moderately high, respond or feedbacks from students and parents turned out slightly the otherwise, and this is something that really need to be taken into account in order to at least ease the problem of bullying among students in secondary schools.

Based on the result, PK HEM (in-charge of Students Affairs) and PP (in-charge of the afternoon session students) have high level of self-efficacy for Behavioral, Cognitive and Emotional. This could be due to certain factor. Whenever there is a disciplinary case, among the first person that the teachers would think of would be either the discipline teacher, the Deputy Principals in-charge of students' affairs (PK HEM) or the Deputy Principals in-charge of the session (PP) of the school. Sometimes, due to the teaching workloads that the discipline teachers have to bear, most probably the next choice would be the Deputy Principals (PK HEM) or PP of the school. It does not mean that the rest of the teachers did not care about the students. It just that, sometimes because of the teaching process or a lot of paper works to do, teachers tend to send or let the Deputy Principals (especially PK HEM or PP) to handle some of the disciplinary problems caused by the students. The Deputy Principals normally have less teaching hours compare to other teachers because they have some administrative works to deal with. Perhaps this can explain why the Deputy Principals (PK HEM and PP) of the present study had higher self-efficacy in dealing with bullying compared to the other two Deputies (PK I and PK KK).

In terms of level of agreement towards the Deputy Principals' Behavioral Efficacy in dealing with bullying among students from students and parents, prior to the post they are holding, PK HEM and PP have higher overall mean compare to PK I and PK KK (Table 7). This showed that, even though overall half of the students and parents did not agree that deputy principals have high behavioral efficacy in dealing with bullying among students, they somehow agreed that PK HEM and PP do contribute as well as play an important role towards this matter. Even though Deputy Principals have optimistic self-efficacy which in a way can enhance or impede their motivation towards dealing with bullying cases in school, feedback regarding the Deputy Principals' efficacy from stakeholders especially from the students and parents could be a true mirror which actually reflects Deputy Principals' efficacy in dealing with bullying among students in Malaysian secondary schools.

Should there be any courses or seminars conducted either by the Ministry of Education, the District Education Department or any Non-governmental organization such as National Teachers Union, Parent Teacher Association etc., which involving the deputy principals, it should be focusing more on acquiring self-regulatory competence so that deputy principals are able to monitor their own performances. This would provide an important mastery building opportunity for self-efficacy enhancement. Self-regulated learning is a deliberate planning and monitoring of cognitive, affective and behavioral processes to successfully complete a given task [17]. It involves taking charge of one's own learning, making accurate assessments of how one is doing and how one might improve. In keeping with Bandura's [16-17] triadic view that personal processes, environmental and behavioral events operate interactively, learners who use self-regulatory strategies are actively involved in regulating three different types of processes: (i) regulating personal processes involved goal setting and planning, managing time, selecting and organizing information [18]; (ii) learners consciously regulate their own behavior by doing self-evaluation, self-monitoring and self-reaction [14-19] and (iii) learners actively interact with their learning environment such as seeking peer or adult assistance and social environmental structuring in order to optimize acquisition of skills [20]

4.0 CONCLUSION

In this particular study, in-service Deputy Principals' preconceptions of their capabilities in dealing with bullying cases among students, mainly drawn from their experiences dealing with certain bullying cases, which also involving different type of students (problematic, defiant, rebellious, and stubborn students) before. This finding is in keeping with Bandura's [15-16] theoretical framework an previous empirical studies that enactive mastery experience consistently makes the largest contribution to self-efficacy beliefs [21-22]. These Deputy Principals especially the PKHEM and PP were actually engaging more in the process of handling or dealing with several bullying cases among students compared to PKI and PK KK and this could be the reason why both PKHEM and PKKK have high level of self-efficacy for Behavioral, Cognitive and Emotional subscales. When in-service deputy principals are convinced that they have what it takes to succeed, they are more resilient a flexible of adversity of bullying phenomena involving students, and hopefully they will quickly rebound from setbacks or any obstacles that they had faced before. Sutton and her colleagues [23] have documented that teachers who engaged in emotional regulation believed they were more effective in managing their classrooms and interacting with students. Findings from this study can be used as a reference or extra input for the design of educational interventions in Deputy Principals preparation programs (e.g. the National Professional Qualification for Educational Leaders (NPQEL) conducted by the Ministry of Education Malaysia) as well as the Deputy Principals development programs that support and strengthen the development of the Deputy Principals' self-efficacy especially in dealing with bullying among students.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This research was partially supported by University Malaya Research Grant. We would like to thank the Ministry of Education Malaysia especially the Educational Planning and Research Division (EPRD) for the approval of this research that we managed to carried out our research smoothly.

REFERENCES

- [1] Cornell, Dewey, and Sharmila Mehta. "Counselor confirmation of middle school student self-reports of bullying victimization." *Professional School Counseling* 14, no. 4 (2011): 261-270.
- [2] Hinduja, Sameer, and Justin W. Patchin. "Social influences on cyberbullying behaviors among middle and high school students." *Journal of youth and adolescence* 42, no. 5 (2013): 711-722.
- [3] Cheng, Yulan, Ian M. Newman, Ming Qu, Lazarous Mbulo, Yan Chai, Yan Chen, and Duane F. Shell. "Being bullied and psychosocial adjustment among middle school students in China." *Journal of School Health* 80, no. 4 (2010): 193-199.
- [4] Mavroveli, Stella, and María José Sánchez-Ruiz. "Trait emotional intelligence influences on academic achievement and school behaviour." *British Journal of Educational Psychology* 81, no. 1 (2011): 112-134.
- [5] Martinez-Criado, Gerard. "The world of bullying: An overview and reflexion." *Coolabah* 13 (2014): 61-73.

- [6] Mestry, Raj, and Jan Khumalo. "Governing bodies and learner discipline: managing rural schools in South Africa through a code of conduct." *South African Journal of Education* 32, no. 1 (2012): 97-110.
- [7] Kendziora, K., and D. Osher. "Starting to turn schools around: The academic outcomes of the Safe Schools, Successful Students initiative." Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research (2009).
- [8] Z. Khalim. *Pengurusan disiplin pelajar sekolah*, Bangi, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, 2014.
- [9] Ismail, Wan Salwina Wan, Nik Ruzyanei Nik Jaafar, Hatta Sidi, Marhani Midin, and Shamsul Azhar Shah. "Why do young adolescents bully? Experience in Malaysian schools." *Comprehensive psychiatry* 55 (2014): S114-S120.
- [10] Olweus, Dan, and Susan P. Limber. "Bullying in school: Evaluation and dissemination of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 80, no. 1 (2010): 124-134.
- [11] Rigby, Ken, and Edmund Barrington Thomas. *How schools counter bullying: Policies and procedures in selected Australian schools*. Aust Council for Ed Research, 2010.
- [12] Rigby, Ken. "What can schools do about cases of bullying?" *Pastoral Care in Education* 29, no. 4 (2011): 273-285.
- [13] Rigby, Ken. "Bullying in schools: Addressing desires, not only behaviours." *Educational Psychology Review* 24, no. 2 (2012): 339-348.
- [14] Bandura, Albert. *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall, Inc, 1986.
- [15] Bandura, Albert. "Self-efficacy: The exercise of control." (1997).
- [16] Lee, M. F., and C. S. Lai. "Rhetoric value based model for Malaysian special vocational education secondary schools' teachers." *Journal of Advanced Research in Social and Behavioural Sciences* 2, no. 1, (2016): 2462-1951.
- [17] Pintrich, Paul R., and Elisabeth V. De Groot. "Motivational and self-regulated learning components of classroom academic performance." *Journal of educational psychology* 82, no. 1 (1990): 33-40.
- [18] Zimmerman, Barry J. "Dimensions of academic self-regulation: A conceptual framework for education." *Self-regulation of learning and performance: Issues and educational applications* 1 (1994): 33-21.
- [19] Schunk, Dale H. "Goal setting and self-efficacy during self-regulated learning." *Educational psychologist* 25, no. 1 (1990): 71-86.
- [20] Zimmerman, Barry J., and Manuel Martinez-Pons. "Student differences in self-regulated learning: Relating grade, sex, and giftedness to self-efficacy and strategy use." *Journal of educational Psychology* 82, no. 1 (1990): 51-59.
- [21] Lopez, Frederick G., and Robert W. Lent. "Sources of mathematics self-efficacy in high school students." *The Career Development Quarterly* 41, no. 1 (1992): 3-12.
- [22] Zeldin, A. L. "Sources and effects of the self-efficacy beliefs of men with careers in Mathematics." *Science, and Technology*. Tese de doutorado, Emory University, Miami (2000).

- [23] Sutton, Rosemary E., René Mudrey-Camino, and Catharine C. Knight. "Teachers' emotion regulation and classroom management." *Theory into Practice* 48, no. 2 (2009): 130-137.