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ABSTRACT: Bullying is a global phenomenon with devastating consequences for the victims, their families, and the societies at large. Bullying is a serious social ill; a lived experience capable of turning individuals within a given society into social misfits with long-term implications. This paper reflects on the account of the stories by some Nigerian school girls of their classroom experiences in a heterogeneous school setting. Aspects of the deliberations from among the 25 girls (and 25 boys as well) who took part in the study are employed in this paper to interrogate how gendered bullying played into the girls’ perceptions of their classroom. Results from the study show that within co-educational classroom, girls are more likely to be bully-victims than boys. Results also revealed that boys are more likely to be perpetrators of bullying than girls in a mixed-sex classroom. Bullying as lived experience, therefore, emerges in the study as a form of belligerent masculinity; and is germane to the understanding of the girl participants’ submissive posture as they struggled for space and identity within the classroom in complex and subtle ways. The implications of this for co-education and co-educational policy-making are highlighted and recommendations for changes in policy and practice are equally suggested.
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Introduction

“Boys like to make noise round the class commanding us all the time. We are tired of having them around us” (Nneka).

Little did he know the concept would generate such an enormous concern and attention from researchers the world over when in the late 1970s and early 1980s, Dan Olweus in Sweden pioneered his research on school bullying and the aggression (Rigby, 1999; Olweus, 2001; Roland, 2002; Olweus, 2003; Young & Sweeting, 2004; and Olweus, 2005). Today, research on school bullying has become the focus of many psycho-behavioural, sociological, as well as health researchers in many parts of the world (Mazza & Overstreet, 2000; Hasting & Bham, 2003; Delfabbro et al., 2006; Egbochuku, 2007; Solberg, Olweus & Endresen, 2007; and Crews, Crews & Turner, 2008). Bullying has been conceptualized by most of these authors to...
involve aggressive behaviours against another (or others) who would have run out of favour in the psyche of the perpetrator(s). According to P. Delfabbro et al. (2006:72), “such aggression need not be physical, and can include a variety of non-physical forms such as emotional and verbal abuse, threats, as well as exclusion in which a person directly, or indirectly, ostracizes another person from a social group”.

Bullying as a phenomenon has been defined variously in literature. According to B.A. Omoteso (2010:498), “a wide range of physical or verbal behaviours of an aggressive or antisocial nature are encompassed by the term bullying... These physical actions can take the forms of physical contact, verbal abuse or making faces and rude gestures”. Bullying is intentional act (Nickel et al., 2005); an exposure to repeated negative actions by a child from other child or children (Balogun, Olapegba & Opayemi, 2006); interaction in which a dominant individual repeatedly exhibits aggressive behaviour intended to cause distress to less dominant individual (Maliki, Asagwara & Ibu, 2009); and as an action intentionally inflicted on someone to cause injury, fear or distress (Kenny, M cEachern & A luede, 2005).

E.O. Egbochuku (2007) has defined bullying as peer aggressive behaviours encompassed in the acts of kicking, hitting, extortion of money by a child or a group from other(s), locking another inside a room, verbal threats as well as teasing. A number of other studies have defined bullying as a form of school violence (Lowry et al., 1999; Farrell, M eyer & W hite, 2001; K archer, 2002; F louri & B uchanan, 2003; H asting & B ham, 2003; and A luede, 2004). Thus, whatever forms bullying takes within or outside of the schools, M.C. K enny, A.G. M cEachern and O. A luede (2005:13) note “the goal of bullying is generally to cause distress in some manner and it usually takes place among children who are not friends”.

However, studies have shown that differences exist on how both teachers and pupils perceive as well as define the concept of bullying within the school system (Naylor et al., 2001). Research also suggest that the differences in the definition appear to be informed by the impact of bullying behaviours on victims, as well as by who is at the receiving end (M azza & O verstreet, 2000; L ewis, 2001; N aylor et al., 2001; and K archer, 2002).

In their study on teachers’ and pupils’ definitions of bullying, P. N aylor et al. (2001) adopted two separate open-ended questionnaire instruments to account for any differences on the responses from 225 teachers and 1,820 pupils in fifty-one UK (U nited K ingdom) secondary schools. P. N aylor et al. (2001:557) compared “teachers' and pupils' definitions of bullying ... regarding whether or not for the bully's behaviour, the ideas of power imbalance, physical abuse, verbal abuse, social exclusion, repetition and intention to cause harm have been invoked”. They found out that pupil-victims of bullying behaviour have lesser understanding and definitional representation of the act, “to the extent that pupils may not always realize that they are being bullied” (N aylor et al., 2001:573). Other studies have also noted these differences in the perceptions of bullying amongst teachers and students while cautioning on the implications of such differences for teaching-learning, policy-making, and for parents themselves (O lweus, 2001; K aratzias, P ower & S wanson, 2002; Y oon & K erber, 2003; L awrence & G reen, 2005; and G eorgiou, 2008).
According to M.E. Solberg, D. Olweus and I.M. Endresen (2007:443), “a bullying relation is characterized by the fact that one or more individuals repeatedly direct negative and hurtful actions on individual who has difficulty defending himself or herself”. Research has shown bullying behaviours to be copious and multi-faceted (Rigby, 1999; 2000; and 2002; Yoon & Kerber, 2003; Smith et al., 2004; and Young & Sweeting, 2004). These include physical and non-physical, as well as verbal and non-verbal behaviours, however, the connecting “identifying criteria of the term ‘bullying’ are that the negative behaviour is intentional and repeated over time to some extent” (Solberg, Olweus & Endresen, 2007:443).

Thus far, various typologies of bullying behaviours found within literature, include physical aggression such as hitting, kicking or punching, name-calling and threats (Newman, Murray & Lussier, 2001; Lawrence & Green, 2005; Olweus, 2005; and Delfabbro et al., 2006); and social exclusion (Hanish & Guerra, 2000; Naylor et al., 2001; and Flouri & Buchanen, 2003). Other types of bullying behaviours include the use of force against another (Lowry et al., 1999; Smith, Shu & Madsen, 2001; Fox & Boulton, 2005; and Galand, Lecocq & Phillipot, 2007); and the intention to cause harm (Baldry & Farrington, 2000; Andreou, 2001; Tolan & Guerra, 2002; and Baldry, 2004).

Some Factors that Can Cause Bullying

Many studies have attempted to provide some explanations as to the possible causes of bullying amongst children, and most of these studies have linked bullying experiences to the families and precisely to parents (Baldry & Farrington, 2000; Hunter, Boyle & Warden, 2007; and Georgiou, 2008). How is it that some children are socialized into bullies?

S.N. Georgiou (2008:109) provides an explanation by noting “children learn to be aggressive towards others... by watching the daily interactions of their family members”. The basic mode of learning, especially for the child, is through imitation whereby the child simply learns by looking at what other members of his/her immediate family environment may be doing. Thus, in the home where both parents usually quarrel and fight before their child, such home would eventually assist the child into socializing such social ills as quarrelling and fighting as normal, and may carry such habits into various fields as the school and classroom environment (Andreou, 2001 and 2004; Dill et al., 2004; and Fox & Boulton, 2005).

Specifically, S.N. Georgiou (2008) notes some specific parental practices, which correlate school and childhood bullying. Studying two hundred and fifty-two, 4th, 5th and 6th grade elementary school Greek-Cypriot children and their mothers in ten schools; S.N. Georgiou (2008) used also four different set of scales to test the relevance of a theoretical model describing the family parameters of bullying and victimization. The study revealed that maternal responsiveness was positively related to the child’s adjustment at school (i.e. achievement and social adaptation), while the same factor was negatively related to school aggression (bullying and disruptive behaviour). Other studies, which have notably contributed
to the increasingly growing international literature on the link between family characteristics and bullying/aggressive behaviours, include that of W. Craig, R. Peters and R. Konarski (1998), which note that specific parenting style as well as some types of family management patterns or practices can indirectly impact on bullying behaviours amongst children from within such homes.

Moreover, I. Connolly and M. O’M oore (2003) have listed some family factors contributory to bullying behaviour in children. They include over-protection of children by parents, absence of fathers in the home, incidence of depression in parents, especially mothers, as well as domestic violence where children are onlookers (Baldry & Farrington, 2000; Flouri & Buchanan, 2003; Ellis & Shute, 2007; and Crews, Crews & Turner, 2008). A way from the family, studies have shown that bullying at school may result through frustration caused by lack of success at school among perpetrators (M ali ki, A sagwara & Ibu, 2009). Specifically, bullying may result because some children “may try to control someone else to get some relief from their own feelings of powerlessness” (M ali ki, A sagwara & Ibu, 2009:210).

Consequences of Peer Bullying

Numerous studies have equally noted that bullying behaviours result in very many psychosocial, physiological, as well as medical consequences for both bullies and their victims; for families and the larger society (Andreou, 2001; Bond et al., 2001; Farrell, M eyer & White, 2001; K archer, 2002; Connolly & O’M oore, 2003; Seals & Young, 2003; Andreou, 2004; Baldry, 2004; D ill et al., 2004; Fox & Boulton, 2005; and Ellis & Shute, 2007). According to P. Delfabbro et al. (2006:72), “bullying has many undesirable consequences for individuals. Children who are bullied tend to have poorer self-esteem ... the effects of bullying have also been found to extend beyond psychological well-being to influence physical health”.

M. E. Solberg, D. Olweus and I. M. Endresen (2007) also note that bully-victims experience multiple personality problems. According to the authors, victims of bullying and other aggressive behaviours present very many emotional and behavioural problems, especially when in company of their peers at school or even when with their parents. The study by C.L. Fox and M.J. Boulton (2005:324) reveals that victims of peer bullying at school were generally perceived as having greater social skill problems than non-victims.

Studies have shown that the consequences of bullying extend well beyond the bullies themselves, the school community, and the society at large. B.A. Omoteso (2010:501) notes “the findings on bullying indicated that bullying is a physically harmful, psychologically damaging, and socially isolating aspect of a large number of children’s school experience”. Frustrations caused by bullying behaviours appear to play significant part to why some victims’ want to take drastic life-threatening decisions as suicide (M azza & O overstreet, 2000; L awrence & G reen, 2005; H unter, Boyle & W arden, 2007; and Omoteso, 2010).

A. E. M ali ki, C.G. A sagwara and J.F. Ibu (2009) have equally noted that bully-victims have the tendency to stop thinking about schooling and education generally.
Most importantly, “bullying also has bad effect on the bullies themselves ... children develop behaviour pattern that endured into adult life. They were also more likely, to have criminal record than those who were not bully” (Maliki, Asagwara & Ibu, 2009:211). This is a feeling shared by B.A. O moteso (2010:502) when the author noted those who bully are more likely to drop out of school, use drug and alcohol, as well as engage in subsequent delinquent and criminal behaviour. It has equally been found that victims of bullying often experience anxiety and depression, low self-esteem, physical and some psychosomatic complaints (Smith et al., 2004). Victims of bullying also possess very serious personality defects; such persons tend to have positive attitudes towards violence, while lacking positive concept of themselves (Andreou, 2004).

Gendered Bullying

Generally, research has shown that more boys than girls engage in acts of bullying; boys also engage in the use of aggressive, physical, and intimidating bullying behaviour (Bond et al., 2001; Farrell et al., 2001; Kenny, M ceachern & A luede, 2005; and Lawrence & Green, 2005). On the other hand, studies show that girls are less aggressive when engaged in bullying behaviour; however, they tend to use more of social exclusion, back-biting, and somewhat facial expressions against their victims irrespective of gender (Kenny, M ceachern & A luede, 2005; Balogun, O lapegba & O payemi, 2006; and Egbochuku, 2007).

P. Delfabbro et al. (2006:71) reveal that girls were more likely to be subject to bullying if they attended co-educational private schools. More so, it has been revealed in a study of 49 boys and 68 girls (Baldry, 2004) that within a co-educational setting, female pupils are more readily inclined to blaming their male counterparts for the prevalence of bullying within the classroom. Gender differences also appear to be implicated in the way both boys and girls perceive bullying behaviour. In a UK (United Kingdom)-based study conducted among 466 boys and 460 girls, P. Naylor et al. (2001) noted the differences, which persisted in the manner both boys and girls in their study defined acts of bullying. P. Naylor et al. (2006:553) also reveal that girls are more likely than boys are, to mention verbal abuse and the effects on the target.

Within the societies of Nigeria, bullying as a social ill is no longer any news. Following media interests generated across the country over the years, “schools, parents and children alike, started demanding investigations and intervention to conquer this seemingly large and serious problem” (Egbochuku, 2007:65). Many researchers across institutions in the country began various attempts to offer better understanding of the social ill, while at the same time offering solutions as part of intervention strategies (Kenny, M ceachern & A luede, 2005; Balogun, O lapegba & O payemi, 2006; Egbochuku, 2007; Maliki, A sagwara & Ibu, 2009; and Omoteso, 2010).

However, these attempts at understanding school bullying have only enriched our understanding in two broad contexts, which include bullies and victims. Our knowledge still appears to be limited about how say, for instance, early childhood
experiences of gendered bullying have a propensity to mediate much of later adult female somewhat submissive and suppressed posture within the patriarchal Nigerian societies. Against this background, this paper while seeking to bridge that perceived gap in research and knowledge on the gendered impact of bullying on the female later life, equally seeks to contribute to the body of international literature on discussions in this regard.

**Collection and Analyses of Data**

The larger qualitative study, which has influenced this paper, was aimed to investigate the gendered perception of schooling amongst some senior secondary school students in a school located within a Nigerian suburb. The larger study was anchored on the interactionist approach to research. Interactionists presume the self appears to be almost certainly shaped by influences from the outside (Stewart & O’Neill, 1999; Neumann & Dickinson, 2002; and Tepperman, 2005). A symbolic interactionist studying how gendered bullying impacts young girls’ social interactions within co-educational setting would examine how the agencies of peer bullying contribute to the shaping of the self-concepts of the girls. Moreover, the interactionist would want to understand how young girls are pressurized through acts of bullying from their male classmates into accepting their subordinate and/or submissive positions as normal. The paper draws from the girls’ talk of their classroom interactions with the boys to illuminate how their classroom gendered bullying experiences mediate much of the girls’ later adult lives.

The study was ethnography of some fifty (50) purposively sampled senior secondary school students in a co-educational setting located within a Nigerian suburb. Around 25 of this sample were girls. Four data collecting methods were used in the main study namely: participants’ observation, unstructured in-depth interviewing, focus group discussions, and the diaries. However, this article is informed by data from the participants’ observation and focus group discussions. Both the analytic induction and grounded theory approach were employed in the analysis of collected data. Analytic induction represents “a process where by the researcher attempts to develop a theory or an explanatory model that satisfactorily accounts for some phenomena ... that have assumed prominence from information obtained ... in the course of the fieldwork” (Obikeze, 1990:76). Grounded theorizing emphasizes the generation of theory through data from empirical studies (Glaser & Strauss, 1999; Plummer, 2000; and Popenoe, 2000).

The researcher was interested in offering an explanatory model of the young adults’ perception of schooling through a systematic study of their activities. Data analysis was done through an initial or preliminary analysis on a daily basis as the data rolled in. Themes and categories discovered in the body of the four data sets were used in the description of the account of the gendered perception of schooling through the main analysis. The second stage of the analysis was made through the connection of the four data sources in order to achieve the aims of triangulation. This connection was made through the metaphor of the statue and
the lenses (Wildy, 1999). The statue in the study was the “gendered perception of schooling” and the “four data sets” were the lenses through which the influence of gender on how the participants perceived schooling and other classroom experiences were explored.

**Results**

First, **Bullying Behaviour Found in the Data on Coercive Front-Row Seating Position for the Girls in the Classroom.** It was observed that the girls in the study occupied the front rows, while the boys were usually permanently seated behind them with the “big boys” taking the last back rows while in their classroom. Though this appeared to be the general practice in the school, e.g. on the assembly ground as was the case in the rest of the classes, but the arrangement was not official as was later discovered.

This issue was taken up during the focus group discussions, and the girls revealed that a major reason why they were seated in front rows was because they were responsible for wiping the chalkboard; “boys were not supposed to do certain duties when the girls are around” (according to one of the girls). For example:

- **Researcher:** “But why should girls alone wipe the chalkboard?”
- **Ann:** “Boys do not like wiping the board”.
- **Chioma:** “Yes it is true. They think they are not supposed to wipe the board when the girls are around. The boys think girls must serve the boys in class”.
- **Nneka:** “Yes it is true!”
- **John (boy):** “Boys are not supposed to do certain work when the girls are there to do it”.
- **Joy:** “If we girls refuse to wipe the board, it is problem for us; sometimes they seize our bags after school”.

Within the above statements, there were deliberate attempts to define roles, duties, and responsibilities in prescriptive tones, albeit coercively, as was evidenced in Joy’s statement. Gender as well as force was invoked as a major determinant of classroom responsibilities. Not surprising of course, within the Nigerian traditional societies, domestic duties were defined along gender lines; such practices it would then seem had forcibly permeated classroom relations for the boys and girls in the study.

It appeared, therefore, that the traditional vocabularies, that were employed by the girls and boys in the study, were manifestations of the prescriptive gender informed domestic roles found within the larger societies of Nigeria. In line with this, therefore, gender informed what were supposed to be proper boys and girls duties. This is consistent with O. Parry (1996) who in her study found that there was gendered differences within heterogeneous classrooms, and maintained that male responses to classroom activities were influenced by the presence of the girls. Within this context, allowing boys to wipe the chalkboard amounted to a violation of the traditional ideal type; a risk the girls were not prepared for, knowing the consequences were painful.
Thus, fears that the boys might attack them, rather than willingness and acceptance of such gender-typicalness of duties, informed the girls’ submissive approach to classroom responsibilities. Within such classroom climate where the girls always and necessarily felt intimidated by the boys, most often unprotected, it was possible for the girls to be bullied into subordination. However, one justification for co-educational arrangement appears to be that both boys and girls would experience education jointly hoping that this would enhance effective learning. The observed situation, in which the boys wittingly separated themselves from the girls while they (the boys) defined what proper girl duties were, raises some concerns for co-educational arrangements.

Evidence from the focus group discussion data revealed that schooling for the girls in the study was an experience marred by fear, unhappiness, lack of confidence, low self-esteem, and defeatist tendencies to classroom activities. This finding is consistent with that of B.A. Omoteso (2010:507) which noted “these unhappy students could be those that were bullied … other consequences exhibited by the students were fear, loneliness, depression and lack of confidence”.

Second, Evidence of Threat and Intimidation in Classroom Interactions. Again backed by observations, it was noted that boys in the study were not very participatory in formal discussions during lessons with their teachers like the girls. During the focus group discussions, it was noticed by this researcher that the boys were not fully participating in classroom discussions except when their “authority” positions were challenged by the kind of statements the girls made. In such case, the boys became very vocal and somehow threatening. For instance, when the researcher asked why the boys were not contributing during the discussions, boys in the focus group were not happy with the girls’ explanation that they (the boys) were not talking because of not being sure of what to say. For instance:

Researcher: “But why are the boys not talking?”
Helen: “Because they don’t know what to say”.
Obi: “Shut up your mouth, you are lying”.
John: “Don’t mind her until after school, continue talking rubbish. Who told you we don’t know what to say? Fool!”

This revelation was in consonance with that made by R.K. Shelly (1996) which revealed that differential gendered interaction becomes possible when gender is activated such as the case with heterogeneous task group (for instance such taking place within co-educational institutions). As the author puts it, “males and females in task groups will exhibit such interaction patterns differentially only in heterogeneous groups” (Shelly, 1996:56). Similarly, the revelation was also consistent with that of N.H. Wolfinger and J. Rabow (1997) which noted differences in the speech and conversational patterns of both males and females, and agreed that men and women speak differentially. According to N.H. Wolfinger and J. Rabow (1997:59), “these differences pervadespeech to the extent that gender is recognizable in short, context-free segments of transcribed talk …. These findings provide new insight into the role of gender in conversation: gender is part of listening as well as talking”.
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A nother case in point was when the issue of classroom comportment was raised by this researcher during the group discussions. The girls in the focus group noted that boys always wanted to be noticed. The girls also believed that it was in the nature of the boys to show-off always, and did not think they needed them around anymore. According to one of the girls in the study, “Boys like to make noise round the class commanding us all the time. We are tired of having them around us” (Nneka).

It must be noted that bullying has been defined as interaction in which a dominant individual or group of individuals repeatedly exhibit aggressive behaviour intended to cause distress to less dominant individual (Maliki, Asagwara & Ibu, 2009). Bullying behaviour has equally been explained as an action, which is intended to cause fear or distress on the victims (Kenny, McEachern & Aluede, 2005), as exemplified in John’s reaction above.

Thus, it would therefore seem to suggest, as evidenced in the data from observations and the group discussions, that the girls’ classroom experiences in the hands of the boys were akin to gendered violence. This revelation is supported by that made by M.C. Kenny, A.G. McEachern and O. Aluede (2005) which noted that bullying occurs mainly among children who are no longer friends within such settings as the school.

Discussion

The findings of the present study and findings from previous studies have confirmed that bullying amongst pupils and students in schools in Nigeria is a very serious act of violence against the victims. This article intends to enrich our understanding of the form of bullying, which appears to coercively socialize girls and females into subordinate, second class individual only good at serving the boys and men. While previous studies, for example by E. Andreou (2001); S.K. Balogun, P.O. Olaoye and A.S. Opayemi (2006); E.O. Egbochuku (2007); and B.A. Omoteso (2010) have emphasized the magnitude of bullying occurrences among boys and girls, and as well as on who among the two groups are most bullied; the present article highlights the almost, always neglected effects of excessive classroom bullying, and other machismo elements on the overall later socialization of the girls in my study.

The evidence from the present study appears to suggest that in term of the aftermath of bullying, girls appear to be mostly affected. Therefore, schooling experiences for the girls in my study were that of pains, unfriendliness, aggression, victimization, stress, depression as well as disinterestedness.

The revelations of the present study indicate that bullying is part of the everyday experiences of students in a heterogeneous setting; such experiences are equally gendered. For instance, girls in the study expressed the difficulties they faced in the hands of their male classmates, as well as the readiness to be separated from the boys. The study revealed that within heterogeneous setting, girls are more likely to be bullied than their male counterpart; a finding, which contradicts the finding of E. Andreou (2001); E.O. Egbochuku (2007); and B.A. Omoteso (2010:506)
which noted that female students were more involved in bullying than their male counterparts.

The girls in the present study were most certainly forcibly socialized into accepting the second class/subordinate positions, first, in the classroom, and during routine manual labour as weaker sex; and second, consequently, within the larger society. This revelation may partly explain why Nigerian girls and women, appear to be excessively subordinated by their male counterparts in public places as well as offices. The situation in which the girl-child while within co-educational setting is socialized into accepting the position of the weaker, perhaps through experiential bullying, and other coercive mechanisms appear to inform the perceived general lack of self-belief among some Nigerian girls, and women. It is argued by this author that such society is in great danger, where girls and women lack self-belief and confidence. Bullying is a very arduous challenge of the twenty-first century societies.

**Conclusion**

Bullying is a global phenomenon with devastating consequences for the victims, their families, and the societies at large. Bullying is a serious social ill; a lived experience capable of turning individuals within a given society into social misfits with long-term implications. As a result the challenges, which accompany acts of bullying, require concerted efforts and decisive actions from individual families, schools, clinical counseling psychologists, policy-makers, and the government if these challenges are to be dealt with. A tripartite intervention approach to tackling bullying problems has been recommended by this author.

By this, therefore, the home, school, and the government must work together in order to find solution to this problem. The government must give necessary assistance to schools to enable them establish specialized counseling and advice centres/units within the schools, to deal with both bullies and victims. These centres must on the hand, ensure that appropriate intervention programmes are put in place to support both bullies and their victims. Finally, every parent is equally challenged to model appropriate behaviour at home as children learn from their parents and other family members.
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