

Anti-Bullying Strategy towards Parents: A Comparative Analysis between Principals of Experimental and Non-Experimental Primary Schools in Greece

Adamos Anastasiou^{ID}
and Despoina
Androutsou
Hellenic Open
University, Greece

Efthymios
Valkanos
University of
Macedonia,
Greece

Georgios Stachtiaris
Primary School of
Neapoli,
Aitolokarnania,
Greece

Evangelos Tsampos^{ID}
Primary School of
Agios Konstantinos,
Aitolokarnania,
Greece

Abstract

School bullying is a type of bullying that occurs in an educational setting. In the present study, we examine the differences in strategy towards parents followed by principals of public experimental and non-experimental primary schools in Greece in their effort to deal with bullying regarding issues related to the proper treatment of the phenomenon. A sample of 11 school principals was the focus of this research. In particular, the population examined were the principals of the three public experimental primary schools of the prefecture of Thessaloniki and eight randomly selected principals of non-experimental public primary schools of the same prefecture. In the prefecture of Thessaloniki, the problem of bullying seems to exist and concern to a great extent the principals of primary education who constitute the sample of this research and pursue their strategy to find appropriate solutions for its immediate and effective coping. At the same time, these principals follow, to a significant degree, common practices in dealing with the phenomenon in their effort to reduce it or even eliminate it, revealing however significant shortcomings on their part.

Keywords: primary school principals, bullying, coping strategy, parents

Introduction

Bullying is not a current phenomenon (Hirsch et al., 2012). Bullying among students is very old and well-known (Olweus, 2003). School bullying is pervasive and most children will probably experience it at some stage, either as a witness, a victim or by being a bully themselves. Bullying evolves throughout childhood, so what bullying might look like during the early years can be different from how it might look in older children. It can involve an individual or a group and can be very obvious (such as punching or calling someone names) or hidden (such as rolling eyes at a person or whispering mean things) (Swit, 2019).

Strategies in natural systems seem to emerge spontaneously from the interaction between the environment and organisms over time. Whether and individual or a population will be more or less successful in coping with environmental changes is determined by their capability to respond to such changes, or in other words, by their capability of adaptation. Therefore, there is an implicit link between strategy and the need to adapt successfully to new conditions in the surrounding environment (Sergio, 2011). Strategy is a word with many relevant and useful meanings to those charged with setting strategies for their corporations, businesses, or organizations (Nickols, 2016).

The educational system in Greece is mainly characterized by its versatile character, which is ordained by the numerous laws and decrees of the Greek Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs. Over the years, significant changes to the education system have been made, most of which were mandated by the wish of each government to adopt recent scientific findings and acclaimed education models of other countries in the world. Some of these schools are termed "Experimental" or "Model" schools, as they carry out experimental education practices and are supervised by university departments specializing in pedagogics and primary education (Fulbright Greece, 2022).

However, so far, the research shows a significant gap in terms of the strategies demonstrated by the principals of public primary schools for successfully tackling bullying in Greece, as they focus - examine, in general, either the principals' views on how to deal with bullying (Pazarakis, 2022; Vergidis & Mousidou, 2016). Either the principals' attitudes and ways of dealing with the phenomenon (Polydorou, 2016) or the role of the principal in dealing with the phenomenon (Zerva, 2017). Therefore, it is highly interesting to consider whether there are differences concerning the strategy of the principals of experimental and non-experimental public primary schools towards parents to tackle bullying while trying to determine if these executives follow a

© 2023 The Authors. Published by Innovare Academic Sciences Pvt Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.22159/ijoe.2023v11i3.47613>. Journal homepage: <https://journals.innovareacademics.in/index.php/ijoe>.

Acknowledgment: We express our sincerest gratitude to all the principals of the Peripheral Unit of Thessaloniki in Greece who participated willingly in this study. **Authors' Contributions:** The authors are responsible for the introduction, the reviews of related literature, the data gathering, the methodology, the discussions and the conclusions, as well as the proof reading. **Conflict of Interest:** The authors declare that he has no sort of conflict of interest with anyone or anything. **Funding Source:** Nil.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Adamos Anastasiou, Hellenic Open University, Greece. **Email:** adamosana@gmail.com

common strategy against this particular phenomenon and whether there are any problems in strategy on their part.

Review of the Related Literature

School bullying is a type of bullying that occurs in an educational setting. Bullying can be physical, sexual, verbal or emotional. Bullying makes children upset and unhappy and they may often feel lonely and frightened. It also makes them feel unsafe and forced to think something is wrong with them. They also lack confidence and interest in going to school, which may result in their sickness (Nazir & Piskin, 2015).

Bullying is a pervasive type of aggression that often occurs in schools. As with other types of aggression, the harm that is inflicted -whether physical, emotional, or both- is intentional. However, bullying has defining features that set it apart from other aggressive behaviors in that it is repeated and that the bully or bullies have greater access to power than their victim(s) (James, 2010).

Bullying is redundant, monotonous, and destructive power-based behavior of students. Multiple forms of bullying include name-calling, hitting or threatening others, and spreading false rumors. Bullying among students decreases their academic performance and causes mental health problems and physical injury. Bullying may refer to "getting picked on" by others. It happens to different types of repeatedly occurring threats, harassment, abuse, ill-treatment and victimization (Jan & Husain, 2015).

Children who bully others, those who are victimized and those who both bully and are bullied share a number of common characteristics and are likely to suffer negative long-term consequences. Important factors appear to be family and peer relationships. Bullying can be seen as a group process, with the peer group playing an important role: other pupils' behavior can reinforce, condone or help to stop bullying, and so it can be more likely in some classes or years than others (James, 2010).

Anti-bullying is about more than just dealing with bullying behavior. It is about creating a positive culture and ethos within our schools and teach communities (Perth & Kinross Council, 2020):

- Ensures openness, honesty and integrity;
- Promotes respect for all, irrespective of race, gender, age, religious belief, sexuality, ability or disability;
- Ensures everyone is treated fairly;
- Encourages our children and young people to trust one another more;
- Builds confidence and self-esteem;
- Includes everyone;
- Encourages the development of a caring community of adults, children, and young people.

Most estimates of school bullying among students are based on self-reports. Although many teachers are aware of the problem, researchers began to study bullying systematically in the 1970s and focused mainly on schools in Scandinavia. However, in the 1980s and early 1990s, studies of bullying among students began to attract wider attention in some other countries, including the United States (Olweus, 2003). Furthermore, some studies assess bullying with global behavior categories, whereas others use concrete actions. There are also differences in the research related to the context and time intervals surveyed (Piskin, 2002).

The strategy has been studied for years by business leaders and by business theorists. But, so far, there is no definitive answer about what strategy is. One reason for this is that people think about strategy in different ways. For instance, some people believe that you must analyze the present carefully, anticipate changes in your market or industry, and plan how you'll succeed in the future. Meanwhile, others think that the future is too difficult to predict, and they prefer to evolve their strategies organically (Rehman Bukhari, 2019).

The paradox about strategy in organizations is that the choice of not having a formal strategy (or strategic management) process is in itself a strategy (Sergio, 2011). In general, implementing a new strategy in school can take place even in cases where the learning outcomes are already excellent (Filder, 2002).

However, strategy is not an exclusive attribute of the human condition. In nature, strategy regards individuals' and populations' traits (characteristics) to deal with the primordial objective of survival. From this perspective, survival strategies emerge and evolve endlessly (Sergio, 2011).

Only recently has research begun to recognize the unique position of parents in addressing bullying. Parents act not only as a protective factor but as a resource to offer strategies to prevent bullying. Parent involvement is also associated with lower rates of bullying. Bullying interventions are needed at home and in school and must involve parents, school staff, and children. Improvements in classroom management and supervision of outdoor areas can decrease bullying (Stives *et al.*, 2021).

In 2011, Law 3966 was proposed and voted on by the Greek parliament under a vast majority, establishing a new pilot type of school. A wide call to public primary and secondary schools was announced in order to choose the initial hub schools. Finally, 61 primary and secondary education schools were selected to become pilot schools characterized as the model and experimental schools (Chiotelis & Theodoropoulou, 2017). The establishment and function of Model and Experimental schools aim at better education planning and pilot implementation of education policy so that the best education methods, practices and tools are fostered and disseminated throughout the education system. Experimental schools are school units that support experimentation and pilot implementation of innovation in education in random samples of the student population. Both primary and secondary education schools are entitled to become experimental school units (Eurydice, 2022), offering in this way a new perspective for their future operation.

Significance of the Study

While attempting to ascertain whether these executives follow a common strategy against this specific phenomenon and whether there are any problems in strategy on their part, it is noted that there is a gap in the strategy followed by experimental and non-experimental public primary school principals toward parents to address bullying.

Objective

The main purpose of the proposed research is to determine the differences in strategy followed at the school level and towards parents by the principals of primary public experimental and non-experimental schools in the context of their general anti-bullying strategy. Additionally, an effort is made to identify any flaws in the approach taken by school principals to combat bullying.

Hypotheses

It is speculated that the primary school principals of both experimental and non-experimental schools have differences in strategy followed towards parents at the school level in their effort to apply an anti-bullying policy.

Methodology

Participants

A sample of eleven primary school principals was the focus of this research. The target population of the research was the 3 public experimental primary school principals in the prefecture of Thessaloniki in Greece and 8 randomly selected ones of public non-experimental primary schools of the same area. In particular, these were the principals of the three public experimental primary schools of the prefecture of Thessaloniki and eight public non-experimental primary schools of the same prefecture for the school year 2016-2017.

Tools

Each of the above principals gave a separate interview, using a structured interview research tool created in Greek, exclusively

based on the existing Greek and foreign literature. The interview is “the result of some kind of methodological strategy,” and “the information is realized - achieved through two realizations” (Filiat, 1993; Paraskevopoulou-Kollia, 2008). First, as Cohen and Manion (1992) point out, it is one of the most important tools of the qualitative method. Regarding the present research, it can be characterized as participatory since it was conducted in the real work of the participants, a fact, according to Nova-Kaltsouni, (2006), very popular in the field of education. The structured interview questions used were piloted to three different people. In particular, it is considered essential, before conducting the main research, to test the functionality of a tool in a small-scale pre-research called “a pilot one” or simply “pilot” (Stamelos & Dakopoulou, 2007). Based on this fact, the specific interview questionnaire was given to be completed initially by a university professor of the specific subject, then by a former head of an education officer, a holder of a master’s degree in Business Administration and Organisations, and finally to a principal, in order to determine the clarity and the degree of understanding of this tool. These specific scientists acted as experts, aiming to reveal language problems, inappropriate questions, and alternative expression options while assessing the questions’ comprehension level.

The important element that characterized the questionnaire of this structured interview was the fact that it is divided into specific areas related to the strategies of principals, with simple and general questions, which in most cases become more and more specialized, in order to record the views and the attitudes of the respondents towards the issue under investigation.

Table 1*Ensuring or Not Good Cooperation with Parents to Tackle Bullying*

Schools	No	Yes	Total	Exact sig. (2-sided)
Experimental primary schools	0	3	3	.0
	0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Non-experimental primary schools	0	8	8	
	0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Total	0	11	11	
	0%	100.0%	100.0%	

On the subsequent question, if so, in what way? , as far as the options parents are called at school are concerned, all the answers that 100% were positive in both categories (all 3 of the experimental school principals and all 8 of the non-experimental ones). In addition, focusing on the option with telephone communication [with Exact Sig. (2-sided) .55], the experimental school principals reached a percentage of 33% (1 vs. 2), while the non-experimental ones had a percentage of 63% (5 vs. 3). As regards the option of an outdoor meeting [with Exact Sig. (2-sided) 1.00], the experimental school principals reached a percentage of

The questions for the principals concerned the following six areas of strategy to determine the general strategy, common or not, that these people follow in order to reduce or eliminate school bullying:

- Community,
- Parents,
- School Unit,
- Class,
- Peers,
- Individual.

According to the purpose and the research questions, the resulting data was processed using descriptive statistics techniques (Papadimitriou, 2001). The interview data collected are presented in frequency allocation tables. The statistical analysis included the application of Fisher’s exact test at a significance level of .05 (sig < .05). The statistical processing and analysis were performed using the statistical package SPSS (Halikias et al., 2015) and the IBM Statistics 19 version.

Results

The questions of the interview concerned the strategies of school principals toward parents. Regarding the strategies toward parents, do you, as a principal, seek to ensure good cooperation with parents in tackling bullying? All the participants of the sample that is 100% answered positively (that is, all three experimental school principals and all eight of the non-experimental primary school principals).

0% (0 vs. 3), while the non-experimental ones had a percentage of 13% (1 vs. 7). According to the by-home visit option, both the experimental principals and the non-experimental ones reached a percentage of 0% (all 3 and all 8 respectively). Concerning the option of sending leaflets at home [with Exact Sig. (2-sided) 1.00], the experimental school principals reached a percentage of 33% (1 vs. 2), while the non-experimental ones had a percentage of 38% (3 vs. 5). Finally, discussing the other option, both the experimental principals and the non-experimental ones reached a percentage of 0% (all 3 and all 8 respectively).

Table 2*Ways to Ensure Good Cooperation with Parents to Tackle Bullying*

Schools	No	Yes	Total	Exact sig. (2-sided)
Are called to the school				
Experimental primary schools	0	3	3	.0
	0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Non-experimental primary schools	0	8	8	
	0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Total	0	11	11	
	0%	100.0%	100.0%	
With telephone communication				
Experimental primary schools	2	1	3	.55
	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	
Non-experimental primary schools	3	5	8	
	37.5%	62.5%	100.0%	
Total	5	6	11	
	45.5%	54.5%	100.0%	
With an outdoor meeting				
Experimental primary schools	3	0	3	1.00
	100.0%	0%	100.0%	

Schools	No	Yes	Total	Exact sig. (2-sided)
Non-experimental primary schools	7	1	8	
	87.5%	12.5%	100.0%	
Total	10	1	11	
	90.9%	9.1%	100.0%	
By home visit				
Experimental primary schools	3	0	3	.0
	100.0%	0%	100.0%	
Non-experimental primary schools	8	0	8	
	100.0%	0%	100.0%	
Total	11	0	11	
	100.0%	0%	100.0%	
By sending leaflets at home				
Experimental primary schools	2	1	3	1.00
	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	
Non-experimental primary schools	5	3	8	
	62.5%	37.5%	100.0%	
Total	7	4	11	
	63.6%	36.4%	100.0%	
Other				
Experimental primary schools	3	0	3	.0
	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
Non-experimental primary schools	8	0	8	
	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
Total	11	0	11	
	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	

On the question, what becomes clear during this briefing? , as far as the option of the cause of bullying is concerned [with Exact Sig. (2-sided) .15], the experimental school principals reached a percentage of 33% (1 vs. 2). In comparison, the non-experimental ones had a percentage of 88% (7 vs. 1). In addition, focusing on the option of the rules that have to be followed to reduce bullying [with exact sig. (2-sided) .49], the experimental school principals reached a percentage of 67% (2 vs. 1). In comparison, the non-experimental ones had a percentage of 88% (7 vs. 1). As regards the option of the consequences of not implementing the rules and the monitoring of their implementation [with Exact Sig. (2-sided) 1.00], the experimental school principals reached a percentage of

33% (1 vs. 2). In comparison, the non-experimental ones had a percentage of 50% (4 vs. 4). Concerning the option. These problems may exist in families [with Exact Sig. (2-sided) .15], the experimental school principals reached a percentage of 33% (1 vs. 2). In comparison, the non-experimental ones had a percentage of 88% (7 vs. 1). According to the possibility of providing personal contact option [with Exact Sig. (2-sided) 1.00], the experimental school principals reached a percentage of 67% (2 vs. 1). In comparison, the non-experimental ones had a percentage of 75% (6 vs. 2). Finally, discussing the other option, both the experimental principals and the non-experimental ones reached a percentage of 0% (all 3 and all 8 respectively).

Table 3
Informing Parents about Tackling Bullying

Schools	No	Yes	Total	Exact sig. (2-sided)
The causes of bullying				
Experimental primary schools	2	1	3	.15
	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	
Non-experimental primary schools	1	7	8	
	12.5%	87.5%	100.0%	
Total	3	8	11	
	27.3%	72.7%	100.0%	
The rules that have to be followed to reduce bullying				
Experimental primary schools	1	2	3	.49
	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%	
Non-experimental primary schools	1	7	8	
	12.5%	87.5%	100.0%	
Total	2	9	11	
	18.2%	81.8%	100.0%	
The consequences of not implementing the rules and monitoring their implementation				
Experimental primary schools	2	1	3	1.00
	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	
Non-experimental primary schools	4	4	8	
	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	
Total	6	5	11	
	54.5%	45.5%	100.0%	
The problems that may exist in families				
Experimental primary schools	2	1	3	.15
	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	
Non-experimental primary schools	1	7	8	

Schools	No	Yes	Total	Exact sig. (2-sided)
	12.5%	87.5%	100.0%	
Total	3	8	11	
	27.3%	72.7%	100.0%	
The possibility of providing personal contact				
Experimental primary schools	1	2	3	1.00
	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%	
Non-experimental primary schools	2	6	8	
	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%	
Total	3	8	11	
	27.3%	72.7%	100.0%	
Other				
Experimental primary schools	3	0	3	.0
	3	0	3	
Non-experimental primary schools	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
	8	0	8	
Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
	11	0	11	

On the question, why are meetings about bullying held with parents? , regarding the option to mobilize community factors is concerned [with Exact Sig. (2-sided) .55], the experimental school principals reached a percentage of 33% (1 vs. 2). In comparison, the non-experimental ones had a percentage of 63% (5 vs. 3). Furthermore, concerning the option to increase knowledge about bullying [with Exact Sig. (2-sided) 1.00], the experimental school principals reached a percentage of 100% (3 out of 3). In

comparison, the non-experimental ones had a percentage of 75% (6 vs. 2). As regards the option to notify parents and community members about upcoming events [with Exact Sig. (2-sided) 1.00], the answers for the experimental school principals were positive at a rate of 33% (1 in 3), while for the non-experimental ones at a rate of 38% (3 vs. 5). Finally, discussing the options typically and other, both the experimental principals and the non-experimental ones reached a percentage of 0% (all 3 and all 8 respectively).

Table 4
Reasons to have a Meeting with Parents about Bullying

Schools	No	Yes	Total	Exact sig. (2-sided)
To mobilize community factors				
Experimental primary schools	2	1	3	.55
	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	
Non-experimental primary schools	3	5	8	
	37.5%	62.5%	100.0%	
Total	5	6	11	
	45.5%	54.5%	100.0%	
To increase knowledge about bullying				
Experimental primary schools	0	3	3	1.00
	0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Non-experimental primary schools	2	6	8	
	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%	
Total	2	9	11	
	18.2%	81.8%	100.0%	
To notify parents and community members about upcoming events				
Experimental primary schools	2	1	3	1.00
	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	
Non-experimental primary schools	5	3	8	
	62.5%	37.5%	100.0%	
Total	7	4	11	
	63.6%	36.4%	100.0%	
Typically				
Experimental primary schools	3	0	3	.0
	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
Non-experimental primary schools	8	0	8	
	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
Total	11	0	11	
	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
Other				
Experimental primary schools	3	0	3	.0
	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
Non-experimental primary schools	8	0	8	
	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
Total	11	0	11	
	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	

If necessary, do you make targeted interventions in specific families with the cooperation of experts? [With exact sig. (2-sided) 1.00], the experimental school principals reached a

percentage of 100% (3 out of 3), while the non-experimental ones had a percentage of 88% (7 vs. 1).

Table 5
Targeted Interventions in Specific Families with the Cooperation of Experts

Schools	No	Yes	Total	Exact sig. (2-sided)
Experimental primary schools	0	3	3	1.00
	0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Non-experimental primary schools	1	7	8	
	12.5%	87.5%	100.0%	
Total	1	10	11	
	9.1%	90.9%	100.0%	

Table 6
Experts and Targeted Interventions in Specific Families

Schools	No	Yes	Total	Exact sig. (2-sided)
Psychologists				
Experimental primary schools	0	3	3	1.00
	0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Non-experimental primary schools	2	6	8	
	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%	
Total	2	9	11	
	18.2%	81.8%	100.0%	
Psychiatrists				
Experimental primary schools	0	3	3	1.00
	0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Non-experimental primary schools	1	7	8	
	12.5%	87.5%	100.0%	
Total	1	10	11	
	9.1%	90.9%	100.0%	
Qualified - specialized teachers				
Experimental primary schools	2	1	3	1.00
	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	
Non-experimental primary schools	4	4	8	
	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	
Total	6	5	11	
	54.5%	45.5%	100.0%	
The school advisor-consultant				
Experimental primary schools	2	1	3	.55
	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	
Non-experimental primary schools	3	5	8	
	37.5%	62.5%	100.0%	
Total	5	6	11	
	45.5%	54.5%	100.0%	
The Head of Education				
Experimental primary schools	3	0	3	1.00
	100.0%	0%	100.0%	
Non-experimental primary schools	7	1	8	
	87.5%	12.5%	100.0%	
Total	10	1	11	
	90.9%	9.1%	100.0%	
The Regional Head of Education				
Experimental primary schools	3	0	3	.0
	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
Non-experimental primary schools	8	0	8	
	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
Total	11	0	11	
	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
Specialized Centres				
Experimental primary schools	1	2	3	1.00
	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%	
Non-experimental primary schools	3	5	8	
	37.5%	62.5%	100.0%	
Total	4	7	11	
	36.4%	63.6%	100.0%	
Other				
Experimental primary schools	1	2	3	.15
	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%	
Non-experimental primary schools	7	1	8	
	87.5%	12.5%	100.0%	
Total	8	3	11	
	72.7%	27.3%	100.0%	

The question reported in Table 6, if yes, which expert(s) do you consult? , as far as the option psychologists are concerned [with exact sig. (2-sided) 1.00], the experimental school principals reached a percentage of 100% (3 in 3), while the non-experimental ones had a percentage of 75% (6 vs. 2). Additionally, as regards the option psychiatrists [with exact sig. (2-sided) 1.00], the experimental school principals reached a percentage of 33% (1 in 3), while the non-experimental ones had a percentage of 25% (2 vs. 6). Moreover, concerning the option of qualified - specialized teachers [with exact sig. (2-sided) 1.00], the replies for the experimental school principals were positive at 33% (1 in 3). In comparison, the replies for the non-experimental school principals were positive at 50% (4 vs. 4). As regards the school advisor option [with exact sig. (2-sided) .55], the replies for the experimental school principals were positive at 33% (1 in 3). In contrast, the replies for the non-experimental school principals were positive at 63% (5 vs. 3). Concerning the option of the Head of Education, the replies for the experimental school principals were positive at 0%

(0 in 3). In contrast, the replies for the non-experimental ones were positive at 13% (1 vs. 7). Focusing on the option of the Head of Regional Education, both the experimental school principals and the non-experimental ones reached a percentage of 0% (all 3 and all 8, respectively). About the option Specialised Centres [with exact sig. (2-sided) 1.00], the replies for the experimental school principals were positive at 67% (2 in 3). In comparison, the replies for the non-experimental school principals were positive at 63% (5 vs. 3). Finally, discussing the option other [with exact sig. (2-sided) .15], the replies for the experimental school principals were positive at 67% (2 in 3), whereas the replies for the non-experimental school principals were positive at 13% (1 vs. 7).

Table 7 indicated the question: Did you find out whether parents behave in a wrong way with their children rather than help schools implement the bullying policy? [With exact sig. (2-sided) .27], the replies for the experimental school principals were positive at 67% (2 in 3), while the replies for the non-experimental school principals were positive at 100% (all 8).

Table 7*Whether Parents Misbehave with their Children*

Schools	No	Yes	Total	Exact sig. (2-sided)
Experimental primary schools	1	2	3	.27
	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%	
Non-experimental primary schools	0	8	8	100.0%
	0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Total	1	10	11	
	9.1%	90.9%	100.0%	

On the question, if so, how do they behave wrongly? , in terms of the option, they exert violence at home [with exact sig. (2-sided) .15], the experimental school principals reached a percentage of 33% (1 in 3). In comparison, the non-experimental school principals reached a percentage of 88% (7 vs. 1). Concerning the option, they urge their children not to follow the rules [with exact sig. (2-sided) .49], the experimental school principals reached a percentage of 33% (1 in 3). In comparison, the non-experimental ones reached a percentage of 75% (6 vs. 2). As regards the option, they are quarrelsome towards the principal protecting their children [with exact sig. (2-sided) .55], the replies

for the experimental school principals were positive at 67% (2 vs. 3). In comparison, the replies for the non-experimental ones were positive at 38% (3 vs. 5). Focusing on the option they are quarrelsome towards the teachers protecting their children [with exact sig. (2-sided) 1.00], the replies for the experimental schools were positive at 67% (2 in 3), while the replies for the non-experimental ones were positive at 63% (5 vs. 3). Finally, discussing the option other [with exact sig. (2-sided) 1.00], the replies for the experimental school principals were positive at 0% (0 vs. 3), while the replies for the non-experimental ones were positive at 13% (1 vs. 7).

Table 8*The Ways Parents Misbehave with their Children*

Schools	No	Yes	Total	Exact sig. (2-sided)
They exert violence at home				
Experimental primary schools	2	1	3	.15
	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	
Non-experimental primary schools	1	7	8	100.0%
	12.5%	87.5%	100.0%	
Total	3	8	11	
	27.3%	72.7%	100.0%	
They urge their children not to follow the rules				
Experimental primary schools	2	1	3	.49
	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	
Non-experimental primary schools	2	6	8	100.0%
	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%	
Total	4	7	11	
	36.4%	63.6%	100.0%	
They are quarrelsome towards the principal protecting their children				
Experimental primary schools	1	2	3	.55
	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%	
Non-experimental primary schools	5	3	8	100.0%
	62.5%	37.5%	100.0%	
Total	6	5	11	
	54.5%	45.5%	100.0%	
They are quarrelsome towards the teachers protecting their children				
Experimental primary schools	3	0	3	.0
	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
Non-experimental primary schools	8	0	8	100.0%
	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
Total	11	0	11	
	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	

Schools	No	Yes	Total	Exact sig. (2-sided)
Other				
Experimental primary schools	3	0	3	.0
	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
Non-experimental primary schools	8	0	8	
	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
Total	11	0	11	
	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	

On the question, if so, how do you deal with them? [With exact sig. (2-sided) .49], the replies of the experimental school

principals reached a percentage of 33% (1 in 3), while the replies of the non-experimental ones reached 75% (6 vs. 2).

Table 9

Whether Principals use Ways to Deal with Parents who Misbehave with their Children

Schools	No	Yes	Total	Exact sig. (2-sided)
Experimental primary schools	2	1	3	.49
	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	
Non-experimental primary schools	2	6	8	
	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%	
Total	4	7	11	
	36.4%	63.6%	100.0%	

Discussion

Before beginning the discussion concerning our research effort, it should be mentioned that no similar research has been contacted about experimental schools in Greece. Furthermore, experimental schools do not exist in other countries in the form that operates in Greece, resulting in the conclusion that no comparison between these schools and others worldwide could be made. Therefore, considering all the above, the following discussion compares experimental and non-experimental schools in Greece.

The fact that non-experimental school principals outnumber both the frequency of telephone communication with parents and what is evident when parents are informed via briefings about specific concerns, such as the causes of bullying and problems in families and also the rules that have to be followed to reduce bullying, is probably related to the number of cases of bullying, which may be more prevalent in non-experimental schools than in the experimental ones, given that parents that send their children to the latter probably exert more and stricter supervision. Perhaps, this is why in meetings with parents about bullying the principals of non-experimental schools seem to be more active in mobilizing community factors than the non-experimental ones since experimental schools seem to have better contact with the community.

Concerning the issue of targeted interventions by principals in particular families with the cooperation of specialists in case of urgent need, the principals of experimental schools take far more advantage of factors such as the social structures and psychology departments of universities, while the non-experimental school principals, on the contrary, cooperate more with the school consultant, constitutes an element that reveals the somewhat more targeted action of the former to tackle the problem, by seeking a broader and higher level of cooperation.

Finally, on the issue of the principals' understanding of whether parents, rather than helping schools to implement their policy of intimidation, behave wrongly with their children, the principals of non-experimental schools are outperforming, stating that there are more cases of this kind, given that parents of their schools behave either very wrongly by themselves using domestic violence, or rather wrongly urging their children themselves not to follow the rules. On the contrary, in quite more cases, experimental schools outweigh the cases involving parents urging their children to be quarrelsome towards the principal, which may indicate a problem of relations solely between the principal and the parents in these schools. Considering everything stated above, it makes sense that non-experimental school principals succeed in their efforts to deal with parents who act inappropriately towards their children by refusing to assist schools in implementing their anti-bullying policy with specific procedures, such as dialogue, discussions, cooperation, and/or action follow-up.

In any case, however, principals and teachers should leave school and be in the neighborhood of students. They should visit their families to understand the pupils' reactions. Perhaps they should start each school year by visiting the students' homes (Boske & Osanloo, 2015). Furthermore, principals could often personally visit the students' homes to conceptualize the difficulties children - adolescents experience and build family assistance relationships (Rigby & Thomas, 2010, p. 33).

Conclusion

As regards comparisons between the principals of experimental and non-experimental schools, the common points are twice as much as the differences. In particular, differences are not equally shared between the two categories, with the non-experimental school principals prevailing in most issues. More specifically, it was revealed that there were not many worthwhile differences between the primary school principals of experimental and non-experimental schools concerning their anti-bullying behavior regarding the parent's involvement.

References

- Boske, C., & Osanloo, A. (2015). *Students, teachers, and leaders addressing bullying in schools*. Sense Publishers.
- Chiotelis, L., & Theodoropoulou, M. (2017). Greek model experimental schools, too good to last: An attempt to evaluate. *US-China Education Review B*, 7(12), 552-560. <https://doi.org/10.17265/2161-6248/2017.12.002>
- Cohen, L., & Manion, L. (1997). *Μεθοδολογία εκπαιδευτικής έρευνας* [Educational research methodology]. Metechmio.
- European Commission. (2022). *National reforms in school education*. Author. <https://eurydice.eacea.ec.europa.eu/national-education-systems/greece/national-reforms-school-education>
- Filder, B. (2002). *Strategic management for school development. Leading your school's improvement strategy*. Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Filiis, B. (1993). *Εισαγωγή στη Μεθοδολογία και τις Τεχνικές των Κοινωνικών Ερευνών* [Introduction to the methodology and techniques of social research]. Gutenberg.
- Fulbright Greece. (2022). *The Greek educational system*. Author. <https://www.fulbright.gr/el/spoudes-stin-ellada/to-elliniko-ekpaideftiko-systima>
- Halikias, M., Manolesou, A., & Lalou, P. (2015). *Μεθοδολογία έρευνας και εισαγωγή στη στατιστική ανάλυση δεδομένων με το IBM SPSS Statistics* [Research methodology and introduction to statistical data analysis with IBM SPSS Statistics]. Association of Greek Academic Libraries.

- Hirsch, L., Lowen, C., & Santorelli, D. (2012). *Bully: An action plan for teachers, parents and communities to combat the bullying crisis*. Weinstein Publishing.
- James, A. (2010). *School bullying*. NSPCC. 2010. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/264166903_School_bullying
- Jan, A., & Husain, S. (2015). Bullying in elementary schools: Its causes and effects on students. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(19), 43–56. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1079521.pdf>
- Nazir, T., & Piskin, M. (2015). School bullying: Effecting child's mental health. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 2(4), 130–135. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/345434707_School_Bullying_Effecting_Childs_Mental_Health
- Nickols, F. (2016). Strategy, strategic management, strategic planning and strategic thinking. *Management Journal*, 1(1), 4–7. https://www.nickols.us/strategy_etc.pdf
- Nova-Kaltsouni, C. (2006). *Μεθοδολογία εμπειρικής έρευνας στις κοινωνικές επιστήμες* [Empirical research methodology in social sciences]. Gutenberg.
- Olweus, D. (2003). A profile of bullying at school. *Educational Leadership*, 60(6), 12–17.
- Papadimitriou, G. (2001). *Περιγραφική Ανάλυση* [Descriptive statistics]. Paratiritis Publications.
- Paraskevopoulou-Kollia, E.-A. (2008). Qualitative research methodology in the social sciences and interviews. *Open Education*, 4, 172–181.
- Pazarakis, N. (2022). *Οι απόψεις των διευθυντών και διευθυντριών των σχολικών μονάδων της Πρωτοβάθμιας εκπαίδευσης για την αποτελεσματική συμβολή τους στην αντιμετώπιση περιστατικών βίας (Bullying)* [The views of principals and primary school principals of primary education school units on the effective contribution to addressing incidents of violence (bullying)] [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Macedonia.
- Perth & Kinross Council. (2020). *Anti-bullying strategy*. Education and student services. https://www.pkc.gov.uk/media/40989/Anti-Bullying-Strategy/pdf/Antibullying_Strategy_1_.pdf?m=636471161244000000
- Piskin, M. (2002). School bullying: Definition, types, related factors, and strategies to prevent bullying problems. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 2(2), 531–562. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/284631890_School_bullying_Definition_types_related_factors_and_strategies_to_prevent_bullying_problems
- Polydorou, A. (2016). *Attitudes and ways of dealing with bullying at the primary school units in the school area* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Hellenic Open University.
- Rehman Bukhari, S. A. (2019). What is strategy? https://www.researchgate.net/publication/336880995_What_Is_Strategy
- Rigby, K., & Thomas, B. E. (2010). *How schools counter bullying: Policies and procedures in selected Australian*. ACER Press.
- Sergio, J. (2011). *Strategic Management: The theory and practice of strategy in (business) organizations*. DTU Management, 1.
- Stamelos, G., & Dakoroulou, A. (2006). *Από τον σχεδιασμό στην υλοποίηση* [From design to implementation]. Metaichmio.
- Stives, K. L., May, D. C., Mack, M., & Bethel, C. L. (2021). Understanding responses to bullying from the parent perspective. *Frontiers in Education*, 6, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.642367>
- Swit, C. (2019). *What is bullying?* The education hub. <https://theeducationhub.org.nz/category/school-resources/>
- Vergidis, E., & Mousidou, E. (2016). *Οι απόψεις των διευθυντών των σχολείων της Περιφέρειας Δυτικής Ελλάδας για τους τρόπους αντιμετώπισης της σχολικής βίας και του εκφοβισμού* [The views of the principals of the schools of the region of Western Greece on the ways of dealing with school violence and bullying]. *Artheas, Scientific Yearbook* 5, 71–92.
- Zerva, B. (2017). *Ο ρόλος του διευθυντή της σχολικής μονάδας στη διαχείριση του φαινομένου του σχολικού εκφοβισμού* [The role of the principal of the school unit in the management of the school bullying phenomenon] [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Ioannina.

Received: 29 December 2022

Revised: 30 January 2023

Accepted: 14 February 2023