The high number of bullying cases among students is one of the problems of education in Indonesia. Previous studies stated that socio economic status (SES), social capital, ethnicity and parenting were the factors leading to the practice of bullying in schools. Students with low SES levels more often fall victim to bullying compared to students who have high SES levels. Likewise, with social capital, students who have a low level of popularity and weak social networks are more vulnerable of bullying from their friends. In addition, victims of bullying are often students from ethnic minorities. Students who become victims of bullying also tend to have strict and overprotective parents. By using a quantitative approach in the form of a survey and binary logistic regression data processing technique, in this article the author uses two main variables, namely SES and social capital, which is then analysed using multicausal analysis simultaneously to observe the more dominant factors in influencing the practice of bullying at school. The results show that students who have low social capital are six times more likely to be victims than students who have high social capital. Meanwhile, the SES level variable is stated not to correlate with bullying in SMAN X in Karawang, West Java. Therefore, the variable of social capital is known to be a more dominant factor as a cause of the practice of bullying compared to the variable of SES level.
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INTRODUCTION

The high number of bullying cases in the school age group is a phenomenon that occurs in various countries in the world. In the United States, at least 1 in 4 children aged 12-17 years become victims of bullying, with the highest percentage occurring in Grade 10 (Bullyingstatistic.org n.d.). In the United Kingdom, including Scotland and Northern Ireland, 54% of 10,020 respondents aged 12-20 years had become victims of bullying (Ditchthelabel.org 2017). In Indonesia, as many as 84% of children of 12-17 age group recorded also suffered from bullying (Ministry of Social Affairs in Detik.com 2017). Ironically, the practice of bullying in Indonesia often happens in the school environment. According to data from the Indonesian Child Protection Commission (KPAI), a total of 339 cases of violence have occurred in public, private and official schools, with a total of 82 fatalities (KPAI in Annisa 2012). According to SKTA Indonesia (2013), schools are the location with the greatest number of physical violence for children, other than the family environment.

Aside from physical violence, the practice of bullying also causes loss of life among students in the form of suicide. According to the Ministry of Social Affairs, as many as 40% of total suicides of children are caused by depression due to being victims of bullying (Liputan6.com 2015). One of the most heartbreaking case is the suicide of a female junior high school student in Bekasi, due to bullying by her school friends. The student was bullied because her parents worked as food sellers (Setiawati in Annisa 2012).

Previous studies have observed that the level of socioeconomic status (SES), social capital, ethnicity and parenting style are important factors that cause students to become victims of bullying. Previous research shows that the practice of bullying often occurs because of economic inequality between students in a school (Due et al. 2009). Students from the lower social classes are more often involved in bullying cases, especially as victims (Kakitainan, Rasanen, & Henttonen 1999; Fu, Land & Lamb 2012). Socio-economic status is considered to be consistent in analyzing the problems of bullying, particularly when observed from the viewpoint of the victims. Through meta-analysis of studies on SES and victimization from various countries, almost all studies show that students who fall victim to bullying are students with low SES levels (Tippet & Wolke 2014). Therefore, it can be concluded...
that students who come from families with weak economies and low education levels are more vulnerable to becoming victims of bullying in schools (Lumeng et al. 2010; Lemstra et al. 2012; Jansen et al. 2012).

As with SES level, imbalance of social capital can also encourage the practice of bullying in schools. Students with small networks of friends and isolation from their peers are more prone to become victims of bullying (Caruso in Suicide.org n.d.). Conversely, students with high levels of popularity and ability to follow shared consensus tend to be less prone to bullying (Mouttapa et al. 2004; Gottfredson & DiPietro 2011). Ironically, not only are they not vulnerable to bullying, students with high levels of popularity and strong social networks are usually more aggressive and are often the bully (Salmivalli et al. 1997; Rodkin et al. 2000; Faris in Theglobeandmail.com 2011).

Studies that observe ethnicity and bullying as practiced in the United States showed that adolescents from ethnic minorities were more often victims of bullying, compared to adolescents from the majority ethnic groups (Nansel et al. 2001; Mouttapa et al. 2004). Likewise, in European countries, such as Norway and the Netherlands, immigrant children more often become victims of bullying, compared to children born and raised in the country (Fandrem et al. 2009; Verkuyten & Thijs 2002).

On the relation of the parenting factor to the practice of bullying in school, previous studies showed that the authoritarian parenting pattern made students feel lacking affection, causing them to become bullying actors in school (Trickett & Kuczynski 1986; Coloroso 2007; Annisa 2012). On the other hand, the authoritarian parenting pattern also has implications towards students who become victims of bullying. In addition to causing children to become bullying actors, authoritarian parents can also cause their children to become victims of bullying (McNamara & McNamara 1997; Baldry & Farrington 1998, Pontzer 2009).

In this article, I shows the results of studies using only two main variables, namely SES and social capital in observing the phenomenon of bullying in SMAN X. The study aims to fill the space of literature through the study of multi-cause analysis by using two independent variables simultaneously, the level of SES and social capital. Therefore, this article can see which variables are more dominant in analyzing abuse victimization. This is important because comparative analysis between SES and social capital in the context of bullying in schools has
not been done by previous studies. In addition, this article is also able to answer the theoretical debates about what capital is most influential and create inequality in the phenomenon of bullying in schools.

As the unit of analysis, I selected students of State High School (SMAN) X in Karawang regency, West Java, a small town or peri-urban area (Novianty 2015). Although data show high rates of bullying in large cities such as Jakarta (72.7%), Surabaya (67.2%) and Yogyakarta (63.8%) (Sejiwa Foundation in Annisa 2012), I argues that the level of bullying in the regions is not much different from that of urban areas. This is evidenced by the research of Woods & Wolke (2004), which showed that there are similarities in patterns and number of cases of bullying between schools in urban areas and schools in small towns. Therefore, this article also aims to look at the phenomenon of bullying that occurs in non-metropolitan cities in Indonesia, especially in SMAN X in West Java. In addition to the context of peri-urban areas, this article also looks at how bullying practices occur in favorite high schools in the area. This is interesting because most students who receive education in favorite schools are known to come from families with high SES levels. Therefore, it is in accordance with the research objectives, one of which is to observe the correlation between SES and bullying due to social class imbalances.

RESEARCH METHOD

This article is based on a quantitative research in the form of a survey using questionnaires. As the unit of analysis and the unit of observation, the author used students from all high school grades. The sampling technique used is stratified random sampling. In the context of this study, the stratified random sampling technique based on grade is relevant to observe which grade has the highest rate of bullying, and to observe patterns of relations between grades through acts of bullying carried out by students across grades. Therefore, any indication of seniority in which senior students bully junior students can be observed. Meanwhile, the number of samples is 135 students, wherein the figure was obtained based on the Slovin formula with a margin of error of 8% of the total population of 1011 students. The number of samples obtained from each grade is 43 students from Grade 10, 43 from Grade 11, and 49 from Grade 12. The number of respondents in each grade
is obtained based on proportional calculation of the population of each grade.

The questionnaire was formulated based on 3 main components, namely the rate of bullying victimization, social capital, and SES level. The level of bullying victimization and social capital is measured based on a 1 to 4 Likert scale. The Likert scale for the rate of bullying victimization is “never”, “rarely”, “often”, and “very often”, then recoded to “high” and “low”. Social capital level is measured using “strongly disagree”, “disagree”, “agree”, and “strongly agree”, and also recoded to “high” and “low”. Meanwhile, SES level is measured using a scoring method based on education level, job prestige and income level, then recoded to “high” and “low”. In addition, questions about the bully is also added in the questionnaire for analysis. The actors are classified into three categories: classmates, seniors and juniors. After the variables have been categorized, the relationship between variables is tested and the dominant variables determined using binary logistic regression. In addition to determining the dominant variable, the binary logistic regression test was also used to observe the extent of which students were exposed to bullying by their peers based on SES and social capital. The reason for the author to use this data processing technique is that the variable is dichotomous, namely high and low. Second, the number of samples taken is quite large or exceeding 30 person. There are two main hypotheses to be tested. The first hypothesis is that the higher the SES level of parents of students, the lower the potential of these students to become victims of bullying. The second hypothesis is the higher the level of social capital of students, the lower the potential of these students to become victims of bullying.

CONCEPTUALIZING THE PHENOMENON OF BULLYING

According to Coloroso (2007), bullying is defined as conscious and repetitive actions in the form of threat, attempt to hurt and create terror to the victim, because of the imbalance of power relations. Bulliery to satisfy the desire to hurt into various actions, either individually or in groups (Rigby 2007). Psychologically, the perpetrators will feel happy after carrying out these acts of bullying. According to Olweus (1993), bullying is never done unintentionally by the actor. However, the perpetrators will usually try to escape responsibility by pretending not to know that their actions are acts of bullying.
As for bullying victimization, this refers to the condition when someone receives various negative treatments from perpetrators of bullying repeatedly (Olweus in Fu, Land & Lamb 2012). Victims of bullying receive negative actions from their peers in the form of physical, verbal, and relational violence (Olweus 1993; Nansel et al. 2001). This can cause the victim to become depressed, frustrated and experience a decrease in self-confidence, thus impacting the child’s academic performance and future. Coloroso (2007) noticed that the victim of bullying is someone who is isolated from the peer group, so that the victims tend to accept the bullying rather than developing their abilities or skills. This is what makes victims of bullying often fail academically. For measurement purposes, the study uses the dimensions of bullying victimization according to Olweus (1993), namely physical bullying, verbal bullying and relational bullying.

**SOCIAL ECONOMIC STATUS (SES) & SOCIAL CAPITAL**

Socio-economic status (SES) refers to the social position of individuals or groups in the community (apa.org 2018). SES levels are generally determined based on visible things that are considered prestigious in a particular community context. Some indicators are commonly used to determine social class of persons, including level of education, job prestige and income levels (Baker 2014). The social class can provide benefits for individuals who occupy the upper hierarchy in the stratification system. According to Bourdieu, economic capital can influence other capital, which can create gaps in a society (Field 2003). Bourdieu’s assumption was influenced by Marx’s thinking that observed economics as the most dominant aspect in society. Therefore, these classical thoughts observe that socio-economic status is always positively correlated with other capital, such as social capital.

Social capital is a concept that focuses on social relations, with the unit of analysis ranging from the individual level to the community (Field 2003). According to Coleman, social capital serves as a resource in the form of relationships that exist in the family and other communities that affect a person’s cognitive and social development (Coleman 1994). Unlike Bourdieu, Coleman’s research in education shows that social capital is actually useful for students from marginal communities and ethnic minorities to be able to improve their standard of living (Coleman in Field 2003). Although his research looked at race and social capital,
in the context of the time, race was an aspect that was closely related to one’s socio-economic status. Therefore, Coleman’s research shows that ownership of social capital does not always correspond with high SES levels. Social capital apparently can also be owned by individuals with low levels of SES. For the marginalized, social capital is able to save them from the misfortunes in the economic aspects of their life (Field 2003). The social capital of students from weak economic levels is generally in the form of high motivation and extensive network of friends (Stanton-Salazar & Dornbusch 1995).

According to Putnam (1996), social capital is part of community life in the form of networks, norms and trust that can make actors act more effectively for common goals. Putnam’s definition of social capital focuses more on aspects of network strength, trust and norms that grow in the relationship. To determine the level of social capital, measuring can be done by operationalizing it into three main dimensions, namely social networks, trust and shared norms.

a. Social network

Social networks have been discussed by almost all social scientists from classical to modern. Putnam (in Field 2003) sees networks as a result of meetings of various individuals who have common interests or goals. Putnam (2001) sees social networking in two aspects: formal and informal. Formal networks refer to organizations that are organized and have a clear management structure, while informal networks are more directed towards emotional relationships because of common goals and interests. The social network for Putnam is highly important, where it justifies the decline of the social capital of the people of the United States because it increasingly becomes individualistic and rarely becomes involved in joint activities with other individuals in a particular network (Field 2003).

b. Trust

According to Putnam (1995) trust is a form of desire and belief that the other party will act as expected and support each other’s common goals, or at least the other party does not harm the individual or group. For Coleman and Putnam trust is an important component in social capital (Field 2003). The same thing was also expressed by Fukuyama (1995) who saw that social capital would emerge from the trust that was built in society. Networks with a high level of trust will function better than those with networks that have a low level of trust (Field 2003). The existence of high trust in certain individuals or groups will make
it easier for them to get various accesses, such as employment, science and ownership of economic assets.

c. Shared norms

In the concept of social capital, norms are not a set of bureaucratic rules contained in various written regulations, but rather an entity regarding the shared consensus that is adhered to by the parties involved. According to Fukuyama (2001), a norm is an entity formed from the past history or by individuals who have the charisma and influence the behavior of individuals or groups, who then will foster social capital itself. Norms will appear automatically when the network is becoming developed. The shared norms in social capital are known to be very important. To the extent to which individuals or groups can comply with these shared norms, social capital will be built.

BULLYING PHENOMENON IN A SMALL TOWN (PERI-URBAN) FAVORITE SCHOOL

In this sub-chapter there are some univariate data that describe the number of bullying cases in SMAN X as a whole and also the rate of victimization of bullying in each grade. The description of the data is an empirical picture in accordance with the context of research conducted in a favorite school in the province of West Java. Based on the previous description, the researcher intends to observe the conditions or climate of the school, especially in terms of relations between students that occur. Besides looking at bullying victimization rates as a whole, the researcher also seeks to compare rates of bullying victimization by grade.

Table 1. Composition of Respondents by Grade and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of Respondents</th>
<th>Grade 10</th>
<th>Grade 11</th>
<th>Grade 12</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16.3% (22)</td>
<td>16.3% (22)</td>
<td>15.6% (21)</td>
<td>48.1% (65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15.6% (21)</td>
<td>15.6% (21)</td>
<td>207% (28)</td>
<td>51.9% (70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31.9% (43)</td>
<td>31.9% (43)</td>
<td>36.3% (49)</td>
<td>100% (135)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2018 SMAN X Survey data
Table 2. Bullying Victimization Rate in the Last 4 Months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low frequency</td>
<td>50.40%</td>
<td>(68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High frequency</td>
<td>49.60%</td>
<td>(67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>(135)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2018 SMAN X Survey data

Graphic 1. Percentage of Bullying Victims by Grade Bullying Victims

Based on data table 2, the rate of bullying victimization at SMAN X is almost 50%. These results are known to be quite significant because at least 1 in 2 students become victims of bullying at school. The phenomenon of the high number of victims of bullying in favorite schools becomes interesting because favorite schools often have the image of a good curriculum and environment. The bullying phenomenon is indeed rarely exposed by schools, especially favorite ones. So far, indicators for favorite schools are only the National Examination ranking, the number of graduates who continue to favorite universities, and the assumptions about the level of intelligence of students (Kompas. com 2018). Therefore, the data above can raise questions about whether favorite schools are always correlated with a good school environment or otherwise.

Based on data from graphic 1, the percentage of students often suffering from bullying in grades 10, 11 and 12 respectively are 30% (20), 30% (20) and 40% (27) respectively. These results indicate a tendency that the higher the grade level, the higher the percentage of victims of bullying. Based on this fact, the assumption that favorite
schools are synonymous with a good environment becomes increasingly inconsistent. This indicates that the school does not have good environmental conditions to ensure the safety and comfort of students in taking education. Previous studies show that the school climate is highly correlated with the level of bullying that occurs. The better the climate of a school, the lower the level of bullying. Conversely, the worse the climate of a school, the higher the level of bullying (Adam & Corner 2008; Kassabri et al. 2008; Magfirah & Rachmawati 2010).

Another noteworthy aspect is the context of SMAN X, which is located in a rural area. The high number of bullying cases at SMAN X shows that the level of bullying in small towns does not differ significantly from the level of bullying in urban schools. The study of Han, Zhang & Zhang (2017) conducted in China also showed such results, where differences in geographical location did not correlate with prevalence and rates of bullying. Even in some cases, the level of bullying in schools in rural areas is higher than that in schools in metropolitan areas. In addition to China, a similar trend is also seen in the United States, where there is no significant difference between rates of bullying in urban schools and rural schools (Smokowski et al., 2013). This is certainly important because there are still many cases of bullying in schools in non-urban areas in Indonesia that have not been exposed and have received less attention from relevant parties.

**BULLYING VICTIMIZATION & SENIORITY: A FORM OF TRADITION**

In this section the researcher does an analysis to look deeper into the phenomenon of bullying that occurs in each grade at SMAN X. In the research questionnaire, the researcher adds questions about the students who most often bully the respondents. At this subchapter we can see the percentage of the bullies, whether seniors, classmates or juniors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. Percentage of Bullying Actors Based on Their Grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SMAN X Survey data
Based on data from table 3, Grades 11 and 12 students are known to only be bullied by classmates, while Grade 10 students are known to be bullied not only by classmates, but also by seniors. At least 1 of 3 students in Grade 10 has been bullied by seniors. Meanwhile, even though the data show that all Grade 11 and 12 students are only bullied by their classmates, that does not mean that they have never been abused by seniors. In the context of this study, the time range asked was the last 4 months. The Grade 11 and 12 students may experience bullying based on seniority when they sit in Grade 10.

The data in table 3 indicate that there is unhealthy seniority in the school environment. It also becomes interesting as victims of bullying by seniors are only found in grade 10, where new students have only been educated in the high school for 4 months. The indication of seniority at SMAN X is not separable from the context of the learning orientation period, which is mostly handled by Grade 11 and 12 students. The student orientation period in Indonesia is still strongly marked by hazing behavior, in which seniors often instruct new students to do frivolous things that are inherited from previous generations, and give psychological pressure to new students. Even in some cases in other high schools, senior students did physical violence to new students. Although at SMAN X there were no indications of physical violence, it did not guarantee that there was no verbal and relational violence carried out by seniors to new students. Thus, some new students assume that they are being bullied by seniors because of the orientation period.

Seniority itself is in fact not a foreign term to the educational environment in Indonesia. The definition of seniority in the context of schools in Indonesia is closely tied to deviant actions that harm other students, especially students who have just entered the school. According to Astuti (2008), the tradition of seniority is one of the causes of bullying that occurs in Indonesian schools. The seniority tradition is usually in the form of the creation of a set of rules or norms by senior students which are retained through generations (Magfirah & Rachmawati 2010). These rules are usually introduced to new students during the orientation period. The existence of rules of seniority in schools generally limits the space for new students.

Besides, grade 10 students are considered to be more vulnerable to bullying by seniors because there are few of them who have friendships with seniors. If they begin to have friendships with seniors, the opportunity to be bullied by seniors will decline. This can be seen in
table 4, which shows that grade 11 students are no longer being bullied by seniors. On the other hand, students in grade 11 would have the opportunity to work with students in grade 12 in bullying students in grade 10. In addition, vulnerability to bullying in grade 10 can also be caused by an imbalance of power relations in the 11th and 12th grade students. The imbalance of power relations is generally caused by feelings of power of the seniors who feel they have been in school for longer.

GENDER AND BULLYING VICTIMIZATION

Based on data in graphic 2 below, the percentage of male bullying victims is known to be higher than female students. Although the difference is not significant, the result has been able to strengthen the argument of earlier studies that observe that the practice of bullying occurs more often among male students than female ones (Aluedse et al. 2006; Smokowski et. Al 2013; Han, Zhang & Zhang 2017). These assumptions are related to the image of male masculinity, which is always associated with everything related to machismo, where men are usually considered stronger than women (Welcoming Schools Foundation 2018; Ditchthelabel.org 2018). Stereotypes or images of certain genders in the community can have an impact on the practice of bullying in schools. In the context of patriarchal societies such as Indonesia, men are forced to fulfill social constructions that apply in society, such as the image of men who must be strong and resilient. The image has an impact on young men who participate in the construction, even in the context of association in the school environment.

Graphic 2. Percentage of Bullying Victims Based on Gender

Source: 67 respondents with a high level of victimization in 2018 SMAN X Survey data
Nevertheless, there is still a large number of female students who become victims of bullying, even though the percentage is lower than that of male students. This is interesting when many girls are involved in bullying, especially as victims, from physical, verbal and relational aspects. Women tend to rarely fall victim of bullying, given the social construction that women must behave more gently than men.

Although the gender aspect is not a major analysis in this study, the difference in the percentage of victims of bullying based on gender is still to be added to the analytical aspects of bullying victimization at SMAN X. This is certainly an important thing to do in order to attempt to reduce the number of bullying to do it effectively, given the different ways of approaching male and female bullying victims.

**MULTICAUSAL ANALYSIS OF BULLYING VICTIMISATION**

This sub-section describes the data that tests the main hypotheses in the current study. The researcher interpreted the results of the binary logistic regression test to find out whether the hypothesis was accepted or rejected. In addition, to observe which variable is dominant in influencing the level of bullying victimization, the researcher used a binary logistic regression test. SES level and social capital variables are operationalized based on their dimensions, then tested in a model to observe the significance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>p value</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent Education Level</td>
<td>0.263 (&gt; 0.05)</td>
<td>Not Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Occupation</td>
<td>0.790 (&gt; 0.05)</td>
<td>Not Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Income Level</td>
<td>0.197 (&gt; 0.05)</td>
<td>Not Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social network</td>
<td>0,000 (&lt;0.05)</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>0.015 (&lt;0.05)</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared norms</td>
<td>0,000 (&lt;0.05)</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100% (135)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Processed from 2018 SMAN X Survey data
Table 5. Simultaneous Test of Binary Logistic Regression (Omnibus Test)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>p value</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 Model</td>
<td>25,476</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Processed from 2018 SMAN X Survey data

Table 6. Partial Test of Binary Logistic Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Exp (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social network</td>
<td>-1.074</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>6,917</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>-.338</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared norms</td>
<td>-1.117</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>8,404</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Processed from 2018 SMAN X Survey data

Equation: \[
\frac{\exp(1.099 - 1.074 X_n - 1.117 X_{sn})}{1 + \exp(1.099 - 1.074 X_n - 1.117 X_{sn})}
\]

Table 7. Model Suitability Test (Hosmer & Lemeshow Test)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.542</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.617</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Processed from 2018 SMAN X Survey data

Table 8. Accuracy Classification Test (Classification Plot)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Predicted</th>
<th>Percentage Correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of bullying victimization</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of bullying victimization</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oravell Percentage</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Processed from 2018 SMAN X Survey data
In the results of the independence test, there are three variables that are found to be not significant, namely the level of education of parents, occupation of parents and also level of income of parents. This can be seen from the p values that are above 0.05. Meanwhile, the other three variables, namely social network, trust and shared norms are found to be correlated because they have p values below 0.05. Therefore, only three significant variables can be included in the partial (multivariate) test.

The three variables that failed the test are those originating from the SES level variable. It shows that the level of SES is not correlated with bullying victimization at SMAN X. Meanwhile, the three variables that passed the test are known to originate from social capital. This shows that social capital is a variable that influences the practice of bullying in SMAN X.

In the simultaneous test, the results show the sig value of 0.000 or <0.05. This indicates that from variables of network, trust and shared norms, there is at least one significant related variable. This assumption is certainly strengthened by partial testing of the three variables to see which factor is most dominant in influencing the level of bullying victimization. Based on the partial test results, the variables of social network and shared norms have each sig values of 0.009 and 0.004, i.e. lower than 0.05. Meanwhile, the variable trust has a sig value of 0.426 or higher than 0.05. Based on these results, there are only two variables known to significantly influence the level of bullying victimization, namely social networks and shared norms.

The most dominant variable is shared norms, because it has a greater Exp (B) value or odds ratio with a smaller sig value. These results can be interpreted as follows: “With a significance level of 0.004, students who are able to follow shared norms are bullied 0.327 times as often as students who do not follow the shared norms.” Another way of interpreting the result is reversing it, by dividing 1 with 0.327 = 3.1. “With a significance level of 0.004, students who do not follow the shared norms are bullied 3.1 times more often compared to students who are able to follow the shared norms.”

Meanwhile, the second dominant variable is the social network, which is interpreted as: “With a significance level of 0.009, students with a high level of social networks are bullied 0.342 times as often as students with a low level of social networks.” Or, “With a significance level of 0.009, students with a low social network suffer from bullying 2.9 times more often compared to students who have a high level of social network.”
The results of the interpretation were then tested for accuracy and validity using the Hosmer & Lemeshow test. The Hosmer & Lemeshow test results show the a sig value of 0.617 or >0.05, so that it can be stated that the binary logistic regression model does not show a real difference between the observations and model predictions. The Hosmer and Lemeshow test result, unlike many other tests, is an exception, where a greater value of significance (> 0.05) means that the model is considered good. The second accuracy test is classification plot, where the total percentage is 69.6%, so the model is declared appropriate. These results can be interpreted that social capital has been able to explain the level of bullying victimization at SMAN X by 69.6%. The remaining, or around 30.4%, is explained by other factors not in the binary logistic regression test model that has been carried out.

SOCIAL CLASS AND BULLYING VICTIMIZATION

The bullying phenomenon that occurs in SMAN X does not show a correlation with the SES level of parents of students. There is no clear pattern of the victims of bullying, whether students with high SES levels or students with low SES levels. There are several previous studies which also do not show correlations between SES levels and bullying victimization, including research in the UK and in Finland (Whitney & Smith 1993; Sourander et al. 2000). Therefore, patterns regarding the relations of SES levels with bullying are highly contextual depending on the dimensions of space and time of the study. Inequalities of social class, which cause marginalization or oppression in the society in general, turned out to be not necessarily found in the context of school education, e.g. not in the context of bullying victimization at SMAN X. This fact actually indicates the absence of granting privileges for certain students based on the social class of their parents. All students, both those from the upper social class and from the lower social class, are equally vulnerable to becoming victims of bullying.

Although the number of bullying cases at SMAN X is quite high, at least there is still a bright spot, namely that the cases occurred not because of the marginalization based on economic inequality. This is important because the main purpose of public schools is to create justice and a meritocracy system so that all students can get a good education. This becomes dangerous if the education system in a school can create exclusion for students with low SES levels. Therefore, the Ministry of
Education and Culture regulation (2018), which requires high schools and vocational schools to provide 20% quota for students from poor families can be said to be successful in minimizing economic inequalities that have an impact on social exclusion, at least in the context of SMAN X in a town in West Java as a favorite school.

As a consideration of the selection, favorite schools usually focus on the academic quality of prospective students than the economic capacity of parents to pay high school fees. Therefore, the proportion of the different socioeconomic status levels of students at SMAN X can be said to be quite well distributed, in the sense that students from all backgrounds are found in the school. This diversity of students in terms of family background makes the school more heterogeneous, and leads into cross-border interactions and does not recognize differences in socioeconomic status. This makes students not view their peers based on social class, but rather based on the similarities of perspectives and informal values.

The absence of correlation between social class and bullying victimization may also occur because of the context of research conducted in a small town. Usually in non-metropolitan areas, the most dominant aspect is the network bond factor, which is based on shared norms. This is certainly different from in urban areas, which are known to be more materialistic, although of course there must be further research on these assumptions. This study on bullying conducted on a high school in a peri-urban area has shown such a tendency, which found that based on the results of statistical tests, networks and shared norms are more dominant than the aspect of social class. Therefore, this study found different results compared to previous studies conducted in Europe and America, namely that in the context of research in Indonesia, especially in non-metropolitan areas, SES levels did not play an important role in the practice of bullying in schools.

The assumption that social network is the most dominant aspect is found correct in this study. Bullying practices that occur at SMAN X can be convincingly explained by the aspect of social capital. Therefore, it can be concluded that the aspect that creates marginalization in the form of bullying practices at SMAN X is not an aspect of social class, but social capital owned by a student.
The practice of bullying that occurs in Public High School X correlates with the social capital of students, where the aspects of social networks and shared norms are the most dominant factors. Students who have a low level of social networking and are unable to follow shared norms are more likely to be victims of bullying compared to students who are otherwise. This becomes interesting, when the role of social class, which is often assumed to go hand in hand with social capital, cannot be proven in this study. Based on the results of the correlation test conducted between SES and social capital variables, chi-square shows the value of 0.736 (>0.05). The assumption of Bourdieu (in Field 2003) concerning economic capital that is able to influence other capitals including social capital is irrelevant, at least in the context of the phenomenon of bullying in SMAN X West Java.

This article shows that students, regardless of their economic capital, are equally prevalent in becoming bullying victims. It is certainly different from the aspect of social capital, which shows the tendency of students with a high level of social capital to be less frequently affected by bullying. Therefore, SES level is not positively correlated with social capital in the context of this study. Students from higher social classes do not necessarily have high levels of social capital, and vice versa. This is certainly in accordance with Coleman’s research (in Field 2003), who more specifically observed the aspect of education, where students with low SES levels could also own social capital to improve living standards and facilitate their studies in school.

In this article, students with high levels of social capital have lower chances of becoming a victims of bullying at school. Today, social capital is indeed one of the tools that individuals use to achieve a better level, at least preventing them from getting socially excluded because they have strong social networks. The power of social networks has the assumption that no matter what is owned by someone, the most important thing is who is known by the individual (Field 2003). This assumption implies that social networks are more important than social class, and that individuals with high or low SES levels both need strong social networks to obtain favorable conditions. Therefore, social capital is important for students to support their experience in taking education at SMAN X, especially saving students from oppression in the form of
bullying practices. These results are in accordance with Sentse et al. (2014) study, who observed at how the popularity factor or likeability of a student can create positive interactions, including saving them from the practice of bullying by their friends. The popularity of these students was obtained from academic and non-academic skills they showed to facilitate interaction with their friends (Anne-Bird 2016).

In addition to providing benefits for students to avoid the practice of bullying, ironically social capital is also one factor that causes students to become victims of bullying. Based on the test results, students with weak social networking are potentially more prone of becoming victims of bullying compared to students who have strong social networks. These results are in accordance with previous studies which saw that weak social networks make students more vulnerable to become victims of bullying (Huitsing & Venstra 2012; Smokowski et al. 2013; Sentse et al. 2014). In the context of the study at SMAN X, students who are not actively involved in organizational activities, have little interaction with teachers or other students tend to be more likely to be bullied by their friends. This happens because the students do not have gangsable to defend or protect themselves from acts of bullying carried out by other students. This is surely different from students who have many friends and are known by many other students or teachers; they are usually more confident because they have groups that are able to defend themselves from acts of bullying. In addition, the image of popular students is usually more respected by other students, so that students are more protected from bullying carried out by their friends. Students who are known to be anti-social are very vulnerable to being victims of bullying. This of course can be seen as one of the openings targeted by perpetrators of bullying, in which the perpetrators tend to become bolder in bullying students who are anti-social, as they are viewed to have a small number of social networks.

Students who are known to be anti-social or have little friendship networks are actually related to the ability of these students to participate in the associations that exist among students in the school. This study suggests that the ability of students to follow shared norms is also very important for them to avoid the practice of bullying. Based on the results of statistical tests, students who are unable to follow the shared norms are more likely to become victims of bullying. These results are in accordance with the study of Kowalski (2007) who saw that students who were often bullied were those who were unable to follow the shared
norms of other students, so they experience rejection from their peer group.

These non-formal norms are usually created inadvertently based on the network that is built in friendships between students. These rules are usually created because of some similarities in certain things within the group. These values such as the value of solidarity or the principle of ‘always together in good and bad’, similarities in hobbies, similarities in perspective on things and the ability to follow the ‘current’ trend among students. The scores of these indicators are related to the level of bullying victimization of students, showing that the higher the score on this indicator, the lower the students’ potential to be bullied. Therefore, in the case of bullying at SMAN X, students who are bullied are students who are considered not concerned with shared interests, have different viewpoints compared to the majority, and are unable to follow the ‘current’ trend or are considered ‘outdated’. If students do not want to become victims of bullying, then the student must follow the rules created in the network of friends at school.

This indicates that there is a dark side to social capital, where the imbalance of social capital turns out to be able to create marginalization of individuals from their social environment, especially for students who lack it. Putnam (2000) noticed that people who have little social capital are isolated individuals in the context of societal life. This shows that it turns out that social exclusion is not only caused by class inequality, but also because of the imbalance of social capital. The findings of the negative side of social capital in this study also become a new critical perspective in looking at the theory of social capital itself. This is certainly different from previous classical thinkers who saw that social capital is almost always associated with positive features, one of which is to facilitate individuals in obtaining various benefits. Field (2003) states that social networks can also be attributes that cause inequality and disadvantages for individuals who do not have or have only a few of them.

CONCLUSION

Bullying practices always occur because of the imbalance of power relations between the perpetrator and the victim. The imbalance of power relations is related to the capital owned by students. It is undeniable that currently social capital related to relationships and
friendships between students is the dominant factor that overcomes economic capital. The strength of social networks can be a savior for students to avoid acts of bullying, and whether the students come from the lower or upper social classes, both need social capital. Ironically, besides being able to save students from the practice of bullying, social capital is also one of the factors that cause students to be bullied by their friends. This indicates that there is a dark side to social capital, which is also a criticism of classical social capital thinkers who always associate it with positive features. Field (2003) sees that there is an imbalance of social capital creating marginalization of individuals from the surrounding social groups.

This article provides the following concrete steps to reduce the number of bullying cases. Students who have low social networks and are unable to follow shared norms are subjects that need special attention. There needs to be non-formal activities involving all students, which in this case can be initiated by the Student Council (organisasi siswa intrasekolah/OSIS), such as classmeeting events or events that aim to strengthen social relations between students. This is important, as when students know each other closely, they will feel reluctant to bully other students because they have emotional closeness. The second stakeholder is parents, in which case parents can provide an understanding of shared norms that apply universally among students. So that through parenting at home, they can train students to be able to follow the universal norms that apply in school. In this case, if students have been able to follow shared norms, the potential for becoming victims of bullying will be smaller. Finally, the school counseling department is an important stakeholder in providing psychological protection and assistance for students who are known to be ‘anti-social’ so they are not bullied by their friends. Counseling teachers can also provide guidance accompanied by sanctions for bullies. This can be the last step if non-coercive measures cannot succeed.
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