

Bullying Type in Gender Perspective in Senior High School Students, South Sulawesi Province, Indonesia

Syahrudin Mahmud, Zainudin Bin Abu Bakar, Hadijah Binti Djaffri

Faculty of Education, University of Teknologi Malaysia, Skudai- Johor, Malaysia.

E-mail : udin.yes@gmail.com E-mail : p-zain@hotmail.co.uk Email: hadijahjaffri@utm.my

Abstract

This paper aims to identify the bullying type in South Sulawesi, Indonesia from gender perspective by using quantitative study. Quantitative data were obtained by using a set of questionnaires from 545 respondents in six districts in South Sulawesi. The result showed that bullying types such physical bullying, verbal bullying, social bullying and cyber bullying are significantly difference in terms of gender in South Sulawesi, Indonesia. Separately, the whole bullying type such as physical, verbal, social and cyber are also significantly different between male and female. The male students are more involved in bullying compared with female students. This finding hopefully can provide useful information for those who involved in bullying prevention program, school administrative staff and teacher.

Keyword: Bullying, Bullying type, Gender

1. Introduction

Bullying is worldwide problem that having deleterious effect on students for general school and for the right students to study in the safe and conducive school. In the past three decades, bullying at school has gained increased attention in the United State due to focused media where bullying as the result of the crime (Dake et al., 2004). In addition, it has become as a major problem among learners, parents, educators, and researchers where the issue of bullying has urbanized a significant amount of research in excess of the past fifteenth years (Craig, Henderson & Murphy, 2000).

In some respect, bullying lead to serious ongoing problems for bullied and victims. Involvement in bullying has been correlated directly as human and social capital as effect of bullying on mental, physical and academic (Anderson, 2007). Correspondingly, Olweus (1993) identified bullying victim will suffer depression, feel lonely, feel anxious and think of suicide. Not surprisingly, Moon, Hwang and Mc Cluskey (2008) posited other studies regarding bullying at school and its impact are widely carried out in many countries such as (China, Austria, Canada, Finland, Italy, Japan, South Korea and United State) and this study consistently show that school bullying is global phenomena and has detrimental impact on students. According to Blazer (2005), bullying is holistic problem in the school and community and has deleterious effect on the school climate and students right, in the secure and safe environment. Further, Blazer (2005) said that bullying behavior influences academic achievement, mental and physical both the bully and the victims.

From such many bullying cases and effect above, it is therefore the evident that bullying has been an interest topic to research from many countries in the world. The researchers have looked the existence of bullying in the school from the different angle and perspective. Rana (2006) confirmed that the variety research

of bullying aspect has become a crucial theme in the field of educational psychology and become interesting topic to investigate.

2. Bullying Type

The body of literature in bullying field indicates that bullying is usually divided into two types. For example, Olweus (1993) and Smith et al. (2005) distinguished bullying into two which are direct and indirect. According to them direct bullying is an attack done openly against the victims. On the other hand indirect bullying is usually done in the form of socially isolating and intentionally excluding the victim from a group. Similarly, Hallford et al., (2006) argued that bullying could consist of direct behaviours such as teasing, taunting, threatening, hitting, stealing and other physical behavior and indirect ones usually called relational bullying such as causing victims socially excluded or spreading rumors.

A variety of study of bullying, however, show arguments that bullying can assume both direct and indirect bullying forms (Lee, 2004; Boulton et al, 2002). Furthermore, direct forms of bullying can be normally open attack to the target (Boulton et al. 2002) that is conducted by face to face (Lee, 2004). Meanwhile, (Boulton et al. 2002) again commented that indirect bullying is less direct and include bullying such as separate and exclude from the group. Another researchers, (Berger, 2007 & Lee, 2004) formulated bullying can be classified in many ways but it is normally manifested in physical bullying, verbal bullying and social relational bullying.

Physical bullying can be categorized as hitting, kicking, beating, etc. This type of bullying can be fatal to students as Berger (2007) has yielded that a tragic bullying case in Chicago where a boy commit suicide after another student spoil chocolate milk and mess his sweatshirt. Additionally, a research conducted by Coloroso (2003) ascertained that the most detectable type of bullying is physical bullying.

Verbal bullying, which is categorized as a direct bullying as showing low respect to someone or calling names towards a victim, has been acknowledged to be more occur in the school playground compared with physical bullying but it is difficult to identify its' existence (Elizabeth Jean Zacher, 2009). In addition, a study showed that verbal bullying was reported double as often as physical bullying (Berger, 2007). Lee (2004) and Coloroso (2003) also looked at the issue from a slightly different angel by investigating the bullying types from gender perspective. Verbal bullying is classified as one of the highest percentages which are around seventy percent used by male and female which have immediate effect. Meanwhile, word bullying are powerful equipment that may reduce the spirit of the victim, those who receiving verbal bullying (Coloroso, 2003).

Relational bullying or also named social bullying is defined as a form of bullying that intends to quit interrelationship (Crick, et al., 2001). According to research conducted by Crick, Casas, and Nelson, 2002; Lee, 2004, relational bullying behavior are committed by the bully to reject, alienated victim or socially exclude from the society. Similar to another two types of bullying behaviors, social bullying can be grouped into direct and indirect as well. Social bullying is difficult to detect from outside because this type of bullying is not identifiable as the first two types of bullying (Physical and Verbal). Since the result is not observable, but the bullied are still experience the pain (Anderson, 2007). It is clearly categorized as harm that occurs through exploitation of connection (Young, et al, 2006). Social bullying has recently received increased attention in the literature. This type of indirect bullying emphasis on social manipulation and includes gossiping, spreading rumors (Young, et al.), exclusion, alliance building, and ignoring (Nixon, 2005). Further Nixon concluded that normally female commit relational bullying within their friends whereas males commit social bullying outside

their group of friends. Female normally engages in more relational bullying than male because they are more likely to apply this form of bullying over physical aggression.

Despite the variation of the type of bullying, the most researchers agree that bullying cover the following five characteristics: (1) the bully means to fear the victim, (2) The aggression occurs repeatedly towards the victim (3) bullying occurs in social groups (4) the bully is stronger than the victims such as social and financial (5) the bullying victim does not inflame bullying actions using verbal and physical bullying (Bonds and Stoker, 2000).

The progress in technology of information such as the use of internet and mobile phone has created a new way of bullying others which is called cyber bullying (Blair, 2003). Cyber bullying is an electronic type of bullying that many researchers have emphasized as a bullying type that has already become important in recent times because of advances in technology and massive changes in the ways people communicate. According to Berger (2007), cyber bullying may occur on websites and social networking online, over email, and by using text message over cell phones and can damage as other types of bullying.

Kowalski et al.(2005) in Bauman (2008) reported in their research on cyber bullying that 25% of female in middle school and 11% of male had been cyber bullied within the past 2 months, 63% of whom were bullied by a schoolmate. In similar vein, a research conducted by (Patchin & Hinduja, 2006) acknowledged that cyber bullying victims claimed to be influenced by the online behaviors at school and also at home, or with friends. This is due to the mobility of the tools used to commit cyber bullying.

According to Dehue, Bolman, & Vollink (2008), who carried out a research in middle school aged children, cyber bullying was mostly an unidentified action that takes place in the home but it has massive effects at school. For instance, Berger (2007) put pertinent case in Canada where a teenager digital photo was sent via cell phone to the whole of her school. In cases where pictures and messages are posted on websites the impact goes far beyond a single school, getting sometimes unlimited to country border. Similarly, Aftab (2004) defined cyber bullying as bullying type which has developed rapidly due to the advance of technology which allows the aggressor to bully other from safe distance.

It is similar to social, physical and verbal bullying, bullies utilize messages, pictures, and website to broaden rumors, abuse, secrets, or threats to harm or socially exclude their victims (Raskauskas, 2010). In fact, it is approximately 20 to 40% of youth have been victimized by cyber bullying at least once in their lives according to recent studies (Patchin & Hinduja, 2006).

3. Effects of Bullying

It is widely accepted that as negative and anti-social behavior bullying has great impacts either on bullies and victims, school and community. This part will cover the possible effect of bullying on those parties based on the current literature in bullying.

Research indicated that bullying has negative effects not only on the victims but also the bullies themselves. In general, the negative effects of bullying, as literatures reveal, falls into physical, psychological, social skill, and criminal problems. For example, Nansel et al. (2001) found that the victims of bullying experience negative physical symptoms and psychological negative symptoms such as: anxiety, loneliness,

physical and mental disorders, and low level of self esteem. In addition, study by Jansen et al. (2004) revealed that bullying victims might experience psychological disorder such as: anxiety, depression, or phobia, social skill disorder such as family dysfunction and physical problem such as obesity. Moreover, study by Roberts and Morotti, (2000) revealed that in addition to psychological and physical effects bullying might also impede student academic achievement both bullies and the victims.

Like the victimized children the bullies experience negative impact of bullying as well. Study by Roberts and Morotti (2000) revealed that bully will be more likely to be involved in alcohol consumption. Study by Farrington (1993) even showed more deleterious effect of bullying peers which are "a greater likelihood of engaging in criminal behavior, domestic violence, and substance abuse as adult". The criminal effect of bullying on bullies is also reported by Slee (1995).

However care must be taken in dealing with the fact that sometimes victims and bullies take turn in becoming victims and bullies. In other words, sometimes a child may become a victim of bullying, in other opportunity he or she becomes a bully by perpetrating the bullying acts. Similarly, a bully is sometime will be in the position of being bullied. However this fact obviously shows that bullying inflicts harmful effects on bullies and victims.

In school level, bullying poses a great danger as well. Unfortunately study focused on negative effect of bullying on school is very few. This results in the limited references that can be used to explore how bullying impacts on school community. However there are some studies, among the very few, that can be used as references. For example, research by Hawker and Boulton in 2000 revealed that in the long term bullying can cause school problems such as truancy and school dropping out. Berthold and Hoover (2000) argued that playing truancy and dropping out from school is the result of fearing the school. In addition, survey conducted by National Institute of Child Health and Human Development in USA (Nansel et. al, 2001) showed that bullying may hamper good relationship among classmates. At more alarming level, pervasive bullying behavior at school can trigger a school wide fear of being the next victim which leads to the reduction of feeling of safety among the students (Cooper & Snell, 2003).

Research singling out on negative effects of bullying on wider community, like those conducted on school community, are rare. Therefore it is quite difficult to find enough references on the negative effects of bullying on wider community. However, findings in some studies, mostly about the criminal effect of bullying behaviors, shed light on this issue. For example, Craig and Pepler (2007) argued that when entering their adulthood phase, bullies will be more likely to be involved in substance use, domestic violence and other domestic crime. In addition, Smith et al., (2005) found that the most frightening effect of bullying is the likelihood of violence and delinquency such as being aggressive toward boyfriends or girlfriends which is a community crime. Some studies reported that bullying problem may lead to social problems such as: fighting (Nansel et al., (2001), vandalism, stealing and weapon carrying (Baldry & Farrington, 2000) and getting into trouble with police (Rigby & Cox, 1996). In another study, sexual and workplace and harassment are also reported as the results of bullying behaviors (Craig & Pepler, 2007).

If analyzed deeply, bullying effects either on individuals, school, and community, are intertwined. For example, schoolchildren who are aggressive in nature will be more likely to frighten his/her schoolmates at school which will lead to their classmates' feeling unsafe in studying. In community setting those violent children will cause trouble by conducting crime. Likewise, in the community where the bullying behaviors

prevail, other children will see more aggressive and violent behavior. This will probably turn their behavior to be aggressive and violent which will then be new spawn of bullies.

4. Bullying and Gender

Many studies have showed the difference between boys and girls in bullying both as bully and bullied. Olweus (1993) stated that in general male are more aggressive than female especially in primary education time. Similarly, Tapper and Boulton (2004) stated male are more caught up in bullying situation. Further, in the case of bully aggressor, it is identified boys also are 2 to 3 times found compared with girls (Espelage, Mebane, Adams, 2004). Consistent with previous studies, a massive study conducted in forty countries by Craig et al., (2009) found similar finding that male is recorded higher rates bullying in all countries. Further, they stated that male involved in whole type of bullying than female and this result is consistent for the whole forty countries.

The study on the occurrence of bullying type is also linked to question regarding gender and age. The result showed that generally more male student noted than female to bully other children.

In contrast, Craig and Pepler (1997) claimed that there is no difference in gender in type of bullying and students in primary and secondary school students had equal chance to involve in bullying. However, most of the studies of bullying regarding with gender including current research are identified that all bullying type are significantly difference with male and female.

5. Sample and Methodology

The sample of the research are 545 senior high school students from six district in South Sulawesi called Pangkep, Maros, Gowa, Luwu, Tator and Palopo. The six district is sampled purposively due to these six district relatively higher bullying cases in South Sulawesi. This study was employed quantitatively by using questionnaires to investigate the demographic and bullying situation in South Sulawesi. Rasch model was utilized to find out the validity and reliability of the questionnaires.

6. Finding

To identify the probability of a significant difference between bullying type, such as physical bullying, social bullying, verbal bullying, cyber bullying and gender.

As indicated in the Levene's test results that the F value is 8.131 and the probability value is .005. This is smaller than alpha 0.05. This finding indicates that the two groups are not homogeny. Meanwhile, the result of t-test for physical bullying type is 2.858 and the probability value is .004. This is smaller than alpha 0.05. This concludes that there is a difference between physical bullying and gender. Similar to the verbal bullying type, t-test results a value of 4.561, with probability value .000, which is smaller than alpha 0.05. This shows that there is a difference between verbal bullying and gender. For social bullying type, t-test produces a value of 4.022, with probability value .000, which is also smaller than alpha 0.05. This also implies that there is a significant difference between social bullying types and gender. The cyber bullying type indicates that t-test results a value of 3.682, with probability value .000, smaller than alpha 0.05. This concludes that there is a significant difference between cyber bullying and gender.

The statistic data indicates that for bullying type, t-test produces a value of 5.847, with probability value of .000, smaller than alpha 0.05. This concludes that there is a significant difference between bullying type and gender. Thus, the hypothesis which proposes that there is no significant difference between bullying type and gender can be accepted and is valid. The table below indicates the statistical result.

Tabel Significant difference between physical, verbal, social and cyber with gender

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Physical	Variance assumed	8.131	.005	2.733	543	.006	1.93979	.70972	.54565	3.33392
	variance not assumed			2.858	404.84	.004	1.93979	.67882	.60534	3.27423
Verbal	Variance assumed	7.966	.005	4.196	543	.000	1.07616	.25650	.57231	1.58002
	variance not assumed			4.561	448.287	.000	1.07616	.23593	.61250	1.53983
Social	Variance assumed	6.915	.009	3.793	543	.000	2.60377	.68642	1.25541	3.95214
	variance not assumed			4.022	420.208	.000	2.60377	.64738	1.33127	3.87628
Cyber	Equal variance	22.020	.000	3.975	543	.000	1.59095	.40026	.80471	2.37719
	Not Equal variance			3.682	295.988	.000	1.59095	.43211	.74054	2.44135
Bullying_Type	Variance assumed	22.528	.000	5.369	543	.000	7.21067	1.34290	4.57275	9.84859
	variance not assumed			5.847	449.999	.000	7.21067	1.23331	4.78691	9.63444

7. Discussion

The finding indicates that for bullying type, the resulted t-test is 5.847 with probability value .000 which is smaller than alpha 0.05. This concludes that there is a significant difference between bullying type and gender. This finding shows that bullying type in South Sulawesi, Indonesia has a significant difference in aspect of

gender. The hypothesis suggesting that there is a significant difference between bullying type and gender is validated and accepted.

The gender aspect is also observed in this study. The evidence presented in this research is relevant to other studies in the same area. A study in respondents with three groups of ages (11 years old, 13 years old and 15 years old) which is conducted by Craig and Harel (2004) informs that from the perspective of gender, generally it is identified that more males commit bullying than females. Furthermore, they mention that bullying in the majority of the observed countries and regions show that there are gender differences in bullying. They find that the number of female students who commit bullying is far lower than male students.

Paetsch and Bertrand (1997) state that research on bullying type and gender was started by many scholars since the 1990s. In general, direct bullying is much more frequently conducted by male than female students (Haynie et al., 2001). Whereas, the female students more frequently commit social bullying, for instance excluding someone from their group and intentionally ignoring the victims (Olweus 1993).

Similarly, Covington (2014) finds that type of bullying, such as social bullying, which is conducted by female is less harmful than physical bullying which is conducted by male students. Furthermore, Covington states that male students prefer to commit face to face bullying to show their physical power, while female students tend to play a role of being director who manage the bullying process. Another strong evidence is also provided by an exploratory study on gender difference in bullying behavior conducted by Silva et al., (2013). They argue that both male and females can be the victims of bullying and there is a significant difference on gender relating to the students' involvement in bullying and their roles in bullying types. Additionally, a research performed by Wang et al., (2009) indicates that bullying type that students experiencing in the school can be varied dependent on gender.

8. Conclusion

In this study, bullying exists in several types such as physical, verbal, social and cyber in South Sulawesi context. Additionally, bullying is also significantly different in gender. It is identified that boys are more engaged in all types of bullying such as physical, verbal, social and cyber bullying.

To conclude, this study is one of the first studies that give overarching explanation with a number of samples which linked with gender perspective in Indonesia. Particularly, it concerns with gender demography in order to get comprehensive analysis. This study hopefully makes significant contribution towards the effort to minimize the number of bullying cases in South Sulawesi, Indonesia.

Reference

- Aftab, P. (2004). Stop cyber bullying. Retrieved November 10, 2012, from <http://www.stopcyberbullying.org>
- Anderson, G. (2007). The impact of bullying in school on the adolescents' sense of self. University of Pretoria
- Baldry, A. C., & Farrington, D.P. (2005). Protective factors as moderators of risk factors in adolescence bullying. *Social Psychology of Education*, 8, 263-284.
- Bauman, S. (2008). The role of elementary school counselors in reducing school bullying. *The Elementary School Journal*, 108(5), 362–375
- Berger, K. (2007). Update on bullying at school: Science forgotten? *Developmental review*, 27(1), 90–126.

- Berthold, K. A., & Hoover, J. H. (2000). Correlates of Bullying and Victimization among Intermediate Students in the Midwestern USA. *School Psychology International*, 21(1), 65–78.
doi:10.1177/0143034300211005
- Blair, J. (2003). New breed of bullies torment their peers on the Internet. *Education Week*, 22(21). Retrieved from <http://global.factiva.com.web.lib.lib.umt.edu:2048/ha/default.aspx>.
- Blazer, C. (2005). Literary review on bullying research services. Miami, Florida. Retrieved from <http://drs.dadeschools.net/Reports/Bullying.pdf>
- Bonds, M., & Stoker, S. (2000). *Bully proofing your school. A comprehensive approach for middle schools*. Colorado: Soprist West.
- Boulton, M. J., Trueman, M., & Flemington, I. (2002). Associations between secondary school pupils' definitions of bullying, attitudes towards bullying, and tendencies to engage in bullying: Age and sex differences. *Educational Studies*, 28(4), 353–370.
- Coloroso, B. (2003). *The bully, the bullied, and the bystander*. New York: Harper Collins Publisher.
- Cooper, D., & Snell, J. L. (2003). Bullying - not just a kid thing. *Educational Leadership*, 60, 22-25.
- Covington M. 2014. Brutal Boys vs. Mean Girls. Exploring gender differences in bullying trends.
<http://www.justsayyes.org/bullying/brutal-boys-vs-mean-girls/>
- Craig, Wendy M., & Pepler, Debra J. (2007). Understanding bullying: from research to practice. *Canadian Psychology*, 48(2). 86-94.
- Craig WM, Harel Y. (2004). Bullying, physical fighting and victimization. In: Currie C, Roberts C, Morgan A, Smith R, Settertobulte W, Samdal O, Rasmussen V Barnekow, editors. *Young People's Health in Context: International report from the HBSC 2001/02 survey*. WHO Policy Series: Health policy for children and adolescents Issue 4, WHO Regional Office for Europe; Copenhagen: pp. 133–44.
- Craig, W Yossi Harel-Fisch, Haya Fogel-Grinvald, Suzanne Dostaler, Jorn Hetland, Bruce Simons-Morton, Molcho, M, Margarida Gaspar de Mato, Overpeck, M, Pernille Due, Pickett, W.(2009). A cross-national profile of bullying and victimization among adolescents in 40 countries. *International Journal Public Health* 54.S216–S224 1661-8556/09/020S216-9DOI 10.1007/s00038-009-5413-9
- Crick, N, Casas, J., & Nelson, D. (2002). Toward a more comprehensive understanding of peer maltreatment: studies of relational victimization. *Current Directions in Psychological Sciences*, 11, 98–101.
- Crick, N., Nelson, D. ., Morales, J., Cullertonsen, C., Casas, J., & Hickman, S. (2001). *Relational victimization in Childhood and adolescence*. In J. Juvonen & S. Graham (Eds.) *School-based peer harassment; The Plight of vulnerable and victimized* (pp.196–214). New York
- Dake, Joseph A., Price, James H, Telljohann, Susan K., & Funk, Jeanne B. (2003). Teacher perceptions and practices regarding school bullying prevention. *The Journal of School Health*, 73(9). 347-355.
- Dehue, F., Bolman, C., & Vollink, T. (2008). Cyber bullying: Youngsters' experiences and parental perception. *Cyber Psychology & Behavior*, 11(2), 217–223.
- Elizabet, Jean Zacher. (2009). *School Counselor Perspective on Bullying Behavior In Urban Middle School Setting*. Northampton, Massachusetts.
- Espelage, D., Mebane, S., Adams, R. (2004). Empathy, Caring and Bullying; Toward an understanding of complex associations. In D Spelage, & M Swarer (Eds). *Bullying in American school; a social ecological perspective on prevention and intervention*. Mahwah NJ. Erlbaum
- Farrington, D. (2005). Childhood origins of Antisocial Behavior. *Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy*, 12, 177-190.
- Hallford, A., Borntrager, C., & Davis, Joanne L. (2006). Evaluation of a bullying prevention program. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 21(1). 91-101.
- Haynie, D., Nansel, T., Eitel, P., Crump, A., Saylor, K., & Yu, K. (2001). Bullies, victims, and bully/victims: Distinct groups of at-risk youth. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 21(1), 29–49.

- Hawker, D. S. & Boulton, M. J. (2000). Twenty years research on peer victimization and psychosocial maladjustment: A meta-analytic review of cross-sectional studies. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 41, 441–455.
- Janssen, I., Craig, W., Boyce, W., Pickett, W. (2004). Association between overweight and obesity with bullying behavior in school aged children. *Pediatric*. 115 (3), 1187-1196.
- Lee, C. (2004). *Preventing bullying in schools a guide for teachers and other professionals*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Moon, B., Hwang, H.-W., & Mc Cluskey, J. D. (2008). Causes of School Bullying: Empirical Test of a General Theory of Crime, Differential Association Theory, and General Strain Theory. *Crime & Delinquency*, 57(6), 849–877. doi:10.1177/0011128708315740
- Nansel, T., Overpeck, M., Pilla, R., Ruan, W., Simons-Morton, B., & Scheidt, P. (2001). Bullying behaviors among US youth: Prevalence and association with psychosocial adjustment. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 285, 2094–2100. doi:10.1001/jama.285.16.2094
- Nixon, C. (2005). Peering into the world of covert aggression: Relational aggression. Paper presented at National Bullying Prevention Conference. Atlanta, Georgia.
- Olweus, Dan. (1993). *Bullying at School: What We Know and What We Can Do. Understanding Children Worlds* (p. xii, 140 p.) Blackwell. Retrieved from <http://www.amazon.co.uk/dp/0631192417>
- Paetsch, J. J., & Bertrand, L. D. (1997). The relationship between peer, social, and school factors, and delinquency among youth. *Journal of School Health*, 67, 27-32.
- Patchin, J. ., & Hinduja, S. (2006). Bullies move beyond the schoolyard: A preliminary look at cyber bullying. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 4, 148–169. doi:10.1177/1541204006286288
- Rana, N. (2006). The experience of being victims of school bullying: A phenomenological study. Doctoral Thesis. Kathmandu.
- Raskauskas, J. (2010). Text-bullying: Associations with traditional bullying and depression among New Zealand adolescents. *Journal of School Violence*, 9, 74–97. doi:10.1080/15388220903185605
- Rigby, K., and Cox, I. K. (1996). The contributions of bullying and low self-esteem to acts of delinquency among Australian teenagers. *Personality and Individual Differences* 21, 4, pp 609-612.
- Roberts, W., Moroty. (2000). The bully as victim. *Professional School Counseling*, 4, 148–156.
- Scheithauer H. 2003. “Aggressives Verhalten von Jungen und Mädchen. [Aggressive behavior of Boys and Girls].” Göttingen: Hogrefe.
- Silva MAI, Pereira B, Mendonça D, Nunes B and Abadio de Oliveira, W. (2013). The Involvement of Girls and Boys with Bullying: An Analysis of Gender Differences. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, 10, 6820-683 www.mdpi.com/journal/ijerph
- Slee, Phillip (2006). *The P.E.A.C.E. pack: A whole-school program for reducing school bullying*. In McGrath, H., & Noble, T. (Eds.). *Bullying solutions: Evidence-based*
- Smith, J. D., Cousins, J. B., & Stewart, R. (2005). Anti bullying Interventions in Schools: Ingredients of Effective Programs. *Canadian Journal of education*, 28(4), 739–762.
- Tapper, J. & Boulton, M. (2004). Sex differences in levels of physical, verbal and indirect aggression amongst primary school children and their association with belief about aggression. *Aggressive Behaviour*. 30, 123-145.
- Wang, J., Iannotti, R. , & Nansel, T. (2009). School bullying among adolescents in the United States: Physical, verbal, relational, and cyber. *Journal of Adolescence Health*, 45. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2009.03.021
- Young, E., Boye, A., & Nelson, D. (2006). Relational aggression: Understanding, identifying, and responding in schools. *Psychology in the Schools*, 43(3), 297–312.