Integrating multi-disciplinary social science theories and perspectives to understand school bullying and victimisation

Jun Sung Hong, Dorothy L. Espelage,
Simon C. Hunter and Paula Allen-Meares

School bullying is a serious social problem, which has received widespread public, media, and research attention over the years. The first study of bullying was published in 1969 by a school physician named P. P. Heinemann (Olweus, 1999), which was subsequently followed by extensive empirical inquiry since the 1970s in Scandinavia led by Dan Olweus (Vaillancourt *et al.*, 2008). In subsequent decades, social scientists have developed a rich theoretical and empirical body of knowledge with regards to children and adolescents' experiences in bullying. Scholars conceptualise bullying as a sub-category of aggression (Smith *et al.*, 2002), characterised as being purposeful, including an imbalance of power, and being repetitive (Hunter, Boyle & Warden, 2007; Smith, 2014).

Bullying has for the most part been explored from a psychological perspective, providing insights into proximal risk factors, such as individual traits and behaviours. However, bullying is a complex, multifaceted problem, and consideration of theoretical frameworks from within and outside of psychology is necessary to fully explain why certain individuals (or groups of individuals) are involved in bullying. Scholars have therefore come to realise the importance of integrating psychological theories with social environmental perspectives (sociological, anthropological, political-economic; Lawson & King, 2012). This has the potential to broaden perspectives on the etiology and outcomes of bullying, introduce innovative methodologies, and raise important questions about new approaches to prevention and intervention (Holt *et al.*, 2017).

This chapter will provide an overview of multiple social science theories and perspectives in explaining bullying. It is divided into theories and perspectives represented by four major branches of social science: psychology, sociology, anthropology, and political-economics.

Psychological perspectives

Psychology, as a discipline, largely attributes the etiology of violence and aggression to individual pathology or family dysfunction (King, 2012). In addition, some psychologists attempt to explain how mental processes might impact an individual's propensity for violent behaviour (Kumpulainen, 2008). Others are interested in how individual traits might interact with the

social environment to produce violent behaviour (Espelage, Holt & Henkel, 2003). Theories and frameworks that underpin psychological perspectives are attachment theory, social learning theory, social-ecological framework, and theory of stress and coping.

Attachment theory

Attachment theory is a widely accepted developmental theory that explains the nature of an affectual bond between child and primary caregiver (Bowlby, 1958). More specifically, attachment theory provides a framework for understanding the influence of socio-emotional relationships on an individual child's cognitive-affective structures for constructing views of the self, world, and others (Kennedy & Kennedy, 2004). A child's attachment behaviours include seeking contact with the primary caregivers, which initially develops over the course of the first 18 months. Early attachment patterns in the home have been shown to influence a child's future behaviour (Thompson, 2000), and attachment theory provides an important link between relations with parents and peers (Bowlby, 1988). Direct (e.g., Kokkinos, 2007; Walden & Beran, 2010) and indirect (Eliot & Cornell, 2009) association between lower quality parent–child attachment and bullying and victimisation have been found in a number of study findings. Moreover, a positive association between insecure attachment with caregivers and bullying and victimisation has also been reported (Eliot & Cornell, 2009; Monks, Smith & Swettenham, 2005; Walden & Beran, 2010). Monks and colleagues' (2005) findings revealed that bullies appeared to have insecure attachments with their mothers, while victims tended to have a secure attachment. Walden and Beran (2010) also found that youth with a high-quality attachment with their caregivers were unlikely to bully others and be victimised by their peers.

Social learning theory

One possible explanation for the development of bullying comes from social learning theory, which suggests that "most human behaviour is learned observationally through modeling: from observing others, one forms an idea of how new behaviours are performed, and on later occasions this coded information serves as a guide for action" (Bandura, 1977, p. 22). In relation to bullying, youth who are exposed to violent behaviours within their family and/or peer contexts may learn and accept such behaviour as an appropriate method of dealing with conflict or reaching a desired goal (Akers, 2011). To date, studies have consistently found that exposure to aggressive behaviour in a child's social context is significantly related to bullying (Knous-Westfall, Ehrensaft, MacDonell & Cohen, 2012).

Social-ecological framework

The social-ecological model of human development focuses on understanding how individual characteristics of children interact with environmental contexts or systems to promote or prevent bullying (Bronfenbrenner, 1977). An ecological explanation of bullying suggests that youth become involved in bullying as perpetrators, victims, perpetrator-victims, or bystanders as a result of complex interactions between their own individual characteristics and their families, schools, peers, and society. Characteristics, such as age, sex, and race/ethnicity are frequently examined predictors of bullying. Individual characteristics that appear to place children at risk for bullying include sex (Espelage et al., 2013), race/ethnicity (Juvonen, Nishina & Graham, 2001), health status (e.g., overweight, disability, depression; Cook et al., 2010), and sexual orientation (Espelage, Aragon, Birkett & Koenig, 2008). Within the family context, bullies tend

to have parents who do not supervise them closely or do not provide adequate social supports (Lereya, Samara & Wolke, 2013). In some families, parents may encourage the use of violence to resolve conflicts and some bullies report exposure to family violence (Espelage, Low *et al.*, 2013). Further, victims often come from families with histories of abuse or inconsistent parenting (Lereya *et al.*, 2013). In contrast, when youth have warm relations with parents, they are less likely to be at risk of being victimised (Bowes *et al.*, 2010).

In terms of peer context, bullying rarely takes place in isolated dyadic interactions, but instead often occurs within peer groups (Salmivalli, 2010). Bullies socialise their friends to engage in similar behaviour (Espelage, Holt & Henkel, 2003). In a meta-analysis, Cook and colleagues (2010) found that youth in middle school who bullied others had greater social status, whereas younger children who bullied were socially rejected. Further, students may perpetuate bullying by actively joining in or passively accepting the bullying behaviours. Alternatively, students can intervene to stop bullying or defend the victim (Espelage, Green & Polanin, 2012).

Regarding school context, youth spend many hours a day in school and schools can be protective spaces or they can promote bullying. Put simply, students' perceptions of their school environment as positive and supportive, or negative and unsupportive shape their behaviours. School environment is a broad term that encompasses multiple features of school climate or "culture" (Gottfredson, Gottfredson, Payne & Gottfredson, 2005). School climate reflects norms, goals, values, interpersonal relations, teaching, learning, leadership practices, and organisational structures (National School Climate Council, 2007). In a study of 40 countries, Harel-Fisch and colleagues (2011) found that as negative school perceptions reported by students increased, so did their involvement in bullying.

Theory of stress and coping

Transactional theories of stress and coping focus on explaining the variation in individual outcomes when individuals appear to experience very similar stressors. The focus is on appraisals (how a situation is interpreted) and coping behaviours (the strategies used to deal with the situation) (Lazarus, 1999; Raskauskas & Huynh, 2015). Key appraisals that have attracted empirical interest have been control, threat, and perceived social support. Greater perceived control over episodes of bullying appears to be associated with lower levels of adjustment reported by bullied children and may mediate the effect of victimisation upon adjustment (Catterson & Hunter, 2010; Hunter *et al.*, 2010; Hunter, Mora-Merchán & Ortega, 2004). Appraisals of threat are positively associated with victims' psychosocial maladjustment and may also mediate the effect of non-discriminatory bullying on adjustment (Catterson & Hunter, 2010; Hunter *et al.*, 2004, 2010). Finally, perceived social support has been shown to moderate the relationship between bullying and suicidal ideation in adolescence (Bonanno & Hymel, 2010). This may not be the case when examining symptoms of depression and anxiety (Cheng, Cheung & Cheung, 2008; Pouwelse, Bolman, Lodewijkx & Spaa, 2011) where instead perceived social support may act as a mediator (Chen & Wei, 2013; Pouselse *et al.*, 2011). Other appraisals, such as self-efficacy and self-blame, have also been considered as moderators or mediators of the relationship between bullying and adjustment (e.g., Barchia & Bussey, 2010; Graham, Bellmore & Mize, 2006; Graham & Juvonen, 1998).

As well as having direct effects on well-being, appraisals are also considered to be proximal determinants of coping responses (Lazarus, 1999). For example, greater perceived control is associated with both assertive (e.g., standing up to bullies) and aggressive (e.g., hitting back) coping strategies, while threat is associated with aggression and avoidance (e.g., skipping school; Hunter, Boyle & Warden, 2006; Terranova, 2009).

Sociological perspectives

The unique perspective of sociology is the perception of violence as a function of social structure rather than individual pathology (Lawson, 2012). Sociologists have contributed much to our knowledge of violence, which is regarded as a product of social processes and institutions (Walby, 2012). From a sociological standpoint, bullying arises not only from microsystem level factors, but also macrosystem level factors, which are the focus of many sociological theories (Jeralds, 2011). According to Pascoe (2013), the sociology of bullying indicates that aggressive interchanges between and among adolescents function as interactional reproductions of structural inequalities that are inherent in our society. There are overarching sociological theories and perspectives on bullying and victimisation, which seek to describe bullying as a function of social structures and systems (Lawson, 2012). Sociological theories include general strain theory, social control theory, routine activity theory, and gender role socialisation theory.

General strain theory

General strain theory contends that adolescents who experience strain may feel angry or frustrated and, as a result, are at an elevated risk of criminal or deviant behaviour (Agnew, 1992). In other words, peer-victimised youth identify abusive peer relations as a strain, which is more likely to cause offending behaviours (Agnew, 2006). As a result, bullying as a source of strain has been identified in several studies (Cullen et al., 2008; Hinduja & Patchin, 2007; Wallace, Patchin & May, 2005). On the contrary, Agnew (2001) argued that bullying is also consequential because it satisfies four conditions that characterise consequential strains: (1) it is perceived as being unjust because bullying will violate basic norms of justice; (2) bullying is perceived as high in magnitude (as peer relations are critical to adolescents); (3) bullying is not linked to conventional social control because it will often occur away from adult authority; and (4) bullying exposes the strained individual (i.e., bullies) to others (Hay, Meldrum & Mann, 2010). In sum, bullying and victimisation are outcomes of pressures created by negative social relationships or negative experiences (Jang, Song & Kim, 2014), which has been supported by a large body of empirical research findings (Hay, Medrum & Mann, 2010; Patchin & Hinduja, 2011). One study found that youth who reported experiencing strain are at an elevated risk of participating in both face-to-face bullying and cyberbullying (Patchin & Hinduja, 2011).

Social control theory

Hirschi's (1969) social control theory is based on linking individuals and conventional social institutions to understand adolescents' delinquent behaviour. The premise of social control theory is that deviant and delinquent behaviours are likely to develop when an individual has weak bonds with society and social institutions (Hirschi, 1969). Additionally, bullying may emerge when an adolescent's bonds or ties to social institutions (i.e., school, family, community) are diminished, making the adolescent more susceptible to such behaviour (Pittaro, 2007). In contrast, healthy bonds with parents, teachers, and schools are hypothesised to moderate whether or not adolescents will engage in bullying. Four components of social control have been proposed to explain why some children and adolescents are not likely to engage in bullying: (1) emotional attachment to parents, peers, and conventional institutions; (2) commitment to long-term educational, occupational, or other conventional goals; (3) involvement in conventional activities (e.g., homework, hobbies); and (4) belief in social rules and laws (Hirschi, 1969). Any of these four components of social control can independently inhibit bullying; however, the combined effect of these components on bullying is greater than the sum of their individual effects

(Peguero *et al.*, 2011). Extant research supports Hirschi's (1969) proposition. Empirical findings have demonstrated that emotional attachment to primary caregivers, bonding to school and teachers, commitment to school, and involvement in conventional extracurricular activities protect students from victimisation or engagement in bullying (Cunningham, 2007; O'Brennan & Furlong, 2010; Peguero, 2008).

Routine activity theory

Routine activity theory (RAT) emerged as a key theoretical approach in the field of criminology in the late 1970s (Wikstrom, 2011). Cohen and Felson (1979) advocated for exploring social interactions in victimisation situations. Routine activity theorists propose that when an adolescent spends time away from home, opportunities for bullying and victimisation increase (Groff, 2007). Scholars have also applied RAT to examine where and with whom a victim spends his or her time (Navarro & Jasinski, 2012; Popp & Peguero, 2011). Opportunities for bullying are created by the routine activities of others in spaces, places, or locations where motivated offenders (perpetrators) frequent (Yar, 2005). RAT also includes three factors that converge prior to victimisation: (1) presence of motivated offenders (bullies), (2) attractive targets (victims), and (3) absence of capable guardians (Schreck, Wright & Miller, 2002). *Motivated offender* could be anyone who has something to gain from victimising the target, whereas *attractive targets* comprise any persons who draw the motivated offenders towards the bullying (Felson & Boba, 2010). Attractive targets are also likely those who do not fit the adolescent social norms (e.g., gender non-conformity) and have few friends (typically those of a low social status; Jeralds, 2011). A *capable guardian* is someone (e.g., teacher) or something (e.g., surveillance measure) that inhibits the motivated offender from engaging in bullying by increasing the likelihood that the perpetrator would be caught and punished (Felson & Boba, 2010).

Gender role socialisation theory

As youth move from childhood to early adolescence, bullying in the form of name-calling becomes "gendered." That is, youth report using homophobic epithets such as "that is so gay", "no homo", and "you are a fag" (Espelage, Basile & Hamburger, 2012). Further, non-gendered bullying perpetration is a longitudinal precursor to homophobic name-calling during the middle school years (Espelage, Hong *et al.*, in press). When homophobic name-calling is present in schools then youth attempt to prove their heterosexuality by either using this language or sexually harassing members of the opposite sex in reaction. Thus, gender role socialisation theory offers some explanation as to how gender norms and violations of gender norms can lead to bullying and gendered harassment (e.g., homophobic name-calling, sexual harassment). Within a social constructionist framework, masculine and feminine ideologies are the result of internalising culturally defined gender role norms and ideologies (Oransky & Fisher, 2009). These norms and expectations influence behaviours and attitudes, especially when individuals hold strongly to particular aspects of these gender role ideologies. Research has suggested that boys who adhere to traditional male norms are at an increased risk of engaging in violence and aggression (Oransky & Fisher, 2009) and have a greater acceptance of violence against women (Flood & Pease, 2009). When girls hold traditional gender roles they are more likely to be victimised in interpersonal relationships (Flood & Pease, 2009). Feminist theories view sexual harassment as "the product of a gender system maintained by a dominant, normative form of masculinity" (Uggen & Blackstone, 2004, pp. 66). In a society that holds the heterosexual male as ideal, other forms of masculinity and femininity are

113

consequently viewed as less ideal, with behaviours that maintain hegemonic masculinity being reinforced by the larger society. As a result, adolescent boys attempt to bolster their masculinity by engaging in behaviours that boost their "manhood" in an effort to gain power and status among their peer group (Wei & Chen, 2012). When youth deviate from the prescribed gender norms, then they are likely to be the target of bullying and gendered harassment. These behaviours can be aggressive and/or sexual in nature, and often are seen as normal and a part of everyday activities. For example, many girls regularly hear boys make comments about their bodies and sexuality (Klein, 2006), and these comments are often ignored or minimised, which serves to reinforce the traditional masculine ideals (Espelage et al., 2016). This is compounded by the reality that many girls will also adhere to traditional gender role ideologies, and in fact may themselves become dismissive of these sexually harassing behaviours. When girls are exposed to chronic sexual harassment, and their experiences are minimised by a lack of adult intervention, they can become desensitised and eventually internalise dismissive attitudes toward sexual harassment (Larkin, 1994).

Anthropological perspectives

Anthropology, and more specifically sociocultural anthropology, is a discipline with potential to inform research on bullying and victimisation primarily through ethnographic research design (Holt et al., 2017). Until the 1980s when the field of "anthropology of violence" emerged as a popular discourse (Accomazzo, 2012a), violence had primarily been dominated by psychological and sociological paradigms, which theorised violence as a natural inclination of human beings or a product of their social conditions or culture (Thomas, 2012). To anthropologists, however, culture is inherently more complex and nuanced than originally understood and it is essential that theories of violence reflect this (Moore, 2008). In addition, the evolutionary basis of aggression is a hotly contested topic in the field of anthropology (Accomazzo, 2012a). Frameworks that are reflective of anthropological perspectives include the evolutionary framework and the sociocultural anthropological framework.

Evolutionary framework

Physical anthropology comprises evolutionary, biological theories that are rooted in Darwinism (Accomazzo, 2012a). Early approaches to the study of violence in the field of physical anthropology tended to reflect an evolutionary view of human societies (Thomas, 2012). The fundamental idea of the evolutionary perspective is that species evolve to carry out or display certain behaviours or traits in order to survive and reproduce (Koh & Wong, 2015). From an evolutionary perspective, adolescents also have two underlying goals: growth/health/survival and finding an appropriate mate (Konner, 2010). An evolutionary perspective also views characteristics such as aggression and competition as being inherent in all humans; thus, bullying can be adaptive in gaining better sexual opportunities and physical protection (Volk, Camilleri, Dane & Marini, 2012). Bullying is also regarded as inherent in various animals (e.g., chicken, chimpanzee) and is adaptive in nature because it promotes access to physical, social, and sexual resources (Book, Volk & Hosker, 2012). Bullying fulfils the main mechanism of evolution, which is natural selection (i.e., "survival of the fittest") because youth who bully carry a reputation as aggressors and are perceived as being tough, which protects them from being targeted for aggression (Archer & Benson, 2008; Koh & Wong, 2008). Furthermore, empirical findings demonstrate that adolescents identified as bullies are physically stronger and have better mental health than victims (e.g., Juvonen, Graham & Schuster, 2003). In terms of sexual

opportunities, some research evidence indicates that bullies of both sexes appear to begin puberty earlier, start dating at a younger age, and are likely to have more opportunities for dating/mating (Connolly, Pepler, Craig & Taradash, 2000). In addition, boys who are bullies are considered to be more attractive to the opposite sex, giving them more sexual opportunities (Volk *et al.*, 2012).

Sociocultural anthropology framework

Sociocultural anthropology places emphasis on exploring the importance of *culture* through ethnography. From the 1950s to the 1970s, the study of violence was for the most part limited to "traditional" or "tribal" societies. However, sociocultural anthropologists since the 1970s have recognised that violence occurs in all societies (Whitehead, 2004). Sociocultural anthropologists have shifted from focusing exclusively on small contained communities to studying larger communities that were confronted with the effects of globalism, colonialism, and capitalism (Accomazzo, 2012a). Cross-culturally, bullying has not been a central topic in the field of sociocultural anthropology; however, it has been documented in past ethnographic works. For example, Japanese children post-Second World War showed patterns of collectively "ganging up" on another child (Benedict, 1946), a behaviour that is characterised as bullying. Numerous ethnographic studies on children and adolescents' identity and socialisation have also explored cultural context and cultural patterns underlying bullying and aggression in school (see MacDonald & Swart, 2004; Merton, 1994). In their ethnographic account of an elementary school in Gauteng, South Africa, MacDonald and Swart (2004) explored how the culture of the particular school influenced bullying. Data from the study suggest that bullying is a complex phenomenon, which is produced as a result of a struggle for status and popularity, seemingly promoting social hierarchy in the peer culture. Other ethnographic studies have also linked bullying to intolerance of differences inherent in peer and school culture (Thornberg, 2011). For instance, Goodwin (2002) observed how girls, in their interactions with another girl who made all efforts to affiliate with them, produced degradation rituals in response to behaviour they regard as socially inappropriate. The socially constructed "odd" and "deviance" ascribed to the victim is also used to justify bullying and social exclusion (Goodwin, 2002; Thornberg, 2011).

Political-economic perspectives

The political-economic perspective of bullying and victimisation is rare, although researchers have come to acknowledge the importance of understanding the characteristics and factors associated with bullying from a macro lens (Horton, 2016). Political-economy is a concept, which refers to "the management of the economic affairs of the state" (Caporaso & Levine, 1992, p. 1), and considers how political institutions or environment and the economic systems (e.g., capitalist, socialist, etc.) shape one another (Weingast & Wittman, 2008). Political economists have traditionally applied political-economy theories to help illuminate our understanding of collective violence and race riots (Accomazzo, 2012b). *Neo-classical theories of political economy* acknowledge that class conflicts resulting from capitalism and the free market engender collective violence (Caporaso & Levine, 1992). *Radical theories of political economy* also postulate that structural forces, such as poverty, discrimination, and inequality stem from capitalism (Barone, 2004), which can reinforce abuse, conflicts, and violence. In line with the radical theories of political economy, socio-economic inequality is found to be related to unequal balance of power between those with access to resources and those without (Chaux, Molano & Podlesky, 2009). Such unequal balance of power can lead to bullying directed by those with more power against those with less power. In one study, bullies were found to be overrepresented in middle

and high socio-economic status (SES) families, whereas victims were overrepresented in families of low socio-economic status (Jankauskiene, Kardelis, Sukys & Kardeliene, 2008). In the economic literature, inequality is more significantly associated with violence than poverty (Fajnzylber, Lederman & Loayza, 2002). Bullying is also reportedly higher among children living in poor political and economic conditions (Chaux et al., 2009; Carlson, 2006). As a case in point, Chaux and colleagues (2009) explored socio-economic, socio-political, and socio-emotional variables associated with bullying from 53,316 children from 1,000 students in Colombia. The study reported higher levels of bullying in the presence of armed conflict and economic inequality.

Conclusion

An attempt to integrate social science theories and perspectives into the scholarship on bullying is imperative to move the field forward. In psychology, bullying is a major social problem that is largely attributed to characteristics of individuals and relationships between individuals, as well as complex interactions in an individual's immediate social environment including home, school, and community. However, scholars have come to realise that bullying permeates all socio-economic and ethnic and racial groups and, as a result, many other theories and perspectives in social sciences have emerged to explain this complex phenomenon as resulting from larger socio-political dynamics. Sociologists emphasise that bullying is a social process to which larger structural inequalities can contribute (Pascoe, 2013). Anthropological perspectives of bullying are less common; however, anthropologists can add new insights into bullying, as they propose that researchers must better understand what adaptive, evolutionary functions bullying can perform (Holt et al., 2017). Political-economic perspectives on bullying are also rare, although political scientists and economists can shed light on structural conditions and ideologies (e.g., capitalism) that place children of low socio-economic status at an elevated risk of bullying and victimisation.

This chapter provides a trans-disciplinary analysis, as well as a singular analysis, of theories and perspectives that move the research beyond a psychologically dominated explanation of bullying. The work presented here can facilitate this by providing a launch pad for the development of better integrated and truly interdisciplinary theory.

References

Accomazzo, S. (2012a). 'Anthropology of violence: Historical and current theories, concepts, and debates in physical and socio-cultural anthropology', *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 22: 535–552.

Accomazzo, S. (2012b). 'Theoretical perspectives on the political economy of violence', *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 22: 591–606.

Agnew, R. (1992). 'Foundation for a general strain theory of crime and delinquency', *Criminology*, 30: 47–88.

Agnew, R. (2001). 'Building on the foundation of general strain theory: Specifying the types of strain most likely to lead to crime and delinquency', *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 38: 319–361.

Agnew, R. (2006). *Pressured into Crime: An Overview of General Strain Theory*, Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury.

Akers, R.L. (2011). *Social Learning and Social Structure: A General Theory of Crime and Deviance*, New Brunswick, NJ and London: Transaction Publishers.

Archer, J. and Benson, D. (2008). 'Physical aggression as a function of perceived fighting ability and provocation: An experimental investigation', *Aggressive Behavior*, 34: 9–24.

Bandura, A. (1977). 'Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change', *Psychological Review*, 84: 191–215.

Barchia, K. and Bussey, K. (2010). 'The psychological impact of peer victimization: Exploring social-cognitive mediators of depression', *Journal of Adolescence*, 33: 615–623.

Barone, C.A. (2004). *Radical Political Economy: A Concise Introduction*, Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Benedict, R. (1946). *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword: Patterns of Japanese Culture*, Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Bonanno, R.A. and Hymel, S. (2010). 'Beyond hurt feelings: Investigating why some victims of bullying are at greater risk for suicidal ideation', *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 56: 420–440.

Book, A.S., Volk, A.A. and Hosker, A. (2012). 'Adolescent bullying and personality: An adaptive approach', *Personality and Individual Differences*, 52: 218–223.

Bowes, L., Maughan, B., Caspi, A., Moffitt, T.E. and Arseneault, L. (2010). 'Families promote emotional and behavioural resilience to bullying: Evidence of an environmental effect', *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 51: 809–817.

Bowlby, J. (1958). 'The nature of the child's tie to his mother', *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 99: 265–272.

Bowlby, J. (1988). *A Secure Base: Parent-child Attachment and Healthy Human Development*, London: Basic Books.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1977).'Toward an experimental ecology of human development', *American Psychologist*, 32: 513–531.

Caporaso, J.A. and Levine, D.P. (1992). *Theories of Political Economy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Carlson, K.T. (2006). 'Poverty and youth violence exposure: Experiences in rural communities', *Children and Schools*, 28: 87–96.

Catterson, J. and Hunter, S.C. (2010). 'Cognitive mediators of the effect of peer victimization on loneliness', *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80: 403–416.

Chaux, E., Molano, A. and Podlesky, P. (2009). 'Socio-economic, socio-political and socio-emotional variables explaining school bullying: A country-wide multilevel analysis', *Aggressive Behavior*, 35: 520–529.

Chen, J.K. and Wei, H.S. (2013). 'School violence, social support, and psychological health among Taiwanese junior high school students', *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 37: 252–262.

Cheng, S.T., Cheung, K.C.C. and Cheung, C. (2008). 'Peer victimization and depression among Hong Kong adolescents', *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 64: 766–776.

Cohen, L.E. and Felson, M. (1979). 'Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach', *American Sociological Review*, 44: 588–608.

Connolly, J., Pepler, D., Craig, W. and Taradash, A. (2000). 'Dating experiences of bullies in early adolescence', *Child Maltreatment*, 5: 299–310.

Cook, C.R., Williams, K.R., Guerra, N.G., Kim, T.E. and Sadek, S. (2010). 'Predictors of bullying and victimisation in childhood and adolescence: A meta-analytic investigation', *School Psychology Quarterly*, 25: 65–83.

Cullen, F.T., Unnever, J.D., Hartman, J.L., Turner, M.G. and Agnew, R. (2008). 'Gender, bullying victimization, and juvenile delinquency: A test of general strain theory', *Victims and Offenders*, 3: 346–364.

Cunningham, N.J. (2007). 'Level of bonding to school and perception of the school environment by bullies, victims, and bully victims', *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 27: 457–478.

Eliot, M. and Cornell, D.G. (2009). 'Bullying in middle school as a function of insecure attachment and aggressive attitudes', *School Psychology International*, 30: 201–214.

Espelage, D.L., Aragon, S.R., Birkett, M. and Koenig, B.W. (2008). 'Homophobic teasing, psychological outcomes, and sexual orientation among high school students: What influence do parents and schools have?' *School Psychology Review*, 37: 202–216.

Espelage, D.L., Basile, K.C. and Hamburger, M.E. (2012). 'Bullying perpetration and subsequent sexual violence perpetration among middle school students', *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 50: 60–65.

Espelage, D., Green, H. and Polanin, J. (2012). 'Willingness to intervene in bullying episodes among middle school students: Individual and peer-group influences', *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 32: 776–801.

Espelage, D.L., Holt, M.K. and Henkel, R.R. (2003). 'Examination of peer-group contextual effects on aggression during early adolescence', *Child Development*, 74: 205–220.

Espelage, D.L., Hong, J.S., Merrin, G.J., Davis, J.P., Rose, C. and Little, T.D. (in press). 'A longitudinal examination of homophobic name-calling in middle school: Bullying, traditional masculinity, and sexual harassment as predictors', *Psychology of Violence*.

Espelage, D.L., Low, S., Rao, M.A., Hong, J.S. and Little, T.D. (2013). 'Family violence, bullying, fighting, and substance use among adolescents: A longitudinal mediational model', *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 24: 337–349.

Fajnzylber, P., Lederman, D. and Loayza, N. (2002). 'Inequality and violent crime', *Journal of Law Economics*, 45: 1–40.

Felson, M. and Boba, R. (2010). *Crime and Everyday Life* (4th ed.), Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Flood, M. and Pease, B. (2009). 'Factors influencing attitudes to violence against women', *Trauma, Violence and Abuse*, 10: 125–142.

Goodwin, M.H. (2002). 'Exclusion in girls' peer group: Ethnographic analysis of language practices on the playground', *Human Development*, 45: 392–415.

Gottfredson, G.D., Gottfredson, D.C., Payne, A.A. and Gottfredson, N.C. (2005). 'School climate predictors of school disorder: Results from a National Study of Delinquency Prevention in Schools', *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 42: 412–444.

Graham, S., Bellmore, A.D. and Mize, J. (2006). 'Peer victimization, aggression, and their co-occurrence in middle school: Pathways to adjustment problems', *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 34: 363–378.

Graham, S. and Juvonen, J. (1998). 'Self-blame and peer victimisation in middle school: An attributional analysis', *Developmental Psychology*, 34: 587–599.

Groff, E.R. (2007). 'Simulation for theory testing and experimentation: An example using routine activity theory and street robbery', *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 23: 75–103.

Harel-Fisch, Y., Walsh, S.D., Fogel-Grinvald, H., Amitai, G., Pickett, W., Molcho, M., Due, P., de Matos, M.G. and Craig, W. (2011). 'Negative school perceptions and involvement in school bullying: A universal relationship across 40 countries', *Journal of Adolescence*, 34: 639–652.

Hay, C., Meldrum, R. and Mann, K. (2010). 'Traditional bullying, cyber bullying, and deviance: A general strain theory approach', *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 26: 130–147.

Hinduja, S. and Patchin, J.W. (2007). 'Offline consequences of online victimisation: School violence and delinquency', *Journal of School Violence*, 9: 89–112.

Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of Delinquency*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Holt, M.K., Green, J.G., Tsay-Vogel, M., Davidson, J. and Brown, C. (2017). 'Multidisciplinary approaches to research on bullying in adolescence', *Adolescent Research Review*, 2: 1–10.

Horton, P. (2016). 'Portraying monsters: Framing school bullying through a macro lens', *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 37: 204–214.

Hunter, S.C., Boyle, J.M.E. and Warden, D. (2006). 'Emotion and coping in young victims of peer-aggression', in P. Buchwald (Ed.) *Stress and Anxiety: Application to Health, Work Place, Community and Education*, Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Press.

Hunter, S.C., Boyle, J.M.E. and Warden, D. (2007). 'Perceptions and correlates of peer-victimisation and bullying', *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 77: 797–810.

Hunter, S.C., Durkin, K., Heim, D., Howe, C. and Bergin, D. (2010). 'Psychosocial mediators and moderators of the effect of peer-victimization upon depressive symptomatology', *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 51: 1141–1149.

Hunter, S.C., Mora-Merchán, J.A. and Ortega, R. (2004). 'The long-term effects of coping strategy use in the victims of bullying', *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 7: 3–12.

Jang, H., Song, J. and Kim, R. (2014). 'Does the offline bully-victimisation influence cyberbullying behavior among youths? Application of general strain theory', *Computers in Human Behavior*, 31: 85–93.

Jankauskiene, R., Kardelis, K., Sukys, S. and Kardeliene, L. (2008). 'Associations between school bullying and psychosocial factors', *Social Behavior and Personality*, 36: 145–162.

Jeralds, L.M. (2011). 'Bullying victimisation, target suitability, and guardianship: A routine activities approach', unpublished Master's thesis. Wilmington: University of North Carolina.

Juvonen, J., Graham, S. and Schuster, M.A. (2003). 'Bullying among young adolescents: The strong, the weak, and the troubled', *Pediatrics*, 112: 1231–1237.

Juvonen, J., Nishina, A. and Graham, S. (2001). 'Peer harassment, psychological adjustment, and school functioning in early adolescence', *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 92: 349–359.

Kennedy, J.H. and Kennedy, C.E. (2004). 'Attachment theory: Implications for school psychology', *Psychology in the Schools*, 41: 247–259.

Klein, J. (2006). 'Sexuality and school shootings: What role does teasing play in school massacres?' *Journal of Homosexuality*, 51: 39–62.

Knous-Westfall, H.M., Ehrensaft, M.K., MacDonell, K.W. and Cohen, P. (2012). 'Parental intimate partner violence, parenting practices, and adolescent peer bullying: A prospective study', *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 21: 754–766.

Koh, J.B. and Wong, J.S. (2015). 'Survival of the fittest and the sexiest: Evolutionary origins of adolescent bullying', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 32: 2668–2690.

Kokkinos, C.M. (2007). 'Elementary school children's involvement in bullying and victimization: The role of attachment style and internalizing and externalizing symptomatology', *Scientia Paedagogica Experimentalis*, XLIV: 49–70.

Konner, M. (2010). *The Evolution of Childhood: Relationships, Emotion, Mind*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kumpulainen, K. (2008). 'Psychiatric conditions associated with bullying', *International Journal of Adolescent Medicine and Health*, 20: 121–132.

Larkin, J. (1994). 'Walking through walls: The sexual harassment of high school girls', *Gender and Education*, 6: 263–280.

Lawson, J. (2012). 'Sociological theories of intimate partner violence', *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 22: 572–590.

Lawson, J. and King, B. (2012). 'Theories of violence: A review of textbooks on human behavior and the social environment', *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 22: 517–534.

Lazarus, R.S. (1999). *Stress and Emotion: A New Synthesis*, New York: Springer.

Lereya, S.T., Samara, M. and Wolke, D. (2013). 'Parenting behavior and the risk of becoming a victim and a bully/victim: A meta-analysis study', *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 37: 1091–1108.

MacDonald, H. and Swart, E. (2004). 'The culture of bullying at a primary school', *Education as Change*, 8: 33–55.

Merton, D.E. (1994). 'The cultural context of aggression: The transition to junior high school', *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 25: 29–43.

Monks, C.P., Smith, P.K. and Swettenham, J. (2005). 'The psychological correlates of peer victimisation in preschool: Social cognitive skills, executive function and attachment profiles', *Aggressive Behavior*, 31: 571–588.

Moore, J. (2008). *Visions of Culture: An Introduction to Anthropological Theories and Theorists* (3rd ed.), Lanham, MD: Altamira Press.

National School Climate Council. (2007). *The School Climate Challenge: Narrowing the Gap between School Climate Research and School Climate Policy, Practice Guidelines and Teacher Education Policy*. Online. Available www.schoolclimate.org/climate/advocacy.php (accessed 22 November 2016).

Navarro, J.N. and Jasinski, J.L. (2012). 'Going cyber: Using routine activities theory to predict cyberbullying experiences', *Sociological Spectrum: Mid-South Sociological Association*, 32: 81–94.

O'Brennan, L.M. and Furlong, M.J. (2010). 'Relations between students' perceptions of school connectedness and peer victimization', *Journal of School Violence*, 9: 375–391.

Olweus, D. (1999). 'Bullying at school: Knowledge base and an effective intervention program', in C.F. Ferris and T. Grisso (Eds.) *Understanding Aggressive Behaviour in Children*. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 794: 265–276.

Oransky, M. and Fisher, C. (2009). 'The development and validation of the meanings of adolescent masculinity scale', *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 10: 57–72.

Pascoe, C.J. (2013). 'Notes on a sociology of bullying: Young men's homophobia as gender socialization', *QED: A Journal in GLBTQ Worldmaking, Inaugural Issue*, 1: 87–104.

Patchin, J.W. and Hinduja, S. (2011). 'Traditional and nontraditional bullying among youth: A test of general strain theory', *Youth and Society*, 43: 727–751.

Peguero, A.A. (2008). 'Bullying victimization and extracurricular activity', *Journal of School Violence*, 7: 71–85.

Peguero, A.A., Popp, A.M., Latimore, T.L., Shekarkhar, Z. and Koo, D.J. (2011). 'Social control theory and school misbehavior: Examining the role of race and ethnicity', *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 9: 259–275.

Pittaro, M.L. (2007). 'School violence and social control theory: An evaluation of the Columbine massacre', *International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences*, 2: 1–12.

Popp, A.M. and Peguero, A.A. (2011). 'Routine activities and victimization at school: The significance of gender', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 26: 2413–2436.

Pouwelse, M., Bolman, C., Lodewijkx, H. and Spaa, M. (2011). 'Gender differences and social support: Mediators or moderators between peer victimization and depressive feelings?' *Psychology in the Schools*, 48: 800–814.

119

Raskauskas, J. and Huynh, A. (2015). 'The process of coping with cyberbullying: A systematic review', *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 23: 118–125.

Salmivalli, C. (2010). 'Bullying and the peer group: A review', *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 15: 112–120.

Schreck, C.J., Wright, R.A. and Miller, J.M. (2002). 'A study of individual and situational antecedents of violent victimization', *Justice Quarterly*, 19: 159–180.

Smith, P.K. (2014). *Understanding School Bullying: Its Nature and Prevention Strategies*, London and Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Smith, P.K., Cowie, H., Olafsson, R.F. and Liefooghe, A.P.D. (2002). 'Definitions of bullying: A comparison of terms used, and age and gender differences, in a fourteen-country international comparison', *Child Development*, 73: 1119–1133.

Smith, P.K., Madsen, K.C. and Moody, J.C. (1999). 'What causes the age decline in reports of being bullied at school? Towards a developmental analysis of risks in being bullied', *Educational Research*, 41: 267–285.

Terranova, A.M. (2009). 'Factors that influence children's responses to peer victimization', *Child Youth Care Forum*, 38: 253–281.

Thomas, D.A. (2012). 'Violence', *Oxford Bibliographies Online*. Online. Available www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780199766567/obo-9780199766567-0027.xml (accessed 22 November 2016).

Thompson, R.A. (2000). 'The legacy of early attachments', *Child Development*, 71: 145–152.

Thornberg, R. (2011). 'She's weird! The social construction of bullying in school: A review of qualitative research', *Children and Society*, 4: 258–267.

Uggen, C. and Blackstone, A. (2004). 'Sexual harassment as a gendered expression of power', *American Sociological Review*, 69: 64–92.

Vaillancourt, T., McDougall, P., Hymel, S., Krygsman, A., Miller, J., Stiver, K. and Davis, C. (2008). 'Bullying: Are researchers and children/youth talking about the same thing?' *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 32: 486–495.

Volk, A.A., Camilleri, J.A., Dane, A.V. and Marini, Z.A. (2012). 'Is adolescent bullying an evolutionary adaptation?', *Aggressive Behavior*, 38: 222–238.

Walby, S. (2012). 'Violence and society: Introduction to an emerging field of sociology', *Current Sociology*, 61: 95–111.

Walden, L.M. and Beran, T.N. (2010). 'Attachment quality and bullying behavior in school-age youth', *Canadian Journal of School Psychology*, 25: 5–18.

Wallace, L.H., Patchin, J.W. and May, J.D. (2005). 'Reactions of victimized youth: Strain as an explanation of school delinquency', *Western Criminology Review*, 6: 104–116.

Wei, H.S. and Chen, J.K. (2012). 'The moderating effect of Machiavellianism on the relationships between bullying, peer acceptance, and school adjustment in adolescents', *School Psychology International*, 33: 345–363.

Weingast, B.R. and Wittman, D. (eds.) (2008). *The Oxford Handbook of Political Economy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Whitehead, N. (2004). 'Rethinking anthropology of violence', *Anthropology Today*, 20: 1–2.

Wikstrom, P.O.H. (2011). 'Routine activity theories', *Oxford Bibliographies*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Yar, M. (2005). 'The novelty of cybercrime: An assessment in light of routine activity theory', *European Journal of Criminology*, 4: 407–427.