

Comparison of Self-Reported Peer-Bullying Victimization in-School Period of Adults Who Do and Do Not Stutter: A Retrospective Survey Study

Kekemeliği Olan ve Olmayan Erişkinlerin Okul Dönemi Akran Zorbalığı Mağduriyet Öz Bildirimlerinin Karşılaştırılması: Geriye Dönük Anket Çalışması

İlkem KARA^a, Aşena KARAMETE^b

^aDepartment of Speech and Language Therapy, Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University Faculty of Health Sciences, Ankara, Türkiye

^bDepartment of Speech and Language Therapy, Nişantaşı University Faculty of Health Sciences, İstanbul, Türkiye

ABSTRACT Objective: Individual differences increase the probability of being bullied, and there are some adverse consequences of victimization. Children who stutter have been reported to be more likely than their peers to be bullied, but there is a scarcity of data on the rates of bullying victimization among individuals who stutter compared to their peers in Türkiye. Therefore, this study investigated school-age peer victimization rates and experiences of adults who do (AWS) and do not (AWNS) stutter in Türkiye. **Material and Methods:** This was a case-control self-reported retrospective survey study. One hundred AWS and 100 AWNS (age range: 18-48) participated. The school-age peer victimization experiences of AWS and AWNS were compared using closed-ended survey items. **Results:** Sixty-four percent of AWS and 41% of AWNS reported being bullying victims during school, which indicates a considerably higher risk of being bullied ($p=0.001$). The comparisons between AWS and AWNS showed that AWS had significantly more difficulty in maintaining friendships ($p=0.03$), but the comparisons between AWS and AWNS who experienced bullying showed that there were no differences between groups in maintaining friendships. Both groups reported that bullying mostly had adverse emotional (AWS: 71.9% and AWNS: 73.2%) and social (AWS: 60.9% and AWNS: 63.4%) effects. **Conclusion:** Being a bullying victim had adverse emotional and social consequences. Strong peer ties are essential in minimizing victimization; thus, further research into predictive role of friendship relations between stuttering and bullying is suggested.

ÖZET Amaç: Bireysel farklılıklar zorbalığa uğrama olasılığını artırır ve zorbalık mağduriyetinin olumsuz sonuçları olabilir. Kekemeliği olan çocukların akranlarına göre daha fazla zorbalığa uğradıkları bildirilmiştir, ancak Türkiye’de kekemeliği olan ve olmayan çocukların zorbalığa uğrama oranlarına ilişkin veri sınırlıdır. Bu nedenle bu çalışmayla Türkiye’de kekemeliği olan ve olmayan erişkinlerin okul çağındaki akran zorbalığı mağduriyeti oranları ve deneyimleri araştırılmıştır. **Gereç ve Yöntemler:** Bu bir vaka-kontrol, geriye dönük öz bildirim anket çalışmasıdır. Yüz kekemeliği olan ve 100 kekemeliği olmayan erişkin (yaş aralığı: 18-48) katılmıştır. Kekemeliği olan ve olmayan erişkinlerin okul çağındaki akran zorbalığı mağduriyeti oranları, kapalı uçlu anket maddeleri kullanılarak elde edilmiş ve karşılaştırılmıştır. **Bulgular:** Kekemeliği olan erişkinlerin %64’ü, kekemeliği olmayanların %41’i okul çağında zorbalığa uğradıklarını bildirmiştir, bu da kekemeliği olanların olmayanlara oranla zorbalığa uğrama riskinin anlamlı biçimde yüksek olduğunu ifade etmiştir ($p=0,001$). Kekemeliği olan ve olmayanlar arasında yapılan karşılaştırmalar, kekemeliği olan erişkinlerin, arkadaşlıkları sürdürmekte önemli ölçüde daha fazla zorluk yaşadıklarını göstermiştir ($p=0,03$), ancak zorbalık mağduru olan kekemeliği olan ve olmayan erişkinler arasında yapılan karşılaştırmalar, arkadaşlıkları sürdürmede gruplar arasında fark olmadığını göstermiştir. Her iki grup da zorbalığın çoğunlukla olumsuz duygusal (AWS: %71,9 ve AWNS: %73,2) ve sosyal (AWS: %60,9 ve AWNS: %63,4) olumsuz etkileri olduğunu bildirmiştir. **Sonuç:** Zorbalık mağduriyetinin olumsuz duygusal ve sosyal sonuçları olduğu gözlenmiştir. Mağduriyeti en aza indirmek için güçlü akran bağlarının önemli olduğu, bu nedenle arkadaşlık ilişkilerinin kekemelik ve zorbalık arasındaki yordayıcı rolünün araştırılması önerilmektedir.

Keywords: Stuttering; bullying; victimization

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kekemelik; zorbalık; mağduriyet

Correspondence: İlkem KARA

Department of Speech and Language Therapy, Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University Faculty of Health Sciences, Ankara, Türkiye

E-mail: ilkemkara@aybu.edu.tr



Peer review under responsibility of Türkiye Klinikleri Journal of Health Sciences.

Received: 05 Jul 2022

Received in revised form: 28 Sep 2022

Accepted: 30 Sep 2022

Available online: 26 Oct 2022

2536-4391 / Copyright © 2023 by Türkiye Klinikleri. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Stuttering is a multifactorial condition that is affected by factors including social, emotional, and cognitive, and previous research has shown children who stutter are more likely to be bullied than their peers who do not stutter.^{1,2} There is also evidence that children who stutter are stigmatized by their peers and teachers.^{3,4} Peer bullying has been characterized as a targeted victim's recurrent exposure to peers' (i.e., the bully) physical, verbal, relational, or cyber unfavorable behaviors.⁵⁻⁷ There are so many variables that influence bullying and victimization, however, it is unclear how these variables (e.g., genes, parents, classmates, cultural norms, and/or school policies) contribute.⁵ Personal differences are known to increase the likelihood of being bullied.^{7,8} Following this knowledge, children who stutter have been reported to be bullied more likely than their fluent peers.^{3,6} This research has examined the school-age peer-bullying rates and experiences of adults who do (AWS) and do not (AWNS) stutter.

Blood and Blood investigated perceived communicative skills, self-esteem, and vulnerability to bullying of adolescents who do (n=53) and do not (n=53) stutter.¹ The authors reported that adolescents who stutter had a considerably higher chance of being bullied (43%) than their unaffected peers (11%). Blood and Blood examined the link between self-reported anxiety and vulnerability to bullying in children who do (n=18) and do not (n=18) stutter.² In line with the earlier findings, the authors reported that children who stutter had a considerably higher probability of being bullied (61%) than their peers (22%). Özdemir et al. used the Turkish version of POSHAS in their study with adults and found that the participants described people who stutter as shy, nervous, and timid.⁴ These findings indicated that stereotypes about individuals who stutter also existed in Türkiye. Moreover, research suggested being a bullying victim was common among AWS during their school years, and peer victimization also existed among preschool-age children who stutter.^{9,10} In their retrospective preliminary study, Kara and Karamete found that 84% of AWS (n=54) reported being bullied during their school years.⁹ However, there is still a lack of information on whether there was a difference between the rates of school-age peer bullying of indi-

viduals who do and do not stutter. Kayhan-Aktürk and Özdemir investigated the preer relations of preschool-age children who do (n=45) and do not stutter (n=45; age range=5-6); and the authors found that peer victimization was significantly higher among children who stutter and these children also experienced more difficulty in adapting to school than their fluent peers.¹⁰ While individual differences such as temperamental characteristics increase the probability of being bullied, there are also some adverse consequences.

Previous research shows that bullying has adverse psychological, social, academic, and physical effects on children and adolescents.^{2,6,11-14} For example, peer bullying can have a detrimental effect on a person's academic performance, causing difficulties such as lack of concentration and learning. Bullying victims are also more likely to suffer from depression, anxiety disorders, impaired social relationships, and reduced self-esteem.^{6,11,12} In addition, children who stutter, like their peers who are bullied, may develop various unfavorable academic, emotional, and social attitudes and behaviors in the short and long term.¹³ Blood and Blood also stated that people who stutter that are bullied have high anxiety levels.² Accordingly, Iverach et al. suggested that negative conditioning due to bullying is related to the higher anxiety levels of AWS.¹⁴

CURRENT STUDY

Bullying affects 20-60% of school-aged children at some point during the school period, with 6-15 percent experiencing it severely.⁷ Kapçı have examined the bullying rate in 4th-5th grades in Türkiye and observed a 40% incidence rate.¹⁵ Unfortunately, in Türkiye, there is a scarcity of data on the rates of bullying victimization among individuals who stutter compared to their peers. As a result, the goal of this study was to investigate whether there was a difference in school-age peer bullying rates and experiences between AWS and AWNS.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

This research was a case-control self-report retrospective survey study to investigate school-age peer bullying and its effects on AWS and AWNS. The

Nişantaşı University Ethics Committee (no: November 8, 2021, no: 2021/18) granted ethical approval for this research. The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author, (removed for the review), upon reasonable request. The Helsinki Declaration's guiding principles were followed in the conduction of this study.

DATA COLLECTION TOOL

The surveys (available by request from the corresponding author) used in this study were versions of those used and developed by Kara and Karamete in light of previous studies conducted by Hugh-Jones and Smith and Schafer et al.^{9,13,16} As in Schafer et al.'s study, the survey contained 3 categories of victimization (physical, verbal, and relational).¹⁶ In addition, while a closed-ended 13-item survey was used for AWS, topics relating to stuttering were omitted from the AWNS survey, and their responses were collected using a 10-item survey. During the preparation of the survey items, special attention was paid to correct phrasing and clear terms with no contradictory meaning. In addition, researchers, non-experts on the topic, and pilot participants were polled for their comments. The data collection process was mixed-mode. Anonymized self-administered web-based and paper-and-pencil surveys were employed. The content of the survey items is shown in Table 1.

PARTICIPANTS

This study included a total of 200 AWS and AWNS (n=100 and n=100, respectively). Respondents were invited by speech and language therapists that were reached through the National Association of Speech and Language Therapists. A hundred AWS were reached at first, and then data were collected from AWNS until 100 adults who were matched in terms of age, education, and sex were reached. The participants of the AWNS group were recruited via referral from each new participant. Written informed consent was obtained from all the participants. The sex, age, and level of education in both groups were controlled. There was no difference between the 2 groups in terms of sex, age, and education ($p=1$, $p=1$, $p=1$). Table 2 shows the participants' demographic information, and Table 3 shows the stuttering-related demographic information of AWS.

TABLE 1: Content of survey items.

Item	Content
1	Age at stuttering awareness
2	Perceived severity of stuttering
3	Difficulty in maintaining friendships
4	Perceived relationship of maintaining friendships and stuttering
5	The presence of peer-bullying
6	The age range of the most common occurrence of bullying
7	Bullying frequency
8	Bullying type
9	Perceived relationship between bullying and stuttering
10	Family's knowledge and reaction
11	Teacher's knowledge and reaction
12	Perceived relationship between bullying and academic performance
13	Perceived relationship between bullying and general life

TABLE 2: Demographic information of the participants.

	AWS (n)	AWNS (n)
Sex		
Female	34	34
Male	66	66
Age group		
18-28	78	78
29-38	15	15
39-48	7	7
Education		
High school	16	16
Undergraduate	74	74
Masters	9	9
Doctoral	1	1

AWS: Adults who stutter; AWNS: Adults who do not stutter.

ANALYSIS

The IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows (Version 21.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.) was used to analyze the data. Statistical significance was defined as a p-value of less than 0.05. Demographic characteristics such as age and sex were included in the descriptive analysis (mean and standard deviation). The relationship between the 2 groups was determined using the chi-square test.

The chi-square test was performed to see if there was a link between stuttering and 1) difficulty in maintaining friendships, 2) being bullied, 3) family knowledge of bullying and action-taking status, and 4) teacher knowledge of bullying and action-taking status. In addition, the chi-square test was used to ex-

TABLE 3: Stuttering-related demographic information of AWS.

	n	%
Treatment history		
+	70	70
-	30	30
Age of stuttering awareness		
<4	18	18
5-7	52	52
8-10	18	18
11-13	4	4
>13	8	8
Perceived severity of stuttering		
Very mild	8	8
Mild	7	7
Moderate	41	41
Severe	34	34
Very severe	10	10

AWS: Adults who stutter.

amine the association between being bullied and academic attainment. Percentages are used to show descriptive statistics.

RESULTS

Sixty-four percent of AWS and 41% of AWNS reported being bullying victims during school. Table 4 shows the findings of victims of bullying. Adults who stutter are statistically significantly more likely than AWNS to be bullied by their peers at school ($X^2=10.61$, $p=0.001$). Adults who stutter reported statistically significantly more difficulties maintaining friendships than AWNS ($p=0.03$), while there was no difference between bullying victims of both groups, AWS and AWNS ($X^2=0.08$, $p=0.77$). Fifty-one percent of AWS, who reported being bullied, attributed difficulties in maintaining friendships to stuttering.

Both groups reported that name-calling and mocking were the most common forms of bullying they encountered. The proportion of subjects who reported family ($X^2=0.82$, $p=0.66$) or teacher ($X^2=4.05$, $p=0.13$) knowledge and action status did not differ by stuttering. The comparison of academic achievement in school showed no difference between AWS and AWNS who experienced bullying ($X^2=3$, $p=0.08$). Both groups reported that bullying mostly had adverse emotional (AWS: 71.9% and AWNS:

73.2%) and social (AWS: 60.9% and AWNS: 63.4%) effects.

DISCUSSION

This study examined whether there was a difference between the school-age peer bullying experiences of AWS and AWNS. Regardless of whether or not they have been bullied, AWS has reported having more difficulty maintaining friendships than AWNS. There was no difference in the difficulties in maintaining friendships between AWS and AWNS, who were bullied. AWS was found to be more likely than AWNS to be bullied, with name-calling and mocking being the most common forms of bullying. There was no difference between knowledge and action status of families and teachers of AWS and AWNS. Additionally, bullying was reported to have adverse emotional and social effects.

In this study, AWS (64%) reported being bullied more than AWNS (41%), which was found to be a significant difference ($p=0.001$). This finding is in line with previous studies showing that children, adolescents, and AWS are more likely to be bullied than those who do not.^{3,6} The analysis of the difficulties of maintaining friendships at school age of AWS and AWNS revealed that those who stutter had significantly more difficulties. However, bullying victims among AWS and AWNS had similar challenges maintaining friendships. As stated previously, it is well established that, among other factors, social issues enhance the probability of being bullied. Bullies target victims who already lack supportive peer relationships and are of a lower social status among their peers, and bullying victims encounter increased emotional difficulties and peer group concerns, including impaired social ties and status.¹⁷⁻¹⁹ The exclusion resulting from bullying is particularly hurtful because it targets a specific person rather than a random target.^{7,20} Furthermore, bullying is a peer group-based social phenomenon that impacts victims' social adjustment. Others are also cautious about connecting with these victims for fear of jeopardizing their standing and increasing their chances of becoming the next target.²¹ As a result, victims have fewer friends to befriend or protect them. Bullying victims experience increased social exclusion due to a lack of supporting

TABLE 4: Findings of victims of bullying.

	AWS n (%)	AWNS n (%)
Difficulty in maintaining a friendship		
Yes	42 (65.63)	28 (68.29)
No	22 (34.37)	13 (31.71)
Stuttering related (perceived relation between stuttering and victimization)		
Yes	33 (51.56)	-
No	31 (48.44)	-
Perceived peer bullying in school		
Yes	64 (F/M=23/41)	41 (F/M=17/24)
No	36	59
The most intensive age range of the peer bullying		
7-10	34 (53.13)	20 (48.78)
11-13	19 (29.69)	24 (58.54)
14-17	29 (45.31)	13 (31.71)
The frequency of the peer bullying		
Everyday	9 (14)	6 (14.63)
A few days a week	33 (51.56)	18 (43.90)
Once a week	7 (10.94)	3 (7.32)
Several times a month	15 (23.44)	14 (34.15)
Type of the bullying		
Calling names	40 (62.5)	25 (60.98)
Mocking	58 (90.63)	34 (82.93)
Threat	4 (6.25)	12 (29.27)
Relational bullying, such as gossiping	19 (29.69)	11 (26.83)
Physical bullying	20 (31.25)	23 (56.1)
Ethnic	1 (1.56)	2 (4.88)
Stuttering related bullying		
Always	11 (17.19)	-
Frequently	30 (46.88)	-
Sometimes	6 (9.38)	-
Rarely	7 (10.94)	-
Never	10 (15.63)	-
Knowledge and action of the family		
Not known	43 (67.19)	28 (68.29)
Known but no action	8 (12.5)	7 (17.07)
Known and action taken	13 (20.31)	6 (14.63)
Knowledge and action of the teacher		
Not known	21 (32.81)	19 (46.34)
Known but no action	23 (35.94)	16 (39.02)
Known and action taken	20 (31.25)	6 (14.63)
Did peer bullying negatively affect academic achievement		
Always	12 (18.75)	3 (7.32)
Frequently	14 (21.88)	6 (14.63)
Sometimes	11 (17.19)	5 (12.2)
Rarely	8 (12.5)	8 (19.51)
Never	19 (29.69)	19 (46.34)
Reported adverse effects of peer bullying on general life outcomes		
No effect	8 (12.5)	5 (12.2)
Effects on stuttering	34 (53.13)	-
Emotional effects	46 (71.88)	30 (73.17)
Social effects	39 (60.94)	26 (63.41)
Academic effects	23 (35.94)	9 (21.95)
Occupational effects	13 (20.31)	3 (7.32)

AWS: Adults who stutter; AWNS: Adults who do not stutter.

peer ties and a lower social standing among peers. Because bullying involves structural social exclusion from which the victim cannot simply escape due to a power imbalance, this type of exclusion negatively impacts mental health, and victims of bullying are more likely to exhibit emotional maladjustment.²² Researchers have found links between friendship and peer victimization and have shown peer acceptance plays a mediating role between individual risk factors and victimization.²³⁻²⁵ Overall, the heightened risk of being a bullying victim as an individual who stutters might be associated with an increased rate of difficulties in maintaining friendships among individuals who stutter.

AWS and AWNS reported that the most common type of bullying they encountered was verbal bullying (i.e., mocking and name-calling), as in line with previous work.²⁶ Previous studies show that children with supportive parents are less likely to be victimized when children face challenges at school.²⁷ This study revealed that the majority of both groups' families were unaware of bullying. The findings of this study showed that most teachers in both groups were unaware of bullying, and the remaining majority of those who were aware did not intervene. Pepler et al. found that while 85 percent of teachers stated they intervened in almost all bullying instances, only 35 percent of students stated teachers intervened in bullying incidents.²⁸ The implication of these findings was that there were inconsistencies between the reports of teachers and students regarding whether teachers intervened in the incidents of bullying. Furthermore, previous studies suggest that how serious a bullying act was perceived may influence whether or not a teacher intervenes.^{29,30} Therefore, possible explanations for teachers' lack of intervention in the bullying act might be that teachers do not witness bullying. When they do, they might not think that the seriousness of the situation does not warrant their involvement. Children's family and school factors had direct implications on poorer social behaviors, which directly impacted peer-relation difficulty, enhancing peer victimization.³¹

The main limitation of this study was the tool used for data collection. Although various factors

were taken into account for reliability, the survey used in this study was not a validated tool. There is a need for future studies using validated and reliable tools. This study examined the school-age experiences of adults using a retrospective method. Further studies need to address school-age children to deeply understand the relationship between friendship, victimization, and adverse emotional and social consequences.

CONCLUSION

This study has shown that individuals who stutter are more likely to be bullied than those who do not. The already well-established negative emotional and social consequences were also supported by this study.¹⁰ It is widely recognized that enhancing parental, teacher, and peer support is critical in reducing victimization and, consequently, reducing the risk of adverse outcomes such as social and emotional harm.³² Further research into predictive role of friendship relations between stuttering and bullying is suggested.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the participants who volunteered to participate in this study and speech-language therapists, and people who helped us reach other participants by telling us about this study to their acquaintances.

Source of Finance

During this study, no financial or spiritual support was received neither from any pharmaceutical company that has a direct connection with the research subject, nor from a company that provides or produces medical instruments and materials which may negatively affect the evaluation process of this study.

Conflict of Interest

No conflicts of interest between the authors and / or family members of the scientific and medical committee members or members of the potential conflicts of interest, counseling, expertise, working conditions, share holding and similar situations in any firm.

Authorship Contributions

All authors contributed equally while this study preparing.

REFERENCES

1. Blood GW, Blood IM. Bullying in adolescents who stutter: communicative competence and self-esteem. *Contemp Issues Commun Sci Disord*. 2004;31(Spring):69-79. [Crossref]
2. Blood GW, Blood IM. Preliminary study of self-reported experience of physical aggression and bullying of boys who stutter: relation to increased anxiety. *Percept Mot Skills*. 2007;104(3 Pt 2):1060-6. [Crossref] [PubMed]
3. Langevin M, Packman A, Onslow M. Peer responses to stuttering in the preschool setting. *Am J Speech Lang Pathol*. 2009;18(3):264-76. [Crossref] [PubMed]
4. Ozdemir RS, St Louis KO, Topbaş S. Stuttering attitudes among Turkish family generations and neighbors from representative samples. *J Fluency Disord*. 2011;36(4):318-33. [Crossref] [PubMed]
5. Berger KS. Update on bullying at school: Science forgotten? *Dev Rev*. 2007;27(1):90-126. [Crossref]
6. Blood GW, Boyle MP, Blood IM, Nalesnik GR. Bullying in children who stutter: speech-language pathologists' perceptions and intervention strategies. *J Fluency Disord*. 2010;35(2):92-109. [Crossref] [PubMed]
7. Olweus D. *Bullying in Schools: What We Know and What We Can Do*. 1st ed. Oxford (UK): Blackwell; 1993.
8. Lievense P, Vacaru VS, Liber J, Bonnet M, Sterkenburg PS. "Stop bullying now!" Investigating the effectiveness of a serious game for teachers in promoting autonomy-supporting strategies for disabled adults: a randomized controlled trial. *Disabil Health J*. 2019;12(2):310-7. [Crossref] [PubMed]
9. Kara İ, Karamete A. Kekemeliği olan yetişkinlerin okul çağındaki akran zorbalığı mağduriyetlerinin belirlenmesi: ön çalışma [Determining the effects of victimization by peer-bullying during school-age on adults who stutter: a preliminary study]. *Journal of Language, Speech and Swallowing Research*. 2018;1(1):50-61. [Link]
10. Kayhan Aktürk S, Özdemir RS. A comparison of peer relations between preschool children who stutter and their unent peers. *Arch Health Sci Res*. 2021;8(3):153-9. [Crossref]
11. Blood GW, Blood IM. Long-term consequences of childhood bullying in adults who stutter: social anxiety, fear of negative evaluation, self-esteem, and satisfaction with life. *J Fluency Disord*. 2016;50:72-84. [Crossref] [PubMed]
12. Craig WM, Pepler DJ. Understanding bullying: from research to practice. *Canadian Psychology-Psychologie Canadienne*. 2007;48(2):86-93. [Crossref]
13. Hugh-Jones S, Smith PK. Self-reports of short- and long-term effects of bullying on children who stammer. *Br J Educ Psychol*. 1999;69(Pt 2):141-58. [Crossref] [PubMed]
14. Iverach L, O'Brian S, Jones M, Block S, Lincoln M, Harrison E, et al. Prevalence of anxiety disorders among adults seeking speech therapy for stuttering. *J Anxiety Disord*. 2009;23(7):928-34. [Crossref] [PubMed]
15. Kapçı EG. İlköğretim öğrencilerinin zorbalığa maruz kalma türünün ve sıklığının depresyon, kaygı ve benlik saygısıyla ilişkisi [Bullying type and severity among elementary school students and its relationship with depression, anxiety and self esteem]. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*. 2004;37(1):1-13. [Crossref]
16. Schäfer M, Korn S, Smith PK, Hunter SC, Mora-Merchán JA, Singer MM, et al. Lonely in the crowd: Recollections of bullying. *Br J Dev Psychol*. 2004;22(3):379-94. [Crossref]
17. Hunter SC, Boyle JM, Warden D. Perceptions and correlates of peer-victimization and bullying. *Br J Educ Psychol*. 2007;77(Pt 4):797-810. [Crossref] [PubMed]
18. Ratcliff BR, Burrow-Sanchez JJ. The influence of perceived reason for being bullied on the relation between type of bullying and depressive symptoms. *J Sch Violence*. 2022;21(2):161-74. [Crossref]
19. Solberg ME, Olweus D. Prevalence estimation of school bullying with the Olweus Bully Victim Questionnaire. *Aggressive Behavior*. 2003;29(3):239-68. [Crossref]
20. Volk AA, Dane AV, Marini ZA. What is bullying? A theoretical redefinition. *Dev Rev*. 2014;34(4):327-43. [Crossref]
21. Salmivalli C. Bullying and the peer group: a review. *Aggression Violent Beh*. 2010;15(2):112-20. [Crossref]
22. Baumeister RF, Leary MR. The need to belong: desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychol Bull*. 1995;117(3):497-529. [Crossref] [PubMed]
23. Boulton MJ, Trueman M, Chau C, Whitehand C, Amatya K. Concurrent and longitudinal links between friendship and peer victimization: implications for befriending interventions. *J Adolesc*. 1999;22(4):461-6. [Crossref] [PubMed]
24. Pellegrini AD, Bartini M, Brooks F. School bullies, victims, and aggressive victims: Factors relating to group affiliation and victimization in early adolescence. *J Educ Psychol*. 1999;91(2):216-24. [Crossref]
25. Fox CL, Boulton MJ. Friendship as a moderator of the relationship between social skills problems and peer victimisation. *Aggressive Beh*. 2006;32(2):110-21. [Crossref]
26. Hunter SC, Boyle JME. Perceptions of control in the victims of school bullying: the importance of early intervention. *Educ Res*. 2002;44(3):323-36. [Crossref]
27. Spriggs AL, Iannotti RJ, Nansel TR, Haynie DL. Adolescent bullying involvement and perceived family, peer and school relations: commonalities and differences across race/ethnicity. *J Adolesc Health*. 2007;41(3):283-93. [Crossref] [PubMed] [PMC]
28. Pepler DJ, Craig WM, Ziegler S, Charach A. An evaluation of an anti-bullying intervention in Toronto schools. *Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health*. 1994;13(2):95-100. [Crossref]
29. Craig WM, Henderson K, Murphy JG. Prospective teachers' attitudes toward bullying and victimization. *Sch Psychol Int*. 2000;21(1):5-21. [Crossref]
30. Ellis AA, Shute R. Teacher responses to bullying in relation to moral orientation and seriousness of bullying. *Br J Educ Psychol*. 2007;77(Pt 3):649-63. [Crossref] [PubMed]
31. Son E, Parish SL, Peterson NA. National prevalence of peer victimization among young children with disabilities in the United States. *Child Youth Serv Rev*. 2012;34(8):1540-5. [Crossref]
32. Monopoli WJ, Evans SW, Himawan LK. Risk and protective factors for patterns of bullying involvement in middle school students. *J Sch Violence*. 2022. [Crossref]