
Understanding the Psychology of Bullying

Moving Toward a Social-Ecological Diathesis–Stress Model

Susan M. Swearer

*University of Nebraska–Lincoln and Born This Way
Foundation, Los Angeles, California*

Shelley Hymel

University of British Columbia

With growing recognition that bullying is a complex phenomenon, influenced by multiple factors, research findings to date have been understood within a social-ecological framework. Consistent with this model, we review research on the known correlates and contributing factors in bullying/victimization within the individual, family, peer group, school and community. Recognizing the fluid and dynamic nature of involvement in bullying, we then expand on this model and consider research on the consequences of bullying involvement, as either victim or bully or both, and propose a social-ecological, diathesis–stress model for understanding the bullying dynamic and its impact. Specifically, we frame involvement in bullying as a stressful life event for both children who bully and those who are victimized, serving as a catalyst for a diathesis–stress connection between bullying, victimization, and psychosocial difficulties. Against this backdrop, we suggest that effective bullying prevention and intervention efforts must take into account the complexities of the human experience, addressing both individual characteristics and history of involvement in bullying, risk and protective factors, and the contexts in which bullying occurs, in order to promote healthier social relationships.

Keywords: bullying, victimization, diathesis–stress, social-ecological

Bullying is a unique but complex form of interpersonal aggression, which takes many forms, serves different functions, and is manifested in different patterns of relationships. Bullying is not simply a dyadic problem between a bully and a victim, but is recognized as a group phenomenon, occurring in a social context in which various factors serve to promote, maintain, or suppress such behavior (e.g., Olweus, 2001; Rodkin & Hodges, 2003; Salmivalli, 2001). Accordingly, researchers have argued for the utility of a social-ecological framework in understanding school bullying (Espelage, Rao, & de la Rue, 2013; Espelage & Swearer, 2010; Hong & Garbarino, 2012; Swearer & Espelage, 2004; Swearer et al., 2012). Social ecological theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) conceptualizes human development as a bidirectional interaction between individuals and the multiple systems in which they operate—home, neighborhood, school, community, and society. Thus, bullying behavior is not just the result of individual characteristics, but is influenced by multiple relationships with peers, families, teachers, neighbors, and

interactions with societal influences (e.g., media, technology). Peer witnesses to bullying are also at risk for negative outcomes (Rivers, Poteat, Noret, & Ashurst, 2009), even after controlling for involvement as bullies or victim (Bonnano & Hymel, 2006).

Complicating our understanding of the consequences of bullying and victimization is recent research documenting the dynamic and fluid nature of children's involvement in bullying across roles and over time. Among youth who are involved in bullying, Ryoo, Wang, and Swearer (2014) found that frequent victims and frequent perpetrators were the least stable subgroups, and that students assumed different roles in bullying across school years. Indeed, youth can observe bullying (i.e., bystanders), experience bullying (i.e., victims), and perpetrate bullying (i.e., bullies) across different situations and/or over time. Across contexts, for instance, a student may be victimized by classmates at school but bully his or her siblings at home. Longitudinal studies by Haltigan and Vaillancourt (2014) and Barker, Arseneault, Brendgen, Fontaine, and Maughan (2008) explored the joint trajectories of involvement in bullying and victimization over time among 9- to 12-year-old and 11- to 16-year-olds, respectively, with similar results. Most students (73% and 75%, respectively) showed low levels of

Editor's note. This article is one of six in the “School Bullying and Victimization” special issue of the *American Psychologist* (May–June 2015). Susan M. Swearer and Shelley Hymel provided the scholarly lead for the special issue.

Authors' note. Susan M. Swearer, Department of Educational Psychology, University of Nebraska–Lincoln; Shelley Hymel, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational and Counselling Psychology and Special Education, University of British Columbia. Susan M. Swearer and Shelley Hymel are Co-Directors of the Bullying Research Network (<http://brnet.unl.edu>).

The authors wish to acknowledge the support received for this work, including support to the first author from the Andrew Gomez Dream Foundation, the Woods Charitable Fund, and the College of Education and Human Sciences at the University of Nebraska at Lincoln, and support to the second author from the Edith Lando Charitable Foundation, the University of British Columbia Faculty of Education Infrastructure Grant, and the Canadian Prevention Science Cluster, funded through the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Susan M. Swearer, 40 Teachers College Hall, Department of Educational Psychology, University of Nebraska–Lincoln, Lincoln, NE, 68588-0345; or Shelley Hymel, Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia, 2125 Main Mall, Vancouver, BC, V6T 1Z4. E-mail: sswearer@unl.edu or shelley.hymel@ubc.ca



Susan M. Swearer

bullying and victimization over time (low/uninvolved students), and 11% (both studies) showed trajectories that would identify them as bullies. Another 10% and 3% of students, respectively, would be classified as victims and 2% (Barker et al. only) as bully-victims. However, 6% and 3% of students, respectively, showed a pattern of declining victimization and increased bullying over time (victim to bully subgroup), a trajectory that was more likely than one in which bullies are increasingly victimized. Importantly, these distinct patterns of involvement are associated with different mental health outcomes.

Researchers have long demonstrated that being involved as both a perpetrator and victim seems to compound the impact of bullying, with bully-victims experiencing worse outcomes than either bullies or victims, being at greater risk for anxiety, depression, low self-esteem, self-harm, suicidal ideation and suicidality, physical injury, substance abuse, negative attitudes toward school, absenteeism, poor perceptions of school safety, aggression, and delinquency (e.g., Berkowitz & Benbenishty, 2012; Copeland, Wolke, Angold, & Costello, 2013; Kumpulainen, Räsänen, & Puura, 2001; Srabstein & Piazza, 2008). In their trajectory analysis, Haltigan and Vaillancourt (2014) further demonstrated that, relative to low-involvement students and after controlling for initial psychopathology, stable victims showed elevated levels of depression, attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder, and anxiety, whereas stable bullies reported higher levels of anxiety, and those who shifted from victimization to bullying reported more anxiety, depression, and somatization. Such findings underscore the importance of considering a child's history of involvement in bullying over time, and to move beyond the "dyadic bias" (Espelage & Swearer, 2003) and view bullying as a dynamic experience, influenced by the social

ecology. In this article, we summarize some of these complexities in support of a social-ecological perspective on bullying, and then expand our lens to propose the application of a diathesis-stress model that can further our understanding of the dynamics of bullying among children and youth.

Correlates and Contributing Factors in the Bullying/Victimization Dynamic

Individual Influences

In terms of individual factors, bullying perpetration has been associated with callous-unemotional traits (Muñoz, Qualter, & Padgett, 2011; Viding, Simmonds, Petrides, & Frederickson, 2009), psychopathic tendencies (Fanti & Kimonis, 2012), endorsement of masculine traits (Gini & Pozzoli, 2006; Navarro, Larrañaga, & Yubero, 2011), conduct problems (Cook, Williams, Guerra, Kim, & Sadek, 2010), antisocial personality traits (Ferguson, San Miguel, & Hartley, 2009; Vaughn et al., 2010), susceptibility to peer pressure (Monks & Smith, 2006; Pepler, Craig, & O'Connell, 2010), anxiety (e.g., Craig, 1998; Kaltiala-Heino, Rimpelä, Rantanen, & Rimpelä, 2000), and depression (e.g., Ferguson et al., 2009). At least some students who bully their peers have been found to be higher in social intelligence (Björkqvist, Österman, & Kaukiainen, 2000; Sutton, Smith, & Swettenham, 1999a, 1999b) and social status (Vaillancourt, Hymel, & McDougall, 2003), with researchers distinguishing between socially integrated and socially marginalized bullies (e.g., Farmer et al., 2010; see Rodkin, Espelage, & Hanish, 2015).

Being bullied by peers (victimization) has been linked with poor physical health (e.g., Gini & Pozzoli, 2013; Knack, Jensen-Campbell, & Baum, 2011) and poor school adjustment, including being unhappy, feeling unsafe, being truant, performing poorly and, in some cases, dropping out of school (e.g., Card, Isaacs, & Hodges, 2007; Graham, Bellmore, & Juvonen, 2007; Juvonen, Nishina, & Graham, 2000; Konishi, Hymel, Zumbo, & Li, 2010; Slee & Rigby, 1993; Smith, Talamelli, Cowie, Naylor, & Chauhan, 2004). Victimization has also been associated with a host of internalizing and externalizing difficulties (see Card et al., 2007, and Espelage & Holt, 2001, for reviews), including loneliness and withdrawal (e.g., Graham & Juvonen, 1998a; Kaltiala-Heino, Rimpelä, Marttunen, Rimpelä, & Rantanen, 1999), anxiety and social avoidance (Craig, 1998; Espelage & Holt, 2001; Graham, & Juvonen, 1998b), depression (e.g., Craig, 1998; Kaltiala-Heino et al., 1999), and suicidal ideation (Bonanno & Hymel, 2010; Kaltiala-Heino et al., 1999), as well as hyperactivity (Kumpulainen et al., 2001), delinquency, and aggression (e.g., Hanish & Guerra, 2000). Victims are also less well liked (e.g., Spriggs, Iannotti, Nansel, & Haynie, 2007), less accepted, and more rejected by peers (Cullerton-Sen & Crick, 2005; Graham et al., 2007; Veenstra et al., 2007).

Unfortunately, the causal nature of these relationships is unclear. Given the multidirectionality of the social-ecological model and the principles of equifinality and multifinality (Cicchetti & Rogosch, 1996), it is likely that con-



Shelley Hymel

text influences the extent to which these individual factors function as antecedents, contributing factors, or consequences of involvement in bullying. An aggressive youth diagnosed with conduct disorder might bully others because of a predisposing trait related to the diagnosis of conduct disorder. Alternatively, youth who are “rewarded” for bullying behaviors (e.g., through enhanced status or popularity, access to goods) may continue bullying, develop further aggressive behaviors, and eventually meet criteria for a diagnosis of conduct disorder. Shy youth might appear more vulnerable, making them appealing targets of victimization. Alternatively, someone who is bullied may develop a shy and withdrawn, perhaps anxious, demeanor as a result of such treatment. Thus, our understanding of the psychology of bullying/victimization is much like the “chicken or egg” conundrum.

Family Influences

A number of family characteristics have been linked to bullying perpetration, including family members’ involvement in gangs, poor parental supervision, negative family environment, parental conflict, domestic violence, low parental communication, lack of parent emotional support, authoritarian parenting, inappropriate discipline, and parental abuse (Baldry, 2003; Baldry & Farrington, 1999; Barboza et al., 2009; Bowes et al., 2009; Cook et al., 2010; Espelage, Bosworth, & Simon, 2000; Espelage & Swearer, 2010; Ferguson et al., 2009; Pepler, Jiang, Craig, & Connolly, 2008). Although such findings are consistent with arguments that aggressive modeling and poor parental supervision contribute to bullying, causal direction has not been clearly established and the impact of families after controlling for hereditary influences remains unclear, as genetic factors have been shown to account for 61% of the

variation in bullying behavior (Ball et al., 2008). Family influences on victimization have been more elusive, but include links to abuse, neglect, and overprotective parenting (see Duncan, 2011).

Peer Influences

Youth spend much of the day interacting with peers in schools, neighborhoods, communities, and through social media, and bullying behaviors almost always occur within the peer context (Pepler et al., 2010). Bullying and victimization are more likely in classrooms characterized by peer norms that support bullying (e.g., Craig & Pepler, 1997; Salmivalli & Voeten, 2004), and by high peer conflict (Pepler et al., 2010). Affiliation with aggressive peers is also associated with greater bullying perpetration (Espelage, Holt, & Henkel, 2003; Ferguson et al., 2009), as is peer victimization (Barboza et al., 2009), and negative relationships with classmates (Bacchini, Esposito, & Afuso, 2009). Again, however, the correlational nature of these studies makes causal interpretation difficult, and several of these associations may simply reflect *homophily*, the tendency to affiliate with similar peers.

One of the most extensively researched peer influences on school bullying is that of bystanders. Observational studies have shown that, on average, two to four peers are present in the vast majority (85% to 88%) of bullying incidents (O’Connell, Pepler, & Craig, 1999; Pepler et al., 2010). Bystanders, however, often respond in ways that encourage rather than discourage bullying (Doll, Song, & Siemers, 2004; Pellegrini & Long, 2004). For example, Craig and Pepler (1997; and see O’Connell et al., 1999) observed that peer bystanders actively joined in with bullying 21% of the time, only intervened on behalf of victims in 25% of incidents, and were most often observed to passively watch (54%)—a response that may well be interpreted as condoning such behavior. According to peer perceptions (Salmivalli, Lagerspetz, Bjorkqvist, Osterman, & Kaukiainen, 1996), about 20% of students are viewed as encouraging bullying, and another 7% as actively supporting or participating in the bullying. Only 17% of students, mostly girls, are identified by peers as defenders who intervened on behalf of victims. Given these findings, many focus on bystanders as a critical resource in antibullying efforts (e.g., Hazler, 1996), with peer support emphasized as a key component in school-based antibullying efforts (e.g., Salmivalli, Kärnä, & Poskiparta, 2010). Unfortunately, with age, bystanders become increasingly passive in their responses and less likely to advocate for victims (Marsh et al., 2011; Trach, Hymel, Waterhouse, & Neale, 2010). Those who defend victims have greater empathy (at least boys) and greater social self-efficacy (Gini, Albiero, Benelli, & Altoè, 2007, 2008), are usually higher in social status (popularity) and better liked (e.g., Caravita, DiBlasio, & Salmivalli, 2009; Salmivalli et al., 1996), not only by the victims they defend but also by the broader peer group (Sainio, Veenstra, Huitsing, & Salmivalli, 2011). High social status may lend confidence to one’s capacity to intervene and reduce concerns about retaliation. Bystanders are also more likely to defend victims if they feel angry

(Rocke Henderson & Hymel, 2011; Sokol, Bussey, & Rapee, 2014), what Vitaglione and Barnett (2003) refer as *empathic anger* in adults.

School Influences

Bullying has been most studied in the school context, and the positive or negative climate of the school impacts the frequency of bullying and victimization (e.g., Gendron, Williams, & Guerra, 2011; Marsh et al., 2012; Richard, Schneider, & Mallet, 2011; Wang, Berry, & Swearer, 2013). Higher levels of bullying and victimization have been linked to inappropriate teacher responses (e.g., Bauman & Del Rio, 2006), poor teacher–student relationships (Bacchini et al., 2009; Doll et al., 2004; Richard et al., 2011), lack of teacher support, and lack of engagement in school activities (Barboza et al., 2009). Students are also less likely to report bullying if they see their school climate as negative (Unnever & Cornell, 2004). The relationship between school climate and bullying/victimization may be bidirectional, however, with poor school climate contributing to bullying and vice versa.

Community/Cultural Influences

Beyond families, peers, and schools, there is the influence of communities and the larger society, with higher levels of bullying linked to negative or unsafe neighborhoods (e.g., Chaux, Molano, & Podlesky, 2009; Espelage et al., 2000), gang affiliation (e.g., White & Mason, 2012), and poverty (Bradshaw, Sawyer, & O’Brennan, 2009). Research has also linked bullying perpetration to exposure to violent TV (Barboza et al., 2009) and video games (Ferguson et al., 2009; Janssen, Boyce, & Pickett, 2012; Olson et al., 2009). Generally, increased bullying and victimization are found in communities in which violence is modeled and/or condoned, although, again, the causal nature of these relationships remains unclear.

Summary

As these findings suggest, bullying and victimization do not occur in isolation. Rather, bullying stems from complex interactions between individuals and the contexts in which they function, both proximal (i.e., family, peers, school climate) and distal (i.e., societal, cultural influences). Accordingly, multiple systems must be targeted in order for bullying prevention and intervention programs to be effective (e.g., O’Donnell, Hawkins, & Abbott, 1995; Rodkin, 2004; Swearer & Espelage, 2004). Although demonstrations of causality remain an important task for future research, these findings begin to set out a road map that guides prevention and intervention efforts, both in schools and communities (see Bradshaw, 2015).

Consequences of Bullying/Victimization

Although it is widely understood that involvement in bullying causes problems for victims (see McDougall & Vaillancourt, 2015), children and youth who bully are also at risk for many of the same problems. Studies addressing

issues of causality have found that bullying perpetration often leads to anxiety and depression (Baldry, 2004), social withdrawal and delinquent behavior (Bender & Lösel, 2011), poor academic achievement (Ma, Phelps, Lerner, & Lerner, 2009), and adult diagnosis of antisocial personality disorder (Copeland et al., 2013). Thus, bully perpetrators experience adverse psychosocial consequences, a result that does not garner much empathy, given the public’s advocacy for suspension, expulsion, and incarceration for aggressive behavior. To understand how involvement in bullying/victimization can lead to such diverse outcomes, we consider a diathesis–stress model, borrowed from developmental psychopathology, magnifying the social-ecological lens.

Understanding the Relationship Between Psychopathology and Bullying/Victimization

Diathesis–stress models propose that psychopathology occurs as the result of the combination of individual cognitive or biological vulnerabilities (i.e., diatheses) and certain environmental stressors (Cicchetti & Toth, 1998; Lazarus, 1993). Further, these models posit that both negative life events and one’s cognitions about those events contribute to the development of internalizing and externalizing psychopathology. In exploring the utility of a diathesis–stress model in understanding school bullying, we consider involvement in bullying, as either a victim or perpetrator, as a negative life event that, when mixed with certain cognitive, biological, and social vulnerabilities (i.e., diatheses), leads to the development of internalizing and externalizing psychopathology and impaired social relationships. Diathesis–stress models have received considerable empirical support (e.g., Garber & Hilsman, 1992; Gibb & Alloy, 2006), and have contributed to our understanding of relational stressors and depressive symptoms (Chango, McElhaney, Allen, Schad, & Marston, 2012), peer exclusion (Gazelle & Ladd, 2003), and compulsive Internet use (van der Aa et al., 2009). We view bullying as a stressful life event that places vulnerable youth at risk for a host of negative outcomes (Ferguson et al., 2009; Kaltiala-Heino et al., 2000), regardless of type of involvement (e.g., bully, bully-victim, victim).

Diathesis–Stress and Internalizing Problems

Stressful life events play a primary role in the development of depression (Garber & Horowitz, 2002; Hammen & Rudolph, 2003), anxiety (Leen-Feldner, Zvolensky, & Feldner, 2006), and posttraumatic stress disorder (Bernstein et al., 2005). For example, major negative life events (e.g., parental loss or divorce, peer problems) are related to the onset and maintenance of depressive symptoms (Hammen, 1991; Hammen & Rudolph, 2003) that, in cyclical fashion, lead to additional negative life events and later depressive symptoms (e.g., Potthoff, Holahan, & Joiner, 1995). Negative life events are also related to the onset and maintenance of anxiety disorders, with anxious individuals seeing the world as a threatening place, and interpreting events through a lens of worry and fear (Beck, Emery, & Greenberg, 1985). Gazelle and Ladd (2003) suggest that

children's feelings of anxiety about social situations, when paired with behavioral inhibition, can serve as a cognitive diathesis, with peer victimization functioning as an added stressor. Schmidt, Polak, and Spooner (2001) found that the experience of stressful life events, such as peer rejection, by individuals with a genetic diathesis can lead to different physiological reactions (e.g., changes in heart rate, cortisol, electroencephalogram [EEG] activity), which are too uncomfortable for the individual to maintain engagement in the social situation. Negative peer experiences, in turn, confirm that the world is a threatening place, leading to more worry about peer interactions, which, in turn, are linked to internalizing and externalizing difficulties (Kearney, 2001).

One rather clear example of the potential applicability of a diathesis–stress model to the outcomes associated with the stress of peer victimization considers the impact of a biological vulnerability. Consistent with a diathesis–stress model, recent research on the biological factors underlying depression has documented the moderating role played by the serotonin transporter gene, 5-HTTLPR, in the relationship between stress and depression (Karg, Burmeister, Shedden, & Sen, 2011). For example, Caspi and colleagues (2003) found that maltreated children who possess a “short-short” allele for the 5-HTTLPR polymorphism were far more likely to be depressed as adults than those with a short-long or long-long allele, who were found to be no more risk for depression than nonmaltreated children. Extending the diathesis–stress model of depression to our understanding of childhood peer victimization, researchers have shown that victimized children with the short-short allele are more likely to be depressed than those with the long-long allele (Benjet, Thompson, & Gotlib, 2010; Iyer, Dougall, & Jensen-Campbell, 2013). Longitudinally, victimized children with the short-short allele for 5HTTLPR have also been found to be at greater risk for emotional problems (Sugden et al., 2010; see Vaillancourt, Hymel, & McDougall, 2013, for a fuller discussion).

Consistent with our arguments for consideration of both a diathesis–stress model and a social-ecological model of peer victimization, recent twin research by Brendgen and colleagues has shown how the impact of genetic predispositions can vary as a function of school context. Specifically, they found that a genetic disposition for aggression placed students at greater risk for peer victimization in classes in which norms for aggressive behavior were negative, but seemed to operate as a protective factor, reducing the likelihood of peer victimization, when students were in classrooms with norms favoring aggression (Brendgen, Girard, Vitaro, Dionne, & Boivin, 2013a). Brendgen et al. (2011) also found that a positive teacher–student relationship mitigated the link between peer victimization and a genetic predisposition for aggression. Thus, the diathesis–stress model, in combination with a social-ecological framework, holds promise in understanding peer victimization, but what about bully perpetration?

Diathesis–Stress and Externalizing Problems

Ferguson and Dyck (2012) argue for the application of a diathesis–stress model to explain the development of aggression, suggesting that the approach has greater explanatory power for understanding aggressive behavior than social–cognitive and social learning theories, and offers an important heuristic for understanding the complexities of aggression. Some research has begun to examine externalizing behavior from a diathesis–stress perspective. For example, parental psychopathology and maltreatment are diatheses for the development of externalizing problems in youth (Walker, Downey, & Bergman, 1989), and disengaged coping mediates the relationship between peer stress and overt aggression among boys (Sontag & Graber, 2010). Increased aggression has also been associated with greater depression, mediated by peer rejection in school (Panak & Garber, 1992). In a study examining the link between peer victimization and child aggression among 506 6-year-old twins, Brendgen et al. (2008) found support for a diathesis–stress model, with peer victimization as a diathesis for the development of aggression in boys, regardless of genetic vulnerability. Finally, Brendgen, Girard, Vitaro, Dionne, and Boivin (2013b) found that a strong genetic predisposition for physical aggression was more likely to be expressed when peer group norms favored aggressive behavior but not when peer norms disfavored such behavior. Thus, a diathesis–stress model takes into account the interaction of individual vulnerabilities, specific life stressors, and aggression. Of interest here is whether the model can be applied to bullying perpetration, a subcategory of aggression.

At least two lines of research demonstrate the potential utility of applying diathesis–stress models to our understanding of peer bullying— one considering a potential biological vulnerability (the heritable tendency for psychopathy) and the other considering a cognitive vulnerability (the capacity for moral disengagement). With regard to the former, studies have demonstrated links between bullying perpetration among youth and callous-unemotional traits (e.g., Thornton, Frick, Crapanzano, & Terranova, 2013; Viding et al., 2009), indifference to the harm caused to others (Rigby & Slee, 1993), and willingness to manipulate others for one's own gain (Sutton & Keogh, 2001). More recently, Fanti and Kimonis (2012) followed 1,416 adolescents in Greece-Cyprus from Grades 7 through 9 to investigate the links between bullying and the three traits identified as core characteristics of psychopathy in youth— callous-unemotional traits, narcissism, and impulsivity. Impulsivity and narcissism predicted high levels of bullying in early adolescence, regardless of levels of callousness or conduct problems. However, all three psychopathic traits contributed to greater levels of reported bullying, and the combination of callous-unemotional traits and conduct problems predicted the highest levels of bullying, even as levels of bullying generally declined with age. Thus, for a small subsample of bullies, early psychopathic tendencies may serve as a diathesis for bullying

perpetration, a tendency that Cullen (2009) suggests in explaining the 1998 Columbine massacre.

With regard to the latter—cognitive vulnerability—a recent meta-analysis by Gini, Pozzoli, and Hymel (2014) documents the tendency for children and youth who bully others to *morally disengage*, a cognitive mechanism that allows individuals to justify and rationalize cruel behavior in ways that make it seem less harmful (see Bandura, 1999, 2002; Hymel & Bonanno, 2014; Hymel, Schonert-Reichl, Bonanno, Vaillancourt, & Rocke Henderson, 2010). Although the tendency to morally disengage may function as a cognitive vulnerability (diathesis) contributing to the likelihood of bullying, this tendency is also affected by peer experiences with victimization, underscoring the utility of also considering a social-ecological framework. Specifically, in one of the early studies examining bullying involvement and moral disengagement, Hymel, Rocke Henderson, and Bonanno (2005) found that youth who never bullied reported low levels of moral disengagement for bullying, and youth who bullied frequently reported high levels of moral disengagement, but youth who reported that they sometimes bullied others varied in level of moral disengagement as a function of their experiences with victimization. The more often they experienced victimization themselves, the less likely they were to morally disengage regarding bullying. Thus, emerging research suggests that a diathesis–stress model, considered within a social-ecological framework, may serve as a useful heuristic for understanding involvement in bullying and may provide greater explanatory power for research findings on the bully-victim phenomenon.

A Social-Ecological Diathesis–Stress Model of Bullying: Applications and Limitations

According to diathesis–stress models, the development of psychological difficulties occurs through the interaction of an individual’s biological and cognitive vulnerabilities and stressful life experiences. Involvement in bullying is conceptualized as a stressful life event, influenced by multiple social stressors. However, the presence of social stressors does not fully explain the development of psychological difficulties like depression, anxiety, and aggression. Rather, stressful life events can be exacerbated by biological vulnerabilities and can activate cognitive vulnerabilities, leading to more significant, negative outcomes. Cognitive diathesis is conceptualized as a distorted lens through which individuals interpret life events (Chango et al., 2012; Hammen & Rudolph, 2003). If negative events are attributed to global, stable, and internal cognitive schemas, and negative beliefs about self, world, and future, individuals are at increased risk for internalizing and externalizing problems. In one study that supports the utility of a social-ecological, diathesis–stress model of peer victimization, Bonanno and Hymel (2010) explored why some victimized youth are more vulnerable to suicidal ideation than others, finding more suicidal ideation among victims who felt more so-

cially hopeless (cognitive diathesis) and who reported less family support (an environmental protective factor).

Beliefs about the self, world, and future are rooted in early experiences, with stable cognitive structures beginning to solidify around the age of 9 (Stark et al., 1996). By adolescence, abstract thinking becomes more advanced, allowing youth to develop more stable concepts about themselves, the world, and the future. Negative self-concept has been shown to be a critical element in predicting involvement in both bullying and victimization (Marsh, Parada, Yeung, & Healey, 2001). Peer victimization can activate negative self-schemas (e.g., “I’m a loser; everyone hates me”), leading to perceptions of the self as unlovable and/or worthless (characterological self-blame; Graham & Juvonen, 1998b), to experiencing the world as hostile, and to the development of a negative outlook on the future, enhancing one’s risk for depression (Stark et al., 1996). Alternatively, bullying perpetration might result from activation of a threat schema (e.g., “Everyone is going to bully me”), which can promote negative self–other beliefs (e.g., “I’d better ruin her reputation before she ruins mine”), leading the individual to become aggressive in social relationships in order to maintain power and control. Individuals who bully others might also operate from hostile schemas about self or others (e.g., “I deserve what I can take from others” or “Losers deserve what they get”), leading to negative beliefs about others and a sense of entitlement, supporting the tendency to morally disengage regarding bullying.

In this article, we have argued for the integration of a social-ecological diathesis–stress model to address bullying and victimization, one which recognizes the complex and dynamic nature of bullying involvement across multiple settings (i.e., home, neighborhood, school, and community) and over time. The social-ecology model takes into account the interconnections in a child’s world, and the diathesis–stress model allows for an understanding of the complexity of stressors and risk/protective factors that influence both engagement and intervention in bullying. We recognize, however, that the proposed integrated model is primarily applicable in cases in which bullying and victimization contribute to significant psychological and mental health difficulties. For many children and youth, bullying involvement reflects developing capacities for social engagement and explorations of the exercise of power, and for these youth, bullying may be best addressed through educational efforts to enhance the social skills and awareness needed for effective and positive interpersonal relationships (see www.prevnnet.ca and www.casel.org). When bullying and victimization lead to clinical difficulties, however, we believe that application of a social-ecological diathesis–stress perspective holds considerable promise. Future research is needed to test the applicability of this integrated model, and our hope is that this review helps stimulate such research and enhance our efforts to understand and address the complexity of bullying among children and youth.

REFERENCES

- Bacchini, E., Esposito, G., & Affuso, G. (2009). School experience and school bullying. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 19*, 17–32. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/casp.975>
- Baldry, A. C. (2003). Bullying in schools and exposure to domestic violence. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 27*, 713–732. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0145-2134\(03\)00114-5](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0145-2134(03)00114-5)
- Baldry, A. C. (2004). The impact of direct and indirect bullying on the mental and physical health of Italian youngsters. *Aggressive Behavior, 30*, 343–355. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ab.20043>
- Baldry, A. C., & Farrington, D. P. (1999). Brief report: Types of bullying among Italian school children. *Journal of Adolescence, 22*, 423–426. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jado.1999.0234>
- Ball, H. A., Arseneault, L., Taylor, A., Maughan, B., Caspi, A., & Moffitt, T. E. (2008). Genetic and environmental influences on victims, bullies and bully-victims in childhood. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 49*, 104–112. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2007.01821.x>
- Bandura, A. (1999). Moral disengagement in the perpetration of inhumanities. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 3*, 193–209. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr0303_3
- Bandura, A. (2002). Selective moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency. *Journal of Moral Education, 31*, 101–119. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0305724022014322>
- Barboza, G. E., Schiamberg, L. B., Oehmke, J., Korzeniewski, S. J., Post, L. A., & Heraux, C. G. (2009). Individual characteristics and the multiple contexts of adolescent bullying: An ecological perspective. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 38*, 101–121. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10964-008-9271-1>
- Barker, E. D., Arseneault, L., Brendgen, M., Fontaine, N., & Maughan, B. (2008). Joint development of bullying and victimization in adolescence: Relations to delinquency and self-harm. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 47*, 1030–1038.
- Bauman, S., & Del Rio, A. (2006). Preservice teachers' responses to bullying scenarios: Comparing physical, verbal, and relational bullying. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 98*, 219–231. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.98.1.219>
- Beck, A. T., Emery, G., & Greenberg, R. L. (1985). *Anxiety disorders and phobias: A cognitive perspective*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Bender, D., & Lösel, F. (2011). Bullying at school as a predictor of delinquency, violence and other anti-social behaviour in adulthood. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health, 21*, 99–106. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/cbm.799>
- Benjet, C., Thompson, R. J., & Gotlib, I. H. (2010). 5-HTTLPR moderates the effect of relational peer victimization on depressive symptoms in adolescent girls. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 51*, 173–179. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2009.02149.x>
- Berkowitz, R., & Benbenishty, R. (2012). Perceptions of teachers' support, safety, and absence from school because of fear among victims, bullies, and bully-victims. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 82*, 67–74. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1939-0025.2011.01132.x>
- Bernstein, A., Zvolensky, M. J., Feldner, M. T., Lewis, S. F., Fauber, A. L., Leen-Feldner, E. W., & Vujanovic, A. A. (2005). Anxiety sensitivity taxon and trauma: Discriminant associations for posttraumatic stress and panic symptomatology among young adults. *Depression and Anxiety, 22*, 138–149. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/da.20091>
- Björkqvist, K., Österman, K., & Kaukiainen, A. (2000). Social intelligence—Empathy = aggression? *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 5*, 191–200. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1359-1789\(98\)00029-9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1359-1789(98)00029-9)
- Bonanno, R., & Hymel, S. (2006, July). *Exposure to school violence: The impact of bullying on witnesses*. Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the International Society for the Study of Behavior Development, Melbourne, Australia.
- Bonanno, R., & 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. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/mpq.0.0051>
- Bowes, L., Arseneault, L., Maughan, B., Taylor, A., Caspi, A., & Moffitt, T. E. (2009). School, neighborhood, and family factors are associated with children's bullying involvement: A nationally representative longitudinal study. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 48*, 545–553. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/CHI.0b013e31819cb017>
- Bradshaw, C. P. (2015). Translating research to practice in bullying prevention. *American Psychologist, 70*, 322–332. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0039114>
- Bradshaw, C. P., Sawyer, A. L., & O'Brennan, L. M. (2009). A social disorganization perspective on bullying-related attitudes and behaviors: The influence of school context. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 43*, 204–220. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10464-009-9240-1>
- Brendgen, M., Boivin, M., Dionne, G., Barker, E. D., Vitaro, F., Girard, A., . . . Pérusse, D. (2011). Gene-environment processes linking aggression, peer victimization, and the teacher-child relationship. *Child Development, 82*, 2021–2036. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2011.01644.x>
- Brendgen, M., Boivin, M., Vitaro, F., Girard, A., Dionne, G., & Pérusse, D. (2008). Gene-environment interaction between peer victimization and child aggression. *Development and Psychopathology, 20*, 455–471. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0954579408000229>
- Brendgen, M., & Girard, A., Vitaro, F., Dionne, G., & Boivin, M. (2013a). Gene-environment correlation linking aggression and peer victimization: Do classroom behavioral norms matter? *Abnormal Child Psychology, 43*, 19–21. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10802-013-9807-z>
- Brendgen, M., Girard, A., Vitaro, F., Dionne, G., & Boivin, M. (2013b). Do peer group norms moderate the expression of genetic risk for aggression? *Journal of Criminal Justice, 41*, 324–330. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2013.06.004>
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Caravita, S., DiBlasio, P., & Salmivalli, C. (2009). Unique and interactive effects of empathy and social status on involvement in bullying. *Social Development, 18*, 140–163. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9507.2008.00465.x>
- Card, N. A., Isaacs, J., & Hodges, E. V. E. (2007). Correlates of school victimization: Implications for prevention and intervention. In J. E. Zins, M. J. Elias, & C. A. Maher (Eds.), *Bullying, victimization, and peer harassment: A handbook of prevention and intervention* (pp. 339–366). New York, NY: Haworth Press.
- Caspi, A., Sugden, K., Moffitt, T. E., Taylor, A., Craig, I. W., Harrington, H., . . . Poulton, R. (2003). Influence of life stress on depression: Moderation by a polymorphism in the 5-HTT gene. *Science, 301*, 386–389. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1083968>
- Chango, J. M., McElhane, K. B., Allen, J. P., Schad, M. M., & Marston, E. (2012). Relational stressors and depressive symptoms in late adolescence: Rejection sensitivity as a vulnerability. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 40*, 369–379. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10802-011-9570-y>
- Chaux, E., Molano, A., & Podlesky, P. (2009). Socio-economic, socio-political and socio-emotional variables explaining school bullying: A country-wide multilevel analysis. *Aggressive Behavior, 35*, 520–529. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ab.20320>
- Cicchetti, D., & Rogosch, F. A. (1996). Equifinality and multifinality in developmental psychopathology. *Development and Psychopathology, 8*, 597–600. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400007318>
- Cicchetti, D., & Toth, S. L. (1998). The development of depression in children and adolescents. *American Psychologist, 53*, 221–241. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.53.2.221>
- Cook, C. R., Williams, K. R., Guerra, N. G., Kim, T. E., & Sadek, S. (2010). Predictors of bullying and victimization in childhood and adolescence: A meta-analytic investigation. *School Psychology Quarterly, 25*, 65–83. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0020149>
- Copeland, W. E., Wolke, D., Angold, A., & Costello, E. J. (2013). Adult psychiatric outcomes of bullying and being bullied by peers in childhood and adolescence. *JAMA Psychiatry, 70*, 419–426. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2013.504>
- Craig, W. M. (1998). The relationship among bullying, victimization, depression, anxiety, and aggression in elementary school children. *Personality and Individual Differences, 24*, 123–130. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(97\)00145-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(97)00145-1)
- Craig, W. M., & Pepler, D. J. (1998). Observations of bullying and victimization in the school yard. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology, 13*, 41–59. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/082957359801300205>
- Cullen, D. (2009). *Columbine*. New York, NY: Hachette Book Group.

- Cullerton-Sen, C., & Crick, N. R. (2005). Understanding the effects of physical and relational victimization: The utility of multiple perspectives in predicting social-emotional adjustment. *School Psychology Review, 34*, 147–160.
- Doll, B., Song, S., & Siemers, E. (2004). Classroom ecologies that support or discourage bullying. In D. L. Espelage & S. M. Swearer (Eds.), *Bullying in American schools: A social-ecological perspective on prevention and intervention* (pp. 161–183). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Duncan, R. D. (2011). Family relationships of bullies and victims. In D. L. Espelage & S. M. Swearer (Eds.), *Bullying in North American schools* (2nd ed., pp. 191–204). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Espelage, D. L., Bosworth, K., & Simon, T. R. (2000). Examining the social context of bullying behaviors in early adolescence. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 78*, 326–333. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.2000.tb01914.x>
- Espelage, D. L., & Holt, M. K. (2001). Bullying and victimization during early adolescence: Peer influences and psychosocial correlates. *Journal of Emotional Abuse, 2*, 123–142. http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J135v02n02_08
- Espelage, D. L., Holt, M. K., & Henkel, R. R. (2003). Examination of peer-group contextual effects on aggression during early adolescence. *Child Development, 74*, 205–220. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00531>
- Espelage, D. L., Rao, M. A., & de la Rue, L. (2013). Current research on school-based bullying: A social-ecological perspective. *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless, 22*, 21–27. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1179/1053078913Z.00000000002>
- Espelage, D. L., & Swearer, S. M. (2003). Research on bullying and victimization: What have we learned and where do we go from here? *School Psychology Review, 32*, 365–383.
- Espelage, D. L., & Swearer, S. M. (2010). A social-ecological model for bullying prevention and intervention: Understanding the impact of adults in the social ecology of youngsters. In S. R. Jimerson, S. M. Swearer, & D. L. Espelage (Eds.), *Handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective* (pp. 61–72). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Fanti, K. A., & Kimonis, E. R. (2012). Bullying and victimization: The role of conduct problems and psychopathic traits. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 22*, 617–631. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2012.00809.x>
- Farmer, T. W., Petrin, R., Robertson, D., Fraser, M., Hall, C., Day, S., & Dadisman, K. (2010). Peer relations of bullies, bully-victims, and victims: The two social worlds of bullying in second-grade classrooms. *The Elementary School Journal, 110*, 364–392. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/648983>
- Ferguson, C. J., & Dyck, D. (2012). Paradigm change in aggression research: The time has come to retire the general aggression model. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 17*, 220–228. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2012.02.007>
- Ferguson, C. J., San Miguel, C., & Hartley, R. D. (2009). A multivariate analysis of youth violence and aggression: The influence of family, peers, depression, and media violence. *The Journal of Pediatrics, 155*, 904–908. e3. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jpeds.2009.06.021>
- Garber, J., & Hilsman, R. (1992). Cognitions, stress, and depression in children and adolescents. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics of North America, 1*, 129–167.
- Garber, J., & Horowitz, J. L. (2002). Depression in children. In I. H. Gotlib & C. L. Hammen (Eds.), *Handbook of depression* (pp. 510–540). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Gazelle, H., & Ladd, G. W. (2003). Anxious solitude and peer exclusion: A diathesis–stress model of internalizing trajectories in childhood. *Child Development, 74*, 257–278. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00534>
- Gendron, B., Williams, K., & Guerra, N. (2011). An analysis of bullying among students within schools: Estimating the effects of individual normative beliefs, self-esteem, and school climate. *Journal of School Violence, 10*, 150–164. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2010.539166>
- Gibb, B. E., & Alloy, L. B. (2006). A prospective test of the hopelessness theory of depression in children. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 35*, 264–274. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15374424jccp3502_10
- Gini, G., Albiero, P., Benelli, B., & Altoè, G. (2007). Does empathy predict adolescents' bullying and defending behavior? *Aggressive Behavior, 33*, 467–476. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ab.20204>
- Gini, G., Albiero, P., Benelli, B., & Altoè, G. (2008). Determinants of adolescents' active defending and passive bystanding behavior in bullying. *Journal of Adolescence, 31*, 93–105. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2007.05.002>
- Gini, G., & Pozzoli, T. (2006). The role of masculinity in children's bullying. *Sex Roles, 54*, 585–588. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-006-9015-1>
- Gini, G., & Pozzoli, T. (2013). Bullied children and psychosomatic problems: A meta-analysis. *Pediatrics, 132*, 720–729. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1542/peds.2013-0614>
- Gini, G., Pozzoli, T., & Hymel, S. (2014). Moral disengagement among children and youth: A meta-analytic review of links to aggressive behavior. *Aggressive Behavior, 40*, 56–68. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ab.21502>
- Graham, S., Bellmore, A., & Juvonen, J. (2007). Peer victimization in middle school: When self- and peer views diverge. In J. E. Zins, M. J. Elias, & C. A. Maher (Eds.), *Bullying, victimization, and peer harassment: A handbook of prevention and intervention* (pp. 121–141). New York, NY: Haworth Press.
- Graham, S., & Juvonen, J. (1998a). A social-cognitive perspective on peer aggression and victimization. In R. Vasta (Ed.), *Annals of child development* (pp. 23–70). London, UK: Jessica Kingsley.
- Graham, S., & Juvonen, J. (1998b). Self-blame and peer victimization in middle school: An attributional analysis. *Developmental Psychology, 34*, 587–599. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.34.3.587>
- Haltigan, J. D., & Vaillancourt, T. (2014). Joint trajectories of bullying and peer victimization across elementary and middle school and associations with symptoms of psychopathology. *Developmental Psychology, 50*, 2426–2436. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0038030>
- Hammen, C. (1991). Generation of stress in the course of unipolar depression. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 100*, 555–561. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.100.4.555>
- Hammen, C., & Rudolph, K. D. (2003). Childhood mood disorders. In E. J. Mash & R. A. Barkley (Eds.), *Child psychopathology* (2nd ed., pp. 233–278). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Hanish, L. D., & Guerra, N. G. (2000). Predictors of peer victimization among urban youth. *Social Development, 9*, 521–543. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-9507.00141>
- Hazler, R. J. (1996). Bystanders: An overlooked factor in peer on peer abuse. *Journal for the Professional Counselor, 11*, 11–21.
- Hong, J. S., & Garbarino, J. (2012). Risk and protective factors for homophobic bullying in schools: An application of the social-ecological framework. *Educational Psychology Review, 24*, 271–285. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10648-012-9194-y>
- Hymel, S., & Bonanno, R. (2014). Moral disengagement processes in bullying. *Theory into Practice, 53*, 278–285. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2014.947219>
- Hymel, S., Rocke Henderson, N., & Bonanno, R. A. (2005). Moral disengagement: A framework for understanding bullying among adolescents. *Journal of Social Sciences, 8*, 1–11.
- Hymel, S., Schonert-Reichl, K. A., Bonanno, R. A., Vaillancourt, T., & Rocke Henderson, N. (2010). Bullying and morality: Understanding how good kids can behave badly. In S. Jimerson, S. M. Swearer, & D. L. Espelage (Eds.), *The handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective* (pp. 101–118). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Iyer, P. A., Dougall, A. L., & Jensen-Campbell, L. A. (2013). Are some adolescents differentially susceptible to the influence of bullying on depression? *Journal of Research in Personality, 47*, 272–281. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2013.02.004>
- Janssen, I., Boyce, W. F., & Pickett, W. (2012). Screen time and physical inactivity in 10- to 16-year-old Canadian youth. *International Journal of Public Health, 57*, 325–331. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00038-010-0221-9>
- Juvonen, J., Nishina, A., & Graham, S. (2000). Peer harassment, psychological adjustment, and school functioning in early adolescence. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 92*, 349–359. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.92.2.349>
- Kaltiala-Heino, R., Rimpelä, M., Marttunen, M., Rimpelä, A., & Rantanen, P. (1999). Bullying, depression, and suicidal ideation in Finnish

- adolescents: School survey. *British Medical Journal*, 319, 348–351. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.319.7206.348>
- Kaltiala-Heino, R., Rimpelä, M., Rantanen, P., & Rimpelä, A. (2000). Bullying at school—An indicator of adolescents at risk for mental disorders. *Journal of Adolescence*, 23, 661–674. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jado.2000.0351>
- Karg, K., Burmeister, M., Shedden, K., & Sen, S. (2011). The serotonin transporter promoter variant (5-HTTLPR), stress, and depression meta-analysis revisited: Evidence of genetic moderation. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 68, 444–454. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1001/archgenpsychiatry.2010.189>
- Kearney, C. A. (2001). *School refusal behavior in youth: A functional approach to assessment and treatment*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/10426-000>
- Knack, J. M., Jensen-Campbell, L. A., & Baum, A. (2011). Worse than sticks and stones? Bullying is associated with altered HPA axis functioning and poorer health. *Brain and Cognition*, 77, 183–190. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bandc.2011.06.011>
- Konishi, C., Hymel, S., Zumbo, B. D., & Li, Z. (2010). Do school bullying and student-teacher relations matter for academic achievement? A multilevel analysis. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology*, 25, 19–39.
- Kumpulainen, K., Räsänen, E., & Puura, K. (2001). Psychiatric disorders and the use of mental health services among children involved in bullying. *Aggressive Behavior*, 27, 102–110. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ab.3>
- Lazarus, R. S. (1993). From psychological stress to the emotions: A history of changing outlooks. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 44, 1–21. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.44.1.1>
- Leen-Feldner, E. W., Zvolensky, M. J., & Feldner, M. T. (2006). A test of a cognitive diathesis–stress model of panic vulnerability among adolescents. In A. J. Sanfelippo (Ed.), *Panic disorders: New research* (pp. 41–64). Hauppauge, NY: Nova Biomedical Books.
- Ma, L., Phelps, E., Lerner, J. V., & Lerner, R. M. (2009). Academic competence for adolescents who bully and who are bullied: Findings from the 4-H study of positive youth development. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 29, 862–897. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0272431609332667>
- Marsh, H. W., Lüdtke, O., Nagengast, B., Trautwein, U., Morin, A., Abduljabbar, A., & Köller, O. (2012). Classroom climate and contextual effects: Conceptual and methodological issues in the evaluation of group-level effects. *Educational Psychologist*, 47, 106–124. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2012.670488>
- Marsh, H. W., Nagengast, B., Morin, A. J. S., Parada, R. H., Craven, R. G., & Hamilton, L. R. (2011). Construct validity of the multidimensional structure of bullying and victimization: An application of exploratory structural equation modeling. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 103, 701–732. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0024122>
- Marsh, H. W., Parada, R. H., Yeung, A., & Healey, J. (2001). Aggressive school troublemakers and victims: A longitudinal model examining the pivotal role of self-concept. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 93, 411–419. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.93.2.411>
- McDougall, P., & Vaillancourt, T. (2015). Long-term adult outcomes of peer victimization in childhood and adolescence: Pathways to adjustment and maladjustment. *American Psychologist*, 70, 300–310. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0039174>
- Monks, C. P., & Smith, P. K. (2006). Definitions of bullying: Age differences in understanding of the term, and the role of experience. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 24, 801–821. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/026151005X82352>
- Muñoz, L. C., Qualter, P., & Padgett, G. (2011). Empathy and bullying: Exploring the influence of callous-unemotional traits. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development*, 42, 183–196. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10578-010-0206-1>
- Navarro, R., Larrañaga, E., & Yubero, S. (2011). Bullying-victimization problems and aggressive tendencies in Spanish secondary school students: The role of gender stereotypical traits. *Social Psychology of Education*, 14, 457–473. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11218-011-9163-1>
- O’Connell, P., Pepler, D., & Craig, W. (1999). Peer involvement in bullying: Insights and challenges for intervention. *Journal of Adolescence*, 22, 437–452. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jado.1999.0238>
- O’Donnell, J., Hawkins, J. D., & Abbott, R. D. (1995). Predicting serious delinquency and substance use among aggressive boys. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 63, 529–537. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.63.4.529>
- Olson, C. K., Kutner, L. A., Baer, L., Beresin, E. V., Warner, D. E., & Nicholi, A. M., Jr. (2009). M-rated video games and aggressive or problem behavior among young adolescents. *Applied Developmental Science*, 13, 188–198. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10888690903288748>
- Olweus, D. (2001). Peer harassment: A critical analysis and some important questions. In J. Juvonen & S. Graham (Eds.), *Peer harassment in school: The plight of the vulnerable and victimized* (pp. 3–20). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Panak, W. F., & Garber, J. (1992). Role of aggression, rejection, and attributions in the prediction of depression in children. *Development and Psychopathology*, 4, 145–165. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400005617>
- Pellegrini, A. D., & Long, J. D. (2004). Part of the solution and part of the problem: The role of peers in bullying, dominance, and victimization during the transition from primary school through secondary school. In D. L. Espelage & S. M. Swearer (Eds.), *Bullying in American schools* (pp. 107–117). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Pepler, D., Craig, W., & O’Connell, P. (2010). Peer processes in bullying: Informing prevention and intervention strategies. In S. R. Jimerson, S. M. Swearer, & D. L. Espelage (Eds.), *Handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective* (pp. 469–479). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Pepler, D., Jiang, D., Craig, W., & Connolly, J. (2008). Developmental trajectories of bullying and associated factors. *Child Development*, 79, 325–338. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2007.01128.x>
- Potthoff, J. G., Holahan, C. J., & Joiner, T. E., Jr. (1995). Reassurance seeking, stress generation, and depressive symptoms: An integrative model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 664–670. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.68.4.664>
- Richard, J. F., Schneider, B. H., & Mallet, P. (2011). Revisiting the whole school approach to bullying: Really looking at the whole school. *School Psychology International*, 33, 263–284. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0143034311415906>
- Rigby, K., & Slee, P. T. (1993). Dimensions of interpersonal relation among Australian children and implications for psychological well-being. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 133, 33–42. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1993.9712116>
- Rivers, I., Poteat, V. P., Noret, N., & Ashurst, N. (2009). Observing bullying at school: The mental health implications of witness status. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 24, 211–223. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0018164>
- Rocke Henderson, N., & Hymel, S. (2011). *Peer responses to school bullying: The role of emotions and friendships in early adolescents bystander problem-solving*. Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Montreal, Canada.
- Rodkin, P. C. (2004). Peer ecologies of aggression and bullying. In D. L. Espelage & S. M. Swearer (Eds.), *Bullying in American schools: A social-ecological perspective on prevention and intervention* (pp. 87–106). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Rodkin, P. C., Espelage, D. L., & Hanish, L. D. (2015). A relational framework for understanding bullying: Developmental antecedents and outcomes. *American Psychologist*, 70, 311–321. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0038658>
- Rodkin, P. C., & Hodges, E. V. E. (2003). Bullies and victims in the peer ecology: Four questions for school service providers and social developmental research. *School Psychology Review*, 32, 384–400.
- Ryoo, J. H., Wang, C., & Swearer, S. M. (2014). Examination of the change in latent statuses in bullying behaviors across time. *School Psychology Quarterly*. Advance online publication. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/spq0000082>
- Sainio, M., Veenstra, R., Huitsing, G., & Salmivalli, C. (2011). Victims and their defenders: A dyadic approach. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 35, 144–151. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0165025410378068>
- Salmivalli, C. (2001). Group view on victimization: Empirical findings and their implications. In J. Juvonen & S. Graham (Eds.), *Peer harassment in school: The plight of the vulnerable and victimized* (pp. 398–419). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

- Salmivalli, C., Kärnä, A., & Poskiparta, E. (2010). From peer putdowns to peer support: A theoretical model and how it translated into a national anti-bullying program. In S. Jimerson, S. Swearer, & D. Espelage (Eds.), *Handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective* (pp. 441–454). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Salmivalli, C., Lagerspetz, K., Bjorkqvist, K., Osterman, K., & Kaukianen, A. (1996). Bullying as a group process: Participant roles and their relations to social status within the group. *Aggressive Behavior*, 22, 1–15. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1098-2337\(1996\)22:1<1::AID-AB1>3.0.CO;2-T](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-2337(1996)22:1<1::AID-AB1>3.0.CO;2-T)
- Salmivalli, C., & Voeten, M. (2004). Connections between attitudes, group norms, and behaviour in bullying situations. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 28, 246–258. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01650250344000488>
- Schmidt, L. A., Polak, C. P., & Spooner, A. L. (2001). Biological and environmental contributions to childhood shyness: A diathesis–stress model. In W. Crozier & L. E. Alden (Eds.), *International handbook of social anxiety: Concepts, research and interventions relating to the self and shyness* (pp. 29–51). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Slee, P. T., & Rigby, K. (1993). Australian school children's self appraisal of interpersonal relations: The bullying experience. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development*, 23, 273–282. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00707680>
- Smith, P. K., Talamelli, L., Cowie, H., Naylor, P., & Chauhan, P. (2004). Profiles of non-victims, escaped victims, continuing victims and new victims of school bullying. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74, 565–581. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/0007099042376427>
- Sokol, N., Bussey, K., & Rapee, R. (2014). *The effect of victims' responses to overt bullying on peer bystander reactions*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Sontag, L. M., & Graber, J. A. (2010). Coping with perceived peer stress: Gender-specific and common pathways to symptoms of psychopathology. *Developmental Psychology*, 46, 1605–1620. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0020617>
- Spriggs, A. L., Iannotti, R. J., Nansel, T. R., & Haynie, D. L. (2007). Adolescent bullying involvement and perceived family, peer and school relations: Commonalities and differences across race/ethnicity. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 41, 283–293. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2007.04.009>
- Srabstein, J., & Piazza, T. (2008). Public health, safety and educational risks associated with bullying behaviors in American adolescents. *International Journal of Adolescent Medicine and Health*, 20, 223–233. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/IJAMH.2008.20.2.223>
- Stark, K. D., Napolitano, S., Swearer, S., Schmidt, K., Jaramillo, D., & Hoyle, J. (1996). Issues in the treatment of depressed children. *Applied & Preventive Psychology*, 5, 59–83. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0962-1849\(96\)80001-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0962-1849(96)80001-1)
- Sugden, K., Arseneault, L., Harrington, H., Moffitt, T. E., Williams, B., & Caspi, A. (2010). Serotonin transporter gene moderates the development of emotional problems among children following bullying victimization. *Journal of the Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 49, 830–840. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jaac.2010.01.024>
- Sutton, J., & Keogh, E. (2001). Components of Machiavellian beliefs in children Relationships with personality. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 30, 137–148. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(00\)00017-9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(00)00017-9)
- Sutton, J., Smith, P. K., & Swettenham, J. (1999a). Bullying and “theory of mind”: A critique of the social skills deficit view of anti-social behavior. *Social Development*, 8, 117–127. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-9507.00083>
- Sutton, J., Smith, P. K., & Swettenham, J. (1999b). Social cognition and bullying: Social inadequacy or skilled manipulation? *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 17, 435–450. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/026151099165384>
- Swearer, S. M., & Espelage, D. L. (2004). A social-ecological framework of bullying among youth. In D. L. Espelage & S. M. Swearer (Eds.), *Bullying in American schools: A social-ecological perspective on prevention and intervention* (pp. 1–12). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Swearer, S. M., Espelage, D. L., Koenig, B., Berry, B., Collins, A., & Lembeck, P. (2012). A social-ecological model of bullying prevention and intervention in early adolescence. In S. R. Jimerson, A. B. Nickerson, M. J. Mayer, & M. J. Furlong (Eds.), *Handbook of school violence and school safety* (pp. 333–355). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Thornton, L. C., Frick, P. J., Crapanzano, A. M., & Terranova, A. M. (2013). The incremental utility of callous-unemotional traits and conduct problems in predicting aggression and bullying in a community sample of boys and girls. *Psychological Assessment*, 25, 366–378. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0031153>
- Trach, J., Hymel, S., Waterhouse, T., & Neale, K. (2010). Bystander responses to school bullying: A cross-sectional investigation of grade and sex differences. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology*, 25, 114–130. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0829573509357553>
- Unnever, J. D., & Cornell, D. G. (2004). Middle school victims of bullying: Who reports being bullied? *Aggressive Behavior*, 30, 373–388. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ab.20030>
- Vaillancourt, T., Hymel, S., & McDougall, P. (2003). Bullying is power: Implications for school-based intervention strategies. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, 19, 157–176. http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J008v19n02_10
- Vaillancourt, T., Hymel, S., & McDougall, P. (2013). The biological underpinnings of peer victimization: Understanding why and how the effects of bullying can last a lifetime. *Theory Into Practice*, 52, 241–248. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2013.829726>
- van der Aa, N., Overbeek, G., Engels, R. C., Scholte, R. H., Meerkerk, G. J., & Van den Eijnden, R. J. (2009). Daily and compulsive internet use and well-being in adolescence: A diathesis–stress model based on big five personality traits. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 38, 765–776. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10964-008-9298-3>
- Vaughn, M. G., Fu, Q., Bender, K., DeLisi, M., Beaver, K. M., Perron, B. E., & Howard, M. O. (2010). Psychiatric correlates of bullying in the United States: Findings from a national sample. *Psychiatric Quarterly*, 81, 183–195. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11126-010-9128-0>
- Veenstra, R., Lindenberg, S., Zijlstra, B. J., De Winter, A. F., Verhulst, F. C., & Ormel, J. (2007). The dyadic nature of bullying and victimization: Testing a dual-perspective theory. *Child Development*, 78, 1843–1854. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2007.01102.x>
- Viding, E., Simmonds, E., Petrides, K. V., & Frederickson, N. (2009). The contribution of callous-unemotional traits and conduct problems to bullying in early adolescence. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 50, 471–481. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2008.02012.x>
- Vitaglione, G., & Barnett, M. (2003). Assessing a new dimension of empathy: Empathic anger as a predictor of helping and punishing desires. *Motivation and Emotion*, 27, 301–325. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1026231622102>
- Walker, E., Downey, G., & Bergman, A. (1989). The effects of parental psychopathology and maltreatment on child behavior: A test of the diathesis–stress model. *Child Development*, 60, 15–24. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1131067>
- Wang, C., Berry, B., & Swearer, S. M. (2013). The critical role of school climate in effective bullying prevention. *Theory Into Practice*, 52, 296–302. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2013.829735>
- White, R., & Mason, R. (2012). Bullying and gangs. *International Journal of Adolescent Medicine and Health*, 24, 57–62. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/ijamh.2012.008>