
SPECIAL TOPIC

Hidden Forms of Victimization in Elementary Students Involved in Bullying

Melissa K. Holt, David Finkelhor, and Glenda Kaufman Kantor
*Family Research Laboratory and Crimes Against Children Research Center,
University of New Hampshire*

Abstract. This study explored the possibility that bullies, victims of bullying, and bully-victims (i.e., youth who both perpetrate and are victims of bullying) are at increased risk for victimization in four other domains: conventional crime, child maltreatment, sexual victimization, and witnessing or indirect victimization. It also evaluated the extent to which victimization in these other domains enhances the prediction of internalizing problems. Participants were 689 fifth-grade students from an urban, ethnically diverse school district in the Northeast. Youth completed self-report measures about bullying involvement, victimization in the home and community, and internalizing problems. Bullies, victims, and bully-victims endorsed more victimization in other domains than students not involved in bullying in one of these capacities; bully-victims had the highest victimization rates overall. Further, although regression models showed that bullying involvement was related to greater internalizing problems, explanatory power was increased through the inclusion of other victimization forms. Findings highlight the need for comprehensive victimization assessment among students involved in bullying in any capacity.

Bullying is a pervasive problem in U.S. schools today and a topic of increasing interest to educators, researchers, and policy makers. Recognizing that youth involved in bullying are at risk for short- and long-term deleterious outcomes (Juvoven, Nishina, & Graham,

For the purposes of compliance with Section 507 of PL 104–208 (the “Stevens Amendment”), readers are advised that 100% of the funds for this program are derived from federal sources (this project was supported by Grant No. 2003-JN-FX-0064 awarded by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice). The total amount of federal funding involved is \$214,131. Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Special thanks to Family Research Laboratory and Crimes Against Children Research Center seminar participants for their helpful comments on a previous draft of this article.

Correspondence regarding this article should be addressed to Melissa K. Holt, Crimes Against Children Research Center, University of New Hampshire, 10 West Edge Drive, Suite 106, Durham, NH 03824; e-mail: melissa.holt@unh.edu.

Copyright 2007 by the National Association of School Psychologists, ISSN 0279-6015

2000; Nansel et al., 2001; Olweus, 1993a), states have responded by passing antibullying legislation (Limber & Small, 2003), and schools have implemented antibullying curricula (Committee for Children, 2001; Limber, Nation, Tracy, Melton, & Flerx, 2004; Olweus, Limber, & Mihalic, 1999). For such endeavors to be effective, though, they must address the complex nature of bullying. However, despite a growing body of research on bullying, to date few studies systematically have explored associations between bullying and a comprehensive range of other forms of victimization (e.g., child maltreatment, sexual victimization). Research is needed to reveal the potential connections between bullying and other victimization domains, and to disentangle the unique effects of bullying involvement from influences of other forms of victimization that children experience in their homes and communities. Such research will result in a more complete picture of factors affecting psychological and academic functioning among youth, and will inform intervention and prevention programs.

The current investigation represents an initial step in this research agenda. Specifically, this study examines rates of victimization experienced by youth in the home and community across bully/victim subtypes. Further, it evaluates the extent to which victimization in other domains enhances the prediction of internalizing problems beyond that which is explained by bullying involvement.

Bully/Victim Subtypes

Initial research endeavors focused on bullying emerged in Scandinavia, where Dan Olweus (1978) spearheaded a nationwide campaign against bullying. This initiative, which began in the 1970s, set forth the following definition of bullying that remains current today: "A student is being bullied or victimized when he or she is exposed, repeatedly and over time, to negative actions on the part of one or more students" (Olweus, 1993b, p. 9). The preceding definition highlights the aggressive component of bullying as well as the associated inherent power imbalance and re-

petitive nature. In recent years scholars have recognized the wide range of behaviors consistent with bullying, including both physical and relational manifestations. Physical bullying consists of overt physical acts directed toward peers, such as hitting or shoving, whereas relational bullying includes actions designed to damage or manipulate relationships (Crick, 1996; Crick & Bigbee, 1998). Some research suggests that physical expressions of bullying are more common among boys, whereas relational aggression is more frequent among girls (Cullerton-Sen & Crick, 2005).

All forms of bullying occur along a continuum, with students assuming roles that include bully, victim, and bully-victim (Espelage, Bosworth, & Simon, 2000; Unnever, 2005). Classifications into these categories typically are made based on self-reports by students or by peer and/or teacher nominations (Nansel et al., 2001; Perren & Alsaker, 2006). Research suggests that self-reports and reports by others each provides unique and important information about the psychosocial functioning of youth (Graham, Bellmore, & Juvonen, 2003). With respect to how bullying subtypes are defined, bullies are perpetrators of aggression but do not experience significant victimization by peers. Conversely, victims are often targets of aggression by peers but are not perpetrators of aggressive acts. Finally, bully-victims are students who are both perpetrators and targets of bullying behavior, and may react aggressively to victimization (and therefore are at times labeled "provocative victims"). Based on these definitions, estimates suggest that nearly one-third of American students are involved in bullying in one of these capacities (Nansel et al., 2001). Specifically, findings derived from a nationally representative sample indicated that among 6th- to 10th-graders, 13% were bullies, 11% were victims, and 6% were bully-victims (Nansel et al., 2001).

Effects of Bullying Involvement

Victims, bullies, and bully-victims often report internalizing and externalizing prob-

lems and poor school adjustment as a result of their involvement in bullying, although effects often vary by group. For example, victims of bullying reveal more loneliness, depression, school avoidance, and suicidal ideation than their nonbullied peers (Hawker & Boulton, 2000; Kaltiala-Heino, Rimpelae, & Rantanen, 2001; Kochenderfer & Ladd, 1996; Neary & Joseph, 1994; Olweus, 1992; Rigby, 2001; Swearer, Song, & Cary, 2001). These effects are not necessarily transitory in nature. Results from Olweus's (1995) longitudinal work indicated that at age 23, individuals who had been chronically victimized in their youth had lower self-esteem and were more depressed than nonvictimized members of their cohort.

Bullies also often experience more psychosocial problems than their peers. For instance, bullies are more likely to engage in externalizing behaviors, to experience conduct problems, and to be delinquent (Haynie, Nansel, & Eitel, 2001; Nansel et al., 2001). Furthermore, long-term outcomes for bullies can be serious; compared to their peers, bullies are more likely to be convicted of crimes in adulthood (Olweus, 1993a). One study conducted in the United States revealed that youth identified as bullies in school had a 25% chance of having a criminal record by age 30 (Eron, Huesmann, Dubow, Romanoff, & Yarnel, 1987).

Finally, considerable research has documented that the most at-risk group of youth is bully-victims. For instance, bully-victims may be more hyperactive, have a greater probability of being referred for psychiatric consultation, and have lower self-esteem than their peers (Kokkinos & Panayiotou, 2004; Kumpulainen, Rasanen, & Henttonen, 1998; Nansel, Haynie, & Simons-Morton, 2003; Nansel et al., 2001). In addition, bully-victims have fewer friends than bullies (Unnever, 2005), and youth in the bully-victim group tend to be the most stigmatized by peers (Ireland & Power, 2004). Accordingly, bully-victims are a particularly important group to address in interventions, and research needs to further delineate what differentiates bully-victims from bullies and victims.

Relation Between Bullying and Other Victimization Forms

The majority of studies on correlates of bullying have focused exclusively on linking bullying involvement to psychological functioning without regard to other forms of victimization. In turn, when statistically significant relations emerge between bullying involvement and psychological functioning, it is assumed that it is bullying involvement that drives these associations. However, there are theoretical and empirical reasons to believe children who bully or who are bullied by their peers experience victimization in additional domains. If this indeed is the case, these additional victimization experiences might help to explain differences in functioning among victims, bullies, and bully-victims.

Theoretical reasons for the overlap between bullying involvement and other forms of victimization can be found in the developmental victimology framework (Finkelhor & Dzuiba-Leatherman, 1994; Finkelhor & Kendall-Tackett, 1997). Developmental victimology is the study of the broad spectrum of children's victimizations over the course of childhood, and the effort to understand the overlaps, common risk factors, interrelationships, and sequencings (Finkelhor, 1997). This framework offers explanations for why youth involved in elementary school bullying also might have more extensive victimization histories. First, many kinds of victimizations have common risk factors. Thus, dangerous neighborhoods, family instability, lack of supervision, and personal characteristics, like obesity or poor social interaction skills, appear related to both peer victimization as well as other kinds of victimization (Finkelhor & Asdigian, 1996; Lagerspetz, 1982). Second, bullying involvement might create a risk for additional kinds of victimization. For instance, bullying perpetration might be associated with risk taking or insensitivity to dangers that make other victimizations more likely (Gordon, Kinlock, & Battjes, 2004; Haynie et al., 2001).

Finally, experiencing other forms of victimization might create vulnerability for bullying perpetration or victimization. For instance, studies have found that family violence

is associated with greater difficulties in peer relations (Jacobsen & Straker, 1982; Nugent, Labram, & McLoughlin, 1998). More specifically, one study found that compared with nonmaltreated children, maltreated children (defined as those who were sexually abused, physically abused, or neglected) were more likely to be victimized by peers (Shields & Cicchetti, 2001). Conversely, an Italian study found that girls exposed to parental domestic violence were more likely to bully peers than girls without such exposure, even after accounting for effects of child abuse (Baldry, 2003). There is also some evidence that sibling and peer bullying and victimization are related (Duncan, 1999).

Less research has focused on the cooccurrence of bullying involvement and extrafamilial victimization. However, it appears that youth who experience bullying victimization also are often targets of sexual harassment and physical and emotional abuse in dating relationships (Holt & Espelage, 2005). Conversely, perpetrators of bullying are more likely to engage in physical and social aggression with dating partners than their peers (Connolly, Pepler, Craig, & Taradash, 2000). Research also suggests that urban youth who are victims of community violence are more likely to be targeted by bullies (Schwartz & Proctor, 2000). This is in part because youth who experience community violence often incur symptoms related to post-traumatic stress disorder, which include difficulties in emotion regulation. Subsequently, emotion regulation problems manifest themselves in social maladjustment in school, which is linked to peer victimization.

Despite this strong theoretical and empirical foundation, few studies have examined bullying involvement in relation to multiple other forms of victimization. Most investigations in this area have evaluated bullying in light of only one or two other victimization domains, with links between family and peer violence being most frequently studied. Further, research rarely has compared victimizations across bully/victim subtypes. However, as detailed below, more comprehensive assessment of youth involved in bullying is essential.

Importance of Comprehensive Assessment

If bullying status is not assessed in conjunction with a more comprehensive victimization inventory, critical information might be missed. For example, some children who are judged as nonvictims in bullying assessment might have considerable victimization profiles. This could apply to youth categorized as bullies (but not victims) or to youth identified as not involved in bullying as a bully, victim, or bully-victim. In addition, some children who are victimized by peers might have a large number and extremely diverse range of additional victimization experiences. This might make it appear that they are more affected by peer victimization than other youth who experience only peer victimization, when in fact part of their difficulties stem from their other victimization experiences. Further, unassessed victimization might account for a considerable part of outcomes or correlates otherwise thought to be explained by bully/victim status. That is to say, analyses using bully/victim status but not comprehensive victimization may overstate the variance attributable to bully/victim status. For instance, evaluating other forms of victimization might increase our understanding of why bully-victims are a particularly high-risk group.

A movement toward more comprehensive assessment is consistent with the social-ecological model of bullying (Orpinas & Horne, 2006; Swearer & Doll, 2001; Swearer & Espelage, 2004). Specifically, social-ecological theory posits that youth are embedded within multiple contexts, including families, schools, and communities, and that the interactions among these contexts must be examined to best understand bullying involvement. Accordingly, it is important to not only assess youth victimization experiences within the school environment, but also the multiple other environments that influence youth. Similarly, social-ecological theory indicates that it is essential to consider how contextual characteristics influence victimization. For instance, although research on bullying indicates that rates do not differ across urban, rural, and

suburban areas (Nansel et al., 2001), youth living in urban environments are more likely to encounter community violence (Schwartz & Proctor, 2000). Research has also documented that school characteristics, such as structure and supervision on playgrounds and staff collaboration, are related to rates of cooperative play (Leff, Costigan, & Power, 2004). Accordingly, comprehensive assessment of victimizations and contexts are critical to our understanding of bullying; this investigation focuses on comprehensive assessment.

Information based on comprehensive victimization assessments will be of great interest and importance to school psychologists and other mental health professionals who work with youth. Specifically, understanding a youth's bullying status coupled with his or her comprehensive victimization profile will allow for more effective interventions and for a better understanding of the range of stressors the youth is experiencing. In particular, school-based bullying prevention programs, such as Steps to Respect (Committee for Children, 2001) or the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program (Olweus et al., 1999), might integrate components addressing other forms of victimization if they indeed are related to bullying involvement.

In sum, bully/victim subtypes have been compared across domains including psychological functioning and long-term outcomes, but to date there has not been a comprehensive examination of whether rates of other victimization forms differ across these subtypes. Adding to knowledge in this area is necessary to understand psychological and school outcomes more accurately.

The current investigation extends research on bullying by examining how victimization rates in four domains—conventional crime (e.g., larceny, attacks by unknown individuals), child maltreatment (e.g., physical abuse, neglect), sexual victimization (e.g., sexual abuse), and witnessing or indirect victimization (e.g., witnessing domestic violence)—vary by bully/victim status. Questions related to bullying involvement were limited to experiences within the school context, whereas questions about other victimizations were broad and included the other envi-

ronments in which youth are embedded. This study also analyzes the degree to which other forms of victimization add to the explanation of internalizing problems beyond that which is explained by bullying involvement. Based on previous literature linking bullying victimization to victimization in other areas (e.g., Holt & Espelage, 2005; Nugent et al., 1998; Shields & Cicchetti, 2001), we expected that students who reported peer victimization would be more likely to report victimization in other domains compared with youth who did not report high levels of peer victimization. Given the dearth of research examining rates of victimization outside school for bullies and bully-victims, we did not have specific hypotheses for how much victimization these groups would report. We further hypothesized that, consistent with previous research, involvement in bullying in any capacity would be related to internalizing problems. Finally, we expected that other victimization forms would add to the prediction of internalizing problems beyond that which was explained by bully/victim subtypes.

Method

Participants

Participants were 689 fifth-grade students from 22 elementary schools in a large northeastern city. There were 333 (48.3%) girls and 347 (50.4%) boys; 9 students did not report their gender (1.3%). Youth described themselves as White, non-Hispanic (30.6%, $n = 210$), Portuguese (9.7%, $n = 67$), Hispanic (9.0%, $n = 62$), Black (8.0%, $n = 55$), Native American (5.4%, $n = 37$), Asian (4.6%, $n = 32$), and biracial or multiracial (32.4%, $n = 226$). The mean age for the sample was 10.83 ($SD = 0.64$) with children ranging from 10 to 12 years old. With respect to socioeconomic status, the school district defined students as low income who met at least one of the following criteria: eligible for free or reduced-price lunch, recipient of the state's equivalent to Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, or eligible for food stamps. Fifty-four percent of students in the district were identified as low-income.

With respect to the community in which the students lived, it was an urban environment with a population of approximately 100,000. Seventeen percent of residents lived below the poverty line according to data derived by the U.S. Census Bureau based on household size and number of children under 18 (e.g., for a family of 4, the poverty line is \$16,895). Crime statistics indicated that the violent crime rate in this community was approximately two times the national average.

Measures

Each participant first completed a demographic questionnaire that included questions about his or her sex, age, grade, and race or ethnicity. For race or ethnicity, participants were given six options, from which they could circle one or more response: African American (not Hispanic), Asian, White (not Hispanic), Hispanic, Native American, and "Other" (with a space to write in one or more racial or ethnic descriptor). Throughout this article we refer to this demographic questionnaire and the measures to be described below as the "survey."

University of Illinois Bully Scale. The nine-item University of Illinois Bully Scale (Espelage & Holt, 2001) was used to assess bullying behavior, including teasing, social exclusion, name-calling, and rumor spreading. Researchers developed this scale based on interviews with middle school students, a review of the research literature on existing bullying measures, and extensive factor analytic investigations (Espelage et al., 2000; Espelage, Holt, & Henkel, 2003). Students were asked to indicate how often in the past 30 days they had engaged in each behavior at school (e.g., "I teased other students" and "I upset other students for the fun of it"). Response options included "Never," "1 or 2 times," "3 or 4 times," "5 or 6 times," and "7 or more times." Higher scores indicated more self-reported bullying behaviors. Espelage and Holt (2001) found a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .87 and the Bullying Scale was found to be moderately correlated ($r = .65$) with the Youth Self-Report Aggression Scale (Achen-

bach, 1991), suggesting convergent validity. Further, the University of Illinois Bully Scale was found to converge with peer nomination data (Espelage et al., 2003). This scale was not significantly correlated with the University of Illinois Victimization Scale ($r = .12$), providing evidence of discriminant validity (Espelage et al., 2003). A Cronbach alpha coefficient of .86 for the University of Illinois Bully Scale was found for the current sample.

University of Illinois Victimization Scale. Peer victimization was assessed using the four-item University of Illinois Victimization Scale (Espelage & Holt, 2001), to which four additional items developed for this project were added to expand the scale. There therefore were eight peer victimization items in total. Researchers developed this scale based on interviews with middle school students, a review of the research literature on existing bullying measures, and extensive factor analytic investigations (Espelage et al., 2000; Espelage et al., 2003). Students were asked how often they had experienced peer victimization in the past 30 days at school (e.g., "Other students called me names," "I got hit and pushed by other students"). Response options included "Never," "1 or 2 times," "3 or 4 times," "5 or 6 times," and "7 or more times." Higher scores indicated more self-reported victimization. This scale was also found to converge with peer nomination data (Espelage et al., 2003). A Cronbach alpha coefficient of .89 for the University of Illinois Victimization Scale was found for the current study.

Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire. Participants completed the Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire (JVQ; Hamby, Finkelhor, Ormrod, & Turner, 2004), a 33-item screening measure that assessed a broad range of victimization across five modules: conventional crime (e.g., having something stolen), child maltreatment (e.g., being physically abused), peer and sibling victimization (e.g., being hit by other kids), sexual victimization (e.g., being forced to do something sexual), and witnessing and indirect victimization (e.g., witnessing domestic violence). The majority of items did not specify particular

locations for these experiences. Each question referred to a specific victimization form (e.g., aggravated assault, dating violence), and respondents indicated whether it had occurred within the past year (response options were “yes” and “no”). It is important to note that child maltreatment items asked about both known *and* unknown perpetrators of physical abuse, emotional or psychological abuse, and neglect, differentiating this measure of child maltreatment from some other instruments in the field.

With respect to scoring, it is possible to consider item level responses or to compute dichotomous scores for each module (i.e., a score of 1 would indicate the participant responded affirmatively to at least one question within that module). The current study used both scoring methods. National norms exist for this measure, and preliminary evidence exists for the questionnaire’s construct validity and reliability (Finkelhor, Hamby, Ormrod, & Turner, 2005). Specifically, JVQ items correlated with traumatic symptom items, providing evidence for construct validity (Finkelhor et al., 2005). Also, there was adequate test-retest reliability across a 3- to 4-week period (Finkelhor et al., 2005).

Internalizing problems. The 21 items from the Anxious/Depressed and Withdrawn/Depressed scales from the Youth Self-Report (Achenbach, 1991) were used to assess internalizing problems. For each of the items, students indicated the degree to which particular statements applied to them (e.g., “I feel lonely,” “I am nervous or tense”). Response options were “Not true,” “Somewhat or sometimes true,” and “Very true or often true.” Higher scores indicated more internalizing problems. National norms exist for this measure and there is significant evidence for its reliability and validity in adolescent populations (Bennett & Bates, 1995; Visser, van der Ende, Koot, & Verhulst, 1999). For instance, the 8-day test-retest reliability coefficient in a sample of nonreferred children was .84 for the Anxious/Depressed Scale and .71 for the Withdrawn/Depressed Scale (Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001). In this same sample, alpha

coefficients were .74 for the Anxious/Withdrawn Scale and .67 for the Withdrawn/Depressed Scale. For multivariate models in the current study, Anxious/Depressed and Withdrawn/Depressed scores were combined into one T-score reflecting internalizing problems. The resulting coefficient alpha was .87.

Procedure

Institutional Review Board approval. Given the sensitive nature of this investigation, researchers worked closely with the institutional review board to ensure the protection of participants’ rights and their safety. The Institutional Review Board reviewed the survey and all other materials to be distributed to parents or guardians and participants (e.g., consent forms) before granting approval. Further, school officials reviewed all materials before granting permission to survey the district’s students.

Passive notice and student assent. Parents or guardians of all fifth-grade students in the district ($N = 884$) were sent letters informing them about the purpose of the study. Parents or guardians were also informed that students’ responses to certain items would trigger reporting, but that responses to other items were confidential. If parents did not want their child to participate, they were asked to sign and return the form to the school; 6% of parents ($n = 53$) returned forms. At the beginning of each survey administration, teachers removed students from the room if they were not allowed to participate, and researchers also reminded students that they should not complete the survey if their parents had returned a form. In addition to passive parental consent, students were asked to assent to participate in the project through a standardized assent form read to students before survey administration. Only one child did not choose to complete the survey.

Survey administration. Surveys were administered to students in classrooms of approximately 25 children. Two researchers were present at each survey administration. At the majority of survey administrations, a

school adjustment counselor, whose role in the school was to counsel students, was also present should any children feel distressed. Students were first informed about the general nature of the investigation. Next, researchers made certain that students were sitting far enough from one another to ensure confidentiality. Students were then given survey packets and asked to answer all questions honestly.

One researcher read questions from the first two pages of the survey aloud to ensure that students understood how to complete the survey. After that, researchers were available to answer questions once students began responding to survey items. The grade level of the survey, as indicated by the Flesch–Kincaid readability index, was 3.8, and therefore appropriate for fifth-grade students to complete by themselves. Measures were not counterbalanced because (1) we read the first two pages of the survey aloud to students to ensure comprehension, and this required that all students have the same items on these pages, and (2) given the sensitive nature of some questions, we designed the order of measures such that students did not answer highly sensitive questions at the beginning or end of the survey. On average, it took students approximately 40 min to complete the survey.

At the end of survey administration, participants were provided with a list of phone numbers to call (e.g., community counseling agencies) should they experience an emotional reaction to the questionnaires, and contact information for the researchers. Last, a raffle was held in each classroom in which one student won a \$10 gift certificate to a local store. Students who did not complete surveys also were eligible for this raffle because we did not want students to be penalized whose parents did not want them to participate in the study.

Reporting of abuse and suicidal ideation. Researchers were not mandated reporters of abuse in the state in which these data were collected. However, to best ensure the safety of student participants, four survey items were flagged as reportable items, three of which asked about sexual abuse and one of which inquired about suicidal ideation. If a

participant endorsed one or more of these items, the student was referred to the school adjustment counselor for immediate follow-up. The investigators' Institutional Review Board approved this reporting procedure. Forty-six students (6.9%) were referred to school adjustment counselors for follow-up about suicidal ideation, and 20 students (2.9%) were referred for follow-up about sexual abuse.

Results

Preliminary Analyses

We first classified students as bullies, victims, bully-victims, or no status so that we could then examine group differences in victimization and internalizing problems. In line with previous research (Demaray & Malecki, 2003; Haynie et al., 2001), students were considered "bullies" if their scores were in the top 25th percentile on the bullying measure and not in the top 25th percentile on the victimization measure. This resulted in 99 (14.4%) youth categorized as bullies. The 83 (12.0%) students classified as "victims" had scores in the top 25th percentile on the peer victimization measure and not in the top 25th percentile on the bullying measure. Youth whose scores were in the top 25th percentile on both the bullying and peer victimization measures were considered "bully-victims"; 54 (7.8%) participants received this classification. Finally, students in none of the above categories were considered "no status" ($N = 451$; 65.7%). Mean peer victimization and bullying scores for each subgroup are displayed in Table 1.

To compare mean bullying and peer victimization scores across groups, we conducted two analyses of variance with group membership as the independent variable and bullying and victimization scores on the University of Illinois Bully Scale and University of Illinois Victimization Scale, respectively, as dependent variables. Although it was expected that their mean scores would differ—given that the groups were divided on the basis of their scores on these measures—this analysis provided additional information about each group, such as the mean bullying score for victims. The overall model for bullying was statistically significant

Table 1
Mean Bullying, Peer Victimization, and Internalizing Problems Scores for Bullies, Victims, Bully-Victims, and No Status Youth

Item	No Status (<i>N</i> = 451)		Bullies (<i>N</i> = 83)		Victims (<i>N</i> = 99)		Bully-Victims (<i>N</i> = 54)	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Bullying	1.54	1.59	10.11*	5.91	2.44*	1.77	10.67*	5.61
Peer victimization	2.69	0.16	4.25*	0.38	15.59*	0.35	17.32*	0.47
Internalizing problems	54.56	5.73	57.30*	5.95	60.36*	7.74	62.02*	9.42

Note. Statistically significant between-group differences among bullies, victims, and bully-victims are discussed in the text.

* No status youth differ from all other groups at $p < .01$.

($F[3, 683] = 313.51, p < .01; \eta^2 = .58$). Post hoc Tukey tests revealed that no status youth reported fewer bullying behaviors than members of all other groups ($p < .01$). In addition, bully-victims had higher bullying scores than no status youth and victims ($p < .01$). Further, bullies reported significantly more bullying behaviors than victims ($p < .01$). With respect to bully victimization, the overall model, as expected, was statistically significant ($F[3, 683] = 596.75, p < .01; \eta^2 = .72$; see Table 1). Post hoc Tukey tests showed that no status students reported less bully victimization than bullies, victims, and bully-victims ($p < .01$). Bully-victims had higher bully victimization scores than bullies and victims ($p < .01$), and victims had higher victimization scores than bullies ($p < .01$).

JVQ Prevalence Rates by Bully/Victim Groups

Prevalence rates for the five JVQ modules were computed for each bully/victim subtype (bullies, victims, bully-victims, no status). Modules reflect conceptual categories of similar victimizations, and include conventional crime, peer and sibling victimization, child maltreatment, sexual victimization, and witnessing or indirect victimization. Next, χ^2 analyses were computed to compare differences across subtypes (see Table 2). Across all

victimization domains, no status youth reported less victimization than youth from the other bully/victim subtypes ($p < .01$). With respect to conventional crime victimization, bully-victims reported significantly more than bullies ($p < .05$) and victims ($p < .01$). Conversely, bully-victims and victims reported more child maltreatment than bullies ($p < .01$) and more peer and sibling victimization than bullies ($p < .01$ and $p < .05$, respectively). In terms of sexual victimization, bully-victims reported more than bullies and victims ($p < .01$). Rates for sexual victimization across bully/victim subtypes were particularly striking. Whereas only 3.1% of no status youth experienced sexual victimization within the last year, 32.1% of bully-victims reported being sexually victimized. Finally, rates of witnessing and indirect victimization were higher for bully-victims and bullies than for victims ($p < .05$).

Multivariate Analysis

Correlations among bully/victim subtypes and JVQ modules were calculated before conducting multivariate analyses to determine if any multicollinearity existed. The JVQ peer and sibling victimization model was not included, given that peer victimization was one component of bully/victim subtype clas-

Table 2
Victimization Prevalence for JVQ Modules by Bully/Victim Subtype

Module	Bullies (<i>N</i> = 83)	Victims (<i>N</i> = 99)	Bully-Victims (<i>N</i> = 54)	No Status (<i>N</i> = 453)
Conventional crime victimization	70.1%	66.3%*	84.2%*	42.5%*
Child maltreatment victimization	24.1%	34.6%*	43.9%*	9.5%*
Peer and sibling victimization	56.3%	71.2%*	80.7%*	36.3%*
Sexual victimization	10.6%	12.1%*	32.1%*	3.1%*
Witnessing and indirect victimization	60.5%	40.9%*	58.8%*	28.1%*

Note. JVQ = Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire. Statistically significant between-group differences among bullies, victims, and bully-victims are discussed in the text.

* No status youth differ from all other groups at $p < .01$.

sification. The resulting correlation matrix is displayed in Table 3. Correlations were small to moderate between bully/victim groups and JVQ modules. Accordingly, it was not necessary to combine or eliminate any variables.

Next, hierarchical linear regression models were computed to determine the degree to which JVQ victimization modules explained additional variance in internalizing problems beyond that explained by bully/victim status. Age, gender, and bully/victim groups were entered in Step 1. Groups were calculated such that a code of 1 was given to the target group (e.g., bullies) and a code of 0 was given to all youth not in that target group. This provided a more conservative test of the effects of bully/victim status because all youth, not just no status youth, were included in the comparison group. In Step 2, the four JVQ modules were entered: conventional crime, child maltreatment, sexual victimization, and witnessing or indirect victimization. These were dichotomous variables, with a code of 1 for children who had been victimized in the domain and a code of 0 for children who had not been victimized in the domain. We then compared the one-step model with the two-step model. In this manner, the contribution of additional victimization beyond bullying involvement could best be understood.

Internalizing Problems

Internalizing problems scores by bully/victim subtypes are displayed in Table 1. The

overall model was statistically significant ($F[3, 678] = 38.50, p < .01; \eta^2 = .15$). In particular, bullies, victims, and bully-victims reported significantly more internalizing problems than no status youth ($p < .01$). Further, bully-victims and victims reported significantly more internalizing problems than bullies ($p < .01$).

With respect to the regression analysis, as shown in Table 4 the two-step regression model yielded three statistically significant predictors of internalizing problems: Bully status ($\beta = .14, p < .01$), victim status ($\beta = .29, p < .01$), and bully-victim status ($\beta = .30, p < .01$). Specifically, youth involved in bullying in any capacity reported greater internalizing problems. Once additional victimization forms were entered into the model, however, bully status no longer was a statistically significant predictor, but bully-victim status and victim status remained significant predictors. Of the JVQ modules, only conventional crime ($\beta = .19, p < .01$) and child maltreatment ($\beta = .16, p < .01$) were significantly associated with internalizing problems once bully/victim status was considered. In particular, youth who experienced higher levels of child maltreatment and conventional crime reported more internalizing problems. The final R^2 for this model was .24, indicating that 24% of the variance in internalizing problems was explained by youth involvement in bullying as bully-victims and victims, and youth experiences with conventional crime and child maltreatment.

Table 3
Correlations Among Bully/Victim Subtypes and JVQ Modules

	Conventional Crime	Child Maltreatment	Sexual Victimization	Witnessing and Indirect
Bully vs. others	.15**	.09*	.02	.21**
Bully-Victim vs. others	.29**	.19**	.27**	.16**
Victim vs. others	.14**	.11**	.06	.05
Conventional crime victimization		.48**	.25**	.52**
Child maltreatment victimization			.33**	.34**
Sexual victimization				.26**

Note. JVQ = Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire. "Others" group consists of all participants not in the target group.

* $p < .05$.

** $p < .01$.

Discussion

The present study explored the relation between bully/victim status and victimization in four domains: conventional crime, child maltreatment, sexual victimization, and witnessing or indirect victimization. Further, this investigation examined the extent to which victimization in other domains helped to explain internalizing problems beyond that which was explained by bully/victim status.

Victimization Rates by Bully/Victim Subtype

Results indicated that youth involved in bullying in any capacity, whether as bullies, victims, or bully-victims, reported more victimization in other domains than no status youth. Rates were particularly striking for bully-victims, who reported markedly higher levels of victimization in all JVQ modules (i.e., conventional crime, child maltreatment, sexual victimization, peer and sibling victimization) except witnessing and indirect victimization. This adds additional support to previous findings that bully-victims are a particularly high-risk group (Kumpulainen et al., 1998; Nansel et al., 2003; Swearer et al., 2001). In particular, research has shown that bully-victims experience a constellation of problems such as lack of school success, so-

cial isolation, and problem behaviors, which taken together put bully-victims at risk for deleterious outcomes (Nansel et al., 2001). Further, the high victimization rates among bully-victims found in the current investigation also help to explain why long-term outcomes for this group are often poor, and why at times they end up requiring psychiatric consultation (Kaltiala-Heino et al., 2001).

Also notable were victimization rates for bullies. Rates suggest that although bullies are primarily perpetrators at school, they report victimization within the home and community.

Not surprisingly, the highest victimization rate for bullies occurs within the conventional crime domain. It might be that certain characteristics of bullies, such as aggressiveness, make them more prone to victimizations such as being attacked on the street. Without a tendency to walk away from confrontations, conflicts might escalate and result in a crime being committed against the bully. Further, it might be that because bullies tend to associate with other aggressive youth (Espelage et al., 2003), some of the victimizations they experience at the hands of these associates occurs outside the school environment. For instance, friends might break their things or steal something from them. Or, it might be that because bullies are used to being in positions of power, they incite resentment and competitive aggres-

Table 4
Hierarchical Linear Regression Predicting Internalizing Problems by Bully/Victim Status and JVQ Modules

Steps	Model with Bully/Victim Status Only (<i>N</i> = 678)			Model with Bully/Victim Status and JVQ Modules (<i>N</i> = 639)		
	<i>b</i>	<i>SEb</i>	β	<i>b</i>	<i>SEb</i>	β
Step 1 (status)						
Age	-0.47	0.40	-.04	-0.40	0.38	-.04
Gender (girl = 0)	0.52	0.51	.04	-0.08	0.50	-.01
Bullies vs. others	2.85	0.79	.14**	1.29	0.79	.06
Victims vs. others	5.63	0.74	.29**	4.16	0.73	.21**
Bully-victims vs. others	7.71	0.96	.30**	5.00	0.99	.19**
Step 2 (JVQ Modules)						
Conventional crime				0.87	0.21	.19**
Child maltreatment				1.72	0.45	.16**
Sexual victimization				-0.24	0.66	-.01
Witnessing or indirect				0.24	0.25	.05

Note. JVQ = Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire; *SEb* = standard error of beta. For final model $R^2 = .153$ for Step 1 ($p < .01$); $\Delta R^2 = .09$ for Step 2 ($p < .01$).

* $p < .01$.
 ** $p < .05$.

sion from others desiring power, which in turn culminates into victimization experiences for the bully.

As expected, peer victims also reported considerable victimization profiles in other domains, although interestingly rates were not higher for victims than bullies in all areas. It is consistent with the developmental victimology framework (Finkelhor & Dziuba-Leatherman, 1994; Finkelhor & Kendall-Tackett, 1997), however, that peer victims had higher rates of child maltreatment and sexual victimization than bullies. Just as bullies' characteristics such as aggression might encourage conventional crime victimizations, victims' characteristics such as passivity and smaller size might make them more probable targets of child maltreatment and sexual victimization. Similarly, this research suggests that there is likely some constellation of environmental and other risk factors, including victimizations in the home and community, which are most relevant to victims. This is an area that warrants further exploration.

Finally, it should be noted that even victimization rates for no status youth across victimization domains were somewhat high. For instance, 43% of no status youth reported conventional crime victimizations. This is probably, in part, because of their community context; as previous research indicates, youth who live in urban environments are more likely to encounter community violence through direct victimization or witnessing than youth who live in nonurban environments (Schwartz & Proctor, 2000).

Predicting Internalizing Problems

Involvement in bullying in any capacity was related to greater reported internalizing problems when no other victimization forms were considered. In particular, bullies, victims, and bully-victims all reported more internalizing problems than no status students. However, in multivariate models, once the JVQ victimization domains were added to the model, bully group membership was no longer

a significant predictor of internalizing problems. Further, child maltreatment and conventional crime victimization made unique contributions to the prediction of internalizing problems beyond that explained by bullying involvement. This highlights the strong relation between child maltreatment and adverse outcomes. Further, perhaps the reason bully status is sometimes shown to be linked to internalizing and externalizing problems is because bullies also are likely to experience conventional crime, and it is the conventional crime victimization that better accounts for internalizing problems.

Overall, the regression models suggest that some of the previously documented relations between bullying involvement and internalizing problems might in part have been a function of victimizations not included in models. This is consistent with the social-ecological model of bullying, which highlights the importance of understanding the multiple contexts in which youth are embedded and the ways in which these contexts interact. Further, it points to the importance of early intervention among victimized youth, given that these internalizing problems might be precursors to disorders in adulthood such as depression (MacMillan et al., 2001). Findings about the salience of other victimization forms have important implications for school-wide and individual interventions.

Practice Implications

This study has numerous implications for professionals within and outside of schools who work with youth. First, for school officials to be helpful and to intervene appropriately, they must know more about the range of victimizations students experience beyond bullying involvement. Accordingly, as part of bullying prevention programs or individual counseling interventions, it is critical to assess and address the range of victimizations to which students have potentially been exposed. Such assessments should be considered an integral component of intervention efforts given that other victimizations likely influence youth involvement in bullying, their responses to it,

and their psychological well-being. Assessments should inquire about school-based victimizations in particular and also about victimizations occurring in other contexts such as the home and community. This type of assessment component is consistent with a data-based decision-making model that provides schools with guidelines for how to select bullying prevention and intervention programs for the school based on assessment data collected within a particular school (Swearer & Espelage, 2004). There are also books available that guide schools through the assessment and program selection process (Orpinas & Horne, 2006). Finally, such assessments are an integral component of programs that attempt to address the many contexts in which youth are embedded, such as the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program (Olweus et al., 1999).

Second, the label of bully-victim underplays and minimizes the seriousness of victimization some youth in this category experience. As shown in this study, a significant number of bully-victims experience child maltreatment, conventional crime, sexual victimization, and indirect victimization. These youth might need more comprehensive counseling outside of the school environment and potentially family therapy to deal with these issues. Similarly, the label of bully obscures the fact that some bullies experience considerable victimization. Individuals who design and implement bullying prevention programs should recognize that although bullies are perpetrators at school, they might be victims at home or in the community. Accordingly, in addition to efforts in existing bullying prevention programs aimed at helping bullies to diminish their aggressive behaviors, programs should be expanded to address the internalizing problems youth might have experienced as a result of being victimized.

Limitations and Future Directions

This study was cross-sectional in nature, and therefore inferences cannot be made about causality or directionality. In addition, respondents were youth from only one school district, and therefore findings might not generalize to all fifth-graders in the United States.

Similarly, the sample was composed of a relatively high percentage of minority youth from urban settings, and accordingly the study should be replicated with other groups of youth. Further, similar projects should examine links between bullying involvement and other forms of victimization among older youth. In addition, students whose parents did not want them to participate in the project might be different from their peers in ways that could have influenced study findings. Another potential limitation was that youth who responded affirmatively to one item within a JVQ module were considered to have experienced that victimization form (e.g., conventional crime). It is possible that a more stringent cutoff would have yielded different results. Finally, findings are based on self-report data and accordingly have some limitations (Juvonen et al., 2000), although research points to the importance of collecting self-report data given that it yields unique information (Graham et al., 2003).

In the future, longitudinal studies are needed to better evaluate how developmental victimology theory applies to bullying involvement. Is it that certain characteristics, such as aggression, are inherent in particular youth and predispose them to be perpetrators in school and victims in other domains? Or, is it that youth characteristics such as passivity or problems with emotional regulation develop as a result of victimizations, and then in turn increase a child's likelihood of being victimized in other domains? Following children from a young age would allow a comprehensive assessment of these issues. Future research should also examine whether youth who are involved in bullying and are victimized in other domains experience more internalizing problems than peers who do not have such extensive victimization histories.

Conclusion

This study represents an important first step in broadening our understanding of the victimizations bullies, victims, and bully-victims experience in their homes and communities, and strongly suggests the need for more

comprehensive bullying assessment. Assessments should take place within the context of meetings between school psychologists and youth, and school-based prevention and intervention programs should include components that address potentially hidden victimizations among youth involved in bullying.

References

- Achenbach, T., & Rescorla, L. (2001). *Manual for the ASEBA School-Age Forms & Profiles*. Burlington: University of Vermont, Research Center for Children, Youth, & Families.
- Achenbach, T. M. (1991). *Integrative guide for the 1991 CBCL/4-18, YSR, and TRF profiles*. Burlington: University of Vermont, Department of Psychiatry.
- Baldry, A. C. (2003). Bullying in schools and exposure to domestic violence. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 27(7), 713-732.
- Bennett, D. S., & Bates, J. E. (1995). Prospective models of depressive symptoms in early adolescence: Attributional style, stress, and support. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 15, 299-315.
- Committee for Children. (2001). *Steps to Respect: A bullying prevention program*. Seattle, WA: Author.
- Connolly, J., Pepler, D., Craig, W., & Taradash, A. (2000). Dating experiences of bullies in early adolescence. *Child Maltreatment*, 5(4), 299-310.
- Crick, N. R. (1996). The role of relational aggression, overt aggression, and prosocial behavior in the prediction of children's future social adjustment. *Child Development*, 67, 2317-2327.
- Crick, N. R., & Bigbee, M. A. (1998). Relational and overt forms of peer victimization: A multiinformant approach. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 66, 337-347.
- 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.
- Demaray, M. K., & Malecki, C. K. (2003). Perceptions of the frequency and importance of social support by students classified as victims, bullies, and bully/victims in an urban middle school. *School Psychology Review*, 32(3), 471-489.
- Duncan, R. D. (1999). Peer and sibling aggression: An investigation of intra- and extra-familial bullying. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 14(8), 871-886.
- Eron, L. D., Huesmann, L. R., Dubow, E., Romanoff, R., & Yarnel, P. W. (1987). Aggression and its correlates over 22 years. In D. H. Crowell & I. M. Evans (Eds.), *Childhood aggression and violence: Sources of influence, prevention, and control* (pp. 249-262). New York: Plenum Press.
- Espelage, D. L., Bosworth, K., & Simon, T. R. (2000). Examining the social context of bullying behaviors in early adolescence. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 78(3), 326-333.
- Espelage, D. L., & Holt, M. K. (2001). Bullying and victimization during early adolescence: Peer influences and psychosocial correlates. In R. Geffner & M. Loring (Eds.), *Bullying behaviors: Current issues, research,*

- and interventions (pp. 123–142). Binghamton, NY: The Haworth Press.
- Espelage, D. L., Holt, M. K., & Henkel, R. R. (2003). Examination of peer-group contextual effects on aggression during early adolescence. *Child Development, 74*(1), 205–220.
- Finkelhor, D. (1997). The victimization of children and youth: Developmental victimology. In R. C. Davis, A. J. Lurigio, & W. G. Skogan (Eds.), *Victims of crime* (pp. 86–107). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Finkelhor, D., & Asdigian, N. L. (1996). Risk factors for youth victimization: Beyond a lifestyles/routine activities theory approach. *Violence and Victims, 11*, 3–20.
- Finkelhor, D., & Dziuba-Leatherman, J. (1994). Children as victims of violence: A national survey. *Pediatrics, 94*(4), 413–420.
- Finkelhor, D., Hamby, S. L., Ormrod, R., & Turner, H. (2005). The Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire: Reliability, validity, and national norms. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 29*(4), 383–412.
- Finkelhor, D., & Kendall-Tackett, K. (1997). A developmental perspective on the childhood impact of crime, abuse, and violent victimization. In D. Cicchetti & S. Toth (Eds.), *Developmental perspectives on trauma: Theory, research, and intervention* (pp. 1–32). New York: University of Rochester Press.
- Gordon, M. S., Kinlock, T. W., & Battjes, R. J. (2004). Correlates of early substance use and crime among adolescents entering outpatient substance abuse treatment. *Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse, 30*, 39–59.
- Graham, S., Bellmore, A., & Juvonen, J. (2003). Peer victimization in middle school: When self- and peer views diverge. *Journal of Applied School Psychology, 19*, 117–137.
- Hamby, S. L., Finkelhor, D., Ormrod, R., & Turner, H. (2004). *The Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire (JVQ): Child self-report version*. Durham, NH: Crimes Against Children Research Center.
- Hawker, D. S. J., & Boulton, M. J. (2000). Twenty years' research on peer victimization and psychosocial maladjustment: A meta-analytic review of cross-sectional studies. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines, 41*, 441–455.
- Haynie, D. L., Nansel, T., & Eitel, P. (2001). Bullies, victims, and bully/victims: Distinct groups of at-risk youth. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 21*, 29–49.
- Holt, M., & Espelage, D. (2005). Peer victimization among adolescents: A preliminary perspective on the co-occurrence of sexual harassment, dating violence, and bullying victimization. In K. Kendall-Tackett & S. Giacomoni (Eds.), *Victimization of children and youth: Patterns of abuse, response strategies* (pp. 13.11–13.16). Kingston, NJ: Civic Research Institute.
- Ireland, J. L., & Power, C. L. (2004). Attachment, emotional loneliness, and bullying behavior: A study of adult and young offenders. *Aggressive Behavior, 30*, 298–312.
- Jacobsen, R. S., & Straker, G. (1982). Peer group interaction of physically abused children. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 6*, 321–327.
- Juvonen, J., Nishina, A., & Graham, S. (2000). Self-views versus peer perceptions of victim status among early adolescents. In J. Juvonen & S. Graham (Eds.), *Peer harassment in schools: The plight of the vulnerable and victimized* (pp. 105–124). New York: Guilford Press.
- Kaltiala-Heino, R., Rimpelae, M., & Rantanen, P. (2001). Bullying at school: An indicator for adolescents at risk for mental disorders. *Journal of Adolescence, 23*, 661–674.
- Kochenderfer, B. J., & Ladd, G. W. (1996). Peer victimization: Cause or consequence of school maladjustment? *Child Development, 67*, 1305–1317.
- Kokkinos, C. M., & Panayiotou, G. (2004). Predicting bullying and victimization among early adolescents: Associations with disruptive behavior disorders. *Aggressive Behavior, 30*, 520–533.
- Kumpulainen, K., Rasanen, E., & Henttonen, I. (1998). Children involved in bullying: Psychological disturbance and the persistence of the involvement. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 23*, 1253–1262.
- Lagerspetz, K. M. (1982). Group aggression among school children in three schools. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 23*, 45–52.
- Leff, S. S., Costigan, T., & Power, T. J. (2004). Using participatory research to develop a playground-based prevention program. *Journal of School Psychology, 42*, 3–21.
- Limber, S. P., Nation, M., Tracy, A. J., Melton, G. B., & Flerx, V. (2004). Implementation of the Olweus Bullying Prevention programme in the southeastern United States. In P. K. Smith, D. Pepler, & K. Rigby (Eds.), *Bullying in schools: How successful can interventions be?* (pp. 55–79). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Limber, S. P., & Small, M. A. (2003). State laws and policies to address bullying in schools. *School Psychology Review, 32*, 445–455.
- MacMillan, H. L., Fleming, J. E., Streiner, D. L., Lin, E., Boyle, M. H., Jamieson, E., et al. (2001). Childhood abuse and lifetime psychopathology in a community sample. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 158*, 1878–1883.
- Nansel, T. R., Haynie, D. L., & Simons-Morton, B. G. (2003). The association of bullying and victimization with middle school adjustment. *Journal of Applied School Psychology, 19*, 45–61.
- Nansel, T. R., Overpeck, M., Pilla, R. S., Ruan, W. J., Simons-Morton, B. G., & Scheidt, P. (2001). Bullying behaviors among US youth: Prevalence and association with psychosocial adjustment. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 285*, 2094–2100.
- Neary, A., & Joseph, S. (1994). Peer victimization and its relation to self-concept and depression among schoolgirls. *Personality and Individual Differences, 16*, 183–186.
- Nugent, M., Labram, A., & McLoughlin, L. (1998). The effects of child sexual abuse on school life. *Educational and Child Psychology, 15*(4), 68–78.
- Olweus, D. (1978). *Aggression the schools: Bullies and whipping boys*. Oxford, England: Hemisphere.
- Olweus, D. (1992). Bullying among schoolchildren: Intervention and prevention. In R. D. Peters, R. J. McMahon, & V. L. Quinse (Eds.), *Aggression and violence throughout the life span* (pp. 100–125). London: Sage Publications.
- Olweus, D. (1993a). Bully/victim problems among schoolchildren: Long-term consequences and an effective intervention program. In S. Hodgins (Ed.), *Mental disorder and crime* (pp. 317–349). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Olweus, D. (1993b). *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Olweus, D. (1995). Bullying or peer abuse at school: Facts and interventions. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 4(6), 196–200.
- Olweus, D., Limber, S. S., & Mihalic, S. (1999). *The Bullying-Prevention Program: Blueprints for violence prevention*. Boulder, CO: Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence.
- Orpinas, P., & Horne, A. M. (2006). *Bullying prevention: Creating a positive school climate and developing social competence*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Perrin, S., & Alasaker, F. D. (2006). Social behavior and peer relationships of victims, bully-victims, and bullies in kindergarten. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 47, 45–57.
- Rigby, K. (2001). Health consequences of bullying and its prevention in schools. In J. Juvonen & S. Graham (Eds.), *Peer harassment in school: The plight of the vulnerable and victimized* (pp. 310–331). New York: Guilford Press.
- Schwartz, D., & Proctor, L. J. (2000). Community violence exposure and children's social adjustment in the school group: The mediating roles of emotional regulation and social cognition. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 68, 670–683.
- Shields, A., & Cicchetti, D. (2001). Parental maltreatment and emotion dysregulation as risk factors for bullying and victimization in middle childhood. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 30(3), 349–363.
- Swearer, S. M., & Doll, B. (2001). Bullying in schools: An ecological framework. *Journal of Emotional Abuse*, 2, 7–23.
- Swearer, S. M., & Espelage, D. (2004). Introduction: A social-ecological framework of bullying among youth. In D. Espelage & S. M. Swearer (Eds.), *Bullying in American schools: A social-ecological perspective on prevention and intervention* (pp. 1–12). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Swearer, S. M., Song, S. Y., & Cary, P. T. (2001). Psychosocial correlates in bullying and victimization: The relationship between depression, anxiety, and bully/victim status. In R. A. Geffner & M. Loring (Eds.), *Bullying behavior: Current issues, research, and interventions* (pp. 95–121). Binghamton, NY: Haworth Maltreatment and Trauma Press/The Haworth Press, Inc.
- Unnever, J. D. (2005). Bullies, aggressive victims, and victims: Are they distinct groups? *Aggressive Behavior*, 31, 153–171.
- Visser, J. J., van der Ende, J., Koot, H. M., & Verhulst, F. C. (1999). Continuity of psychopathology in youth referred to mental health services. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 38, 1560–1568.

Date Received: May 1, 2006

Date Accepted: March 14, 2007

Action Editor: Susan Swearer ■

Melissa K. Holt, PhD, is Research Assistant Professor of Psychology at the University of New Hampshire Family Research Laboratory and Crimes Against Children Research Center. Her primary research interests are bullying, child abuse and neglect, multiple victimization among adolescents, and factors promoting resiliency among victimized youth.

David Finkelhor, PhD, is Director of Crimes Against Children Research Center, Co-Director of the Family Research Laboratory, and Professor of Sociology at the University of New Hampshire. He has been studying the problems of child victimization, child maltreatment, and family violence since 1977, and has written about child homicide, missing and abducted children, and children exposed to domestic and peer violence and other forms of family violence. In his recent work, he has tried to unify and integrate knowledge about all the diverse forms of child victimization in a field he has termed “developmental victimology.”

Glenda Kaufman Kantor, PhD, is a sociologist and Research Associate Professor at the Family Research Laboratory, the Department of Sociology, and the Crimes Against Children Research Center at the University of New Hampshire. Her major interests are related to the assessment and prevention of maladaptive risk behaviors related to violence, the etiology and prevention of intimate violence, the linkages between substance abuse and family violence, and child abuse and neglect.