The Philippine secondary school experience of bullying through the lens of Bronfenbrenner's socioecological theory

Mary Anallyn V. Esguerra[1]*, Ronaldo SP. Elicay[2], Cynthia B. Correo[3]

Structured abstract

Background: Bullying is a complex social phenomenon influenced by a myriad of factors, including psychological and environmental ones. It is generally perceived as dangerous and life-threatening and, thus, must be urgently addressed.

Purpose: Investigate the prevalence and the actual bullying experiences of Filipino junior high school students using Urie Bronfenbrenner's socioecological theory or ecological model of development as a framework.

Participants: 1,090 students from nine selected secondary schools in the 4th and 6th District in the province of Batangas, with 30 of them chosen as key informants

Research design: Mixed method expansion sequential research design

Data collection and analysis: The V-SCAIRD Acts of Bullying Inventory Tool was administered to determine the prevalence of bullying (by bullying role, form of bullying, and effect of bullying) across genders and school types. Independent sample t-tests were used to compare male and female differences in the bullying roles, the forms of bullying, and the effects of bullying across genders. Analysis of variance showed the degree of significant differences in the bullying roles, the forms of bullying, and the effects of bullying across school types. Fisher's least significant difference test was run as post hoc test. All statistical analyses were tested at $p < .05$. The students who scored high as bullies, victims, and bystanders were interviewed to draw out their actual bullying experiences and the possible psycho-social environmental factors influencing this social phenomenon.

Findings: Prevalence rates of 8, 14, and 78 in 100 students translate to one bully, two victims, and seven bystanders in every 10 students, with a victimization ratio of 1:5. Male students exhibited a significantly higher tendency to be bullies and victims. All forms of bullying (covert indirect, cyberbullying, physical, and verbal) were experienced by students regardless of gender. However, it appeared that the male students were more exposed to verbal bullying while the female students were more exposed to cyberbullying. Significant gender differences were found in the students' experiences of the cognitive, affective, and behavioral effects of bullying. Across school types, no significant differences were found in bully tendencies, but a significant difference was found in victim tendencies between public and Catholic schools, with the former having a higher rate than the latter. Students from both Catholic and non-sectarian schools registered a significantly higher tendency to become bystanders than those in public schools. The interview disclosed various forms of bullying experienced by the students, categorized into covert indirect, cyberbullying, physical, and verbal types. Verbal abuse from family members was reported, primarily due to failed expectations such as perceived poor academic performance. Psycho-social factors influencing bullying phenomenon in schools include teachers' attitude in school, peer influence, and school discipline.

Recommendation: Provide continuing professional development to teachers on bullying management in schools and create clear structure and school policies that emphasize home and school partnership and certain discipline in school.

Keywords
bullying prevalence, bullying roles, forms of bullying, effects of bullying, gender-specific bullying, school-based bullying

[1]Mary Anallyn V. Esguerra, R.G.S., *Ateneo de Naga University, Naga City, Philippines* https://orcid.org/0009-0008-4648-7797
[2]*Ateneo de Naga University, Naga City, Philippines* https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1773-9584
[3]*Ateneo de Naga University, Naga City, Philippines* https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1538-6172
***Corresponding author**: lynrgs@gmail.com

Introduction

Bullying is considered one of the most pressing educational issues worldwide because of its cataclysmal effects on various levels of society from individuals to families, schools, neighborhoods, and other societal institutions. Teachers who bully children, students who

bully teachers, parents who bully administrators, parents who bully students, or students who bully their peers certainly exist, giving rise to the perception that school is no longer a safe and healthy place (Due et al., 2005; Gofin & Avitzour, 2012; Pörhölä et al., 2020), particularly for vulnerable populations such as those with disability or suffering from extreme poverty (Campbell et al., 2017; National Center for Education Statistics, 2019; Rose & Gage, 2017).

The key facts from the United Nations Children Fund (UNICEF) (Selim, 2018) confirmed the high degree of peer aggression in school settings with approximately half of the students in junior high school around the world experiencing peer-to-peer bullying. The Philippines has not been spared from this socioeducational concern (Plan Philippines, 2008; Selim, 2018), prompting scholars to delve into the issue and investigate its prevalence and severity in the local context (Balatbat et al., 2014; Cardona et al., 2015; Maximo & Loy, 2014).

Recognized as an intricate social phenomenon, bullying has been proven to have multidimensional negative effects on individuals, both short- (e.g., physical injuries, academic problems, cohort survival, depression, self-harm) and long-term (e.g., social and emotional difficulties, poor financial management, suicidal ideation) (Bowes et al., 2015; Gladden et al., 2014; Heydenberk & Heydenberk, 2017; Wolke & Lereya, 2015). The feeling of being powerless, intimidated, and humiliated as a result of bullying may consume some individuals even long after the bullying incident. Bowes et al.'s (2015) study suggests that depression among young adults could be partially attributed to peer victimization in earlier years. Wolke and Lereya's (2015) careful review of studies on the ill effects of bullying found many debilitating effects of bullying even 40 to 50 years later.

Given bullying's complexity and impact on student lives, it becomes imperative to investigate the extent of its prevalence, the factors that influence bullying behaviors, and the psychological and sociocultural profile of students involved in the bullying act. It has been noted that the extent and magnitude of bullying within the school context are quite unknown, particularly in the Philippine setting, due to lack of systematic collation of data. At the national level, bullying data in the Philippines is limited to reported cases from the Legal Department of the Department of Education, the Department of Social Welfare and Development, the PGH Child Protection Unit, and the Philippine National Police. Moreover, most studies conducted in the Philippines focused on certain aspects of bullying only, such as frequency, prevalence rate, and common types of bullying (Balatbat et al., 2014; Rastrullo & Francisco, 2015; Sanapo, 2017) or classroom management approaches to mitigate bullying incidence (Cardona et al., 2015).

To fill the gap in current literature, we approached bul-

lying from a broader perspective by addressing not only individual level predictors but also peer, family, school, community, and cultural contexts through the socioecological lens of Urie Bronfenbrenner (1979, 1994/1997). This report, which is part of a more comprehensive study, focuses on the first two phases. Phase 1 investigated the prevalence of bullying in terms of the bullying role, the form of bullying, and the effect of bullying according to gender and school type, while Phase 2 delved into the actual bullying experiences and the nature of school environment of the individual participants.

Problem statement
Phase 1 sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the prevalence of bullying according to gender and school type among Filipino junior high school students?
2. What are the common forms and effects of bullying according to gender and school type?
3. Are there differences in the bullying roles, forms of bullying, and effects of bullying across genders and school types?

Phase 2 aimed to further understand bullying as experienced particularly by junior high school students. This part of the study intended to establish the nature and forms of bullying experienced in school settings and the school factors contributing to the bullying behaviors of the selected bullies, victims, and bystanders.

4. What are the nature and forms of bullying experienced by the selected students involved in bullying, particularly in school settings?
5. What psycho-social environmental factors could have influenced bullying behavior in the school context?

Research hypotheses
The following hypotheses were tested in the study.

1. There are significant differences in the bullying roles, forms of bullying, and effects of bullying across genders.
2. There are significant differences in the bullying roles, forms of bullying, and effects of bullying across school types.

Bullying as a social phenomenon
In describing bullying, many researchers quote Olweus and Limber (2010) who defined it as "an aggressive behavior or intentional harm carried out repeatedly and over time in an interpersonal relationship characterized by an actual or perceived imbalance of power or strength" (p. 25). The elements of intentionality, aggression, imbalance of power, and repetition were also emphasized by other scholars (e.g., Bosworth & Judkins, 2014; Hymel &

Swearer, 2015). Hymel and Swearer (2015) reiterate that abuse of power distinguishes bullying from other forms of aggression, highlighting the use of strength, physical or otherwise, of one person or even a group over another. The repetitive nature of bullying is also stressed by the American Psychological Association (2018) in its definition of bullying as "a form of intentional and repeated aggressive act that causes another person injury or discomfort" (¶1).

The Anti-Bullying Act of 2013, under the Philippine law, defines bullying as "any severe, or repeated use by one or more students of a written, verbal, or electronic expression, or a physical act or gesture, or any combination thereof, directed at another student that has the effect of actually causing or placing the latter in reasonable fear of physical or emotional harm or damage to his property; creating a hostile environment at school for the other student; infringing on the rights of the other student at school" (*Republic Act No. 10627*, 2013, §2). This document, together with the other literature on bullying, underscores direct or indirect aggression, intentionality, repetition, and power imbalance as the underlying elements of bullying.

As a form of aggression, bullying can be viewed in two forms, namely proactive and reactive aggression (Hanish et al., 2004). Unlike proactive aggression which is a goal-oriented behavior, reactive aggression is a response to a perceived threat or social provocation. Harris (2009), for his part, classified bullying as either a direct behavior or an indirect behavior. The first classification involves discriminatory behavior such as mauling, beating, sexual harassment, physical assaults, pushing/shoving, biting, cases of extortion, theft, hitting, spitting, kicking, and throwing of papers. On the other hand, indirect behavior involves spreading rumors, verbal discrimination, mockery, insults, social exclusion, dirty looks, and other negative gestures which are much harder to detect.

Antiri (2016), who classified bullying into physical, social, verbal, cyber, and psychological, confirmed earlier findings that the verbal type of bullying is the most prevalent bullying form (e.g., Balatbat et al., 2014). In recent years, the prolific use of social media ushered a new platform for cyberbullying in many parts of the world (Antiri, 2016; *CyberSafe: Survey 2015*, 2016; Fretwell, 2015). Watkins (2003) stressed that this societal concern may perpetuate as it is still considered by many as part of human nature which can no longer be changed.

Literature on bullying has identified four roles involved in this aggressive behavior: bullies, bystanders, victims, and bully-victims (e.g., Huang et al., 2013; Psalti, 2012; Seixas et al., 2013; Smith, 2004; Swearer et al., 2010; Yang et al., 2016; Yang & Salmivalli, 2013). The bullies are usually the strongest among peers and thus can cause repeated harm. Found to have a strong need for power, they take an initiative stance as perpetrator and foster violent behavior over others. The bystanders, on the other hand, serve as the audience of a bullying action usually taking place in front of them. They are considered the largest group in bullying incidents. They can support the bully, defend the victim, or serve as passive onlookers. In the majority of cases, bystanders attend without intervening, but still they are considered an integral part of the bullying situation. The third role is taken by the victims who are regarded as the target of bullying. They are the ones who experience hostile behavior and retaliation continually. They are of lower status than their aggressors, tend to isolate themselves, appear unable to defend themselves, and are in need of protection (Smith, 2004). Children who are perpetrators of bullying and are also victims of bullying take the fourth role, bully-victims. Scholars have reported that bully-victims tend to commit significantly more bullying in various forms (i.e., physical, verbal, cyberbullying) compared to pure bullies (e.g., Seixas et al., 2013; Yang et al., 2016; Yang & Salmivalli, 2013). They also tend to perform less favorably in psychosocial and behavioral measures than either the bullies or the victims (Haynie et al., 2001). They are also considered the high-risk group as they tend to exhibit controversial profiles, demonstrating highly positive attitudes towards bullying, higher levels of self-esteem and self-confidence like the bullies, but often with higher levels of rejection and weakness similar to victims (Psalti, 2012; Seixas et al., 2013).

Individuals who have been part of bullying victimization experience numerous internalizing and externalizing behaviors. Higher rates of internalizing behaviors were noted among victims, bullies, and bully-victims such as low self-esteem, depression, loneliness, psychosomatic symptoms, poor social competence, poor relationships with peers, and school avoidance among other symptoms (Deighton et al., 2018; Huang et al., 2013; Nansel et al., 2004; Swearer et al., 2010). More disturbing are the numerous studies cited by Heydenberk and Heydenberk (2017) and the National Center for Education Statistics (2019), confirming "the relationship between bullying and an increased risk of depression and suicidal ideation" (p. 12).

Moilanen et al. (2010) observed that bullies tend to show a higher tendency to manifest externalizing behaviors. They are more inclined to exhibit problem behaviors such as alcohol consumption, cigarette smoking, and poor academic performance. These problematic externalizing behaviors usually manifest earlier than internalizing behaviors commonly observed two years after. Externalizing difficulties are found to be significantly correlated to poor academic performance (Obradović et al., 2010). This observation converges with the results of longitudinal studies (e.g., Chen et al., 2010; Deighton et al., 2018; Vaillancourt et al., 2013), showing that ex-

ternalizing problems exhibited during childhood years predicted academic underachievement in later years, which in turn predicted upsurges in internalizing and externalizing problems in a cyclical manner. Other studies presented similar findings that early manifestations of externalizing problems lead to amplified internalizing problems in later years through deficits in social competence such as anger management, self-control, assertion, cooperation, responsibility, and accountability (Cleverley et al., 2012; Obradović et al., 2010).

Gladden et al. (2014) stressed that the harmful effects of bullying are also felt by others, including friends and families, and can hurt the overall health and safety of schools, neighborhoods, and society. They added that although it is individuals who initiate and carry out this behavior, it is more of a social and cultural issue. For them, bullying may also be regarded as power-based behavior when it happens in a climate that supports the behavior, where everyone participates in it and others simply ignore it. Considering these debilitating effects of bullying, it becomes imperative for schools to have a sustainable program based on comprehensive data in order to mitigate the ill effects of bullying (Espelage & Swearer, 2011; Heydenberk & Heydenberk, 2017; Selim, 2018).

Gender differences in school bullying

Gender variations in bullying experiences have been reported across different cultures and schools. In the USA, males were noted to report a higher rate of bullying perpetration and victimization among middle school (Carbone-Lopez et al., 2010; National Center for Education Statistics, 2019) and university students (Lund & Ross, 2016) as well as juvenile offenders (Tisak et al., 2016). A similar pattern was noted in Greece, Estonia, and Argentina (Pörhölä et al., 2020).

Notably, male students are more likely to get involved in physical forms of bullying while their female counterparts are more likely to experience indirect forms such as gossiping or exclusion from activities on purpose (Carbone-Lopez et al., 2010; Fernández et al., 2013; National Center for Education Statistics, 2019; Pörhölä et al., 2020). Scholars have explained this male inclination to physical aggression, especially to aggravated assaults, in line with the socially constructed view that physical aggression is indicative of masculinity or manhood (Bosson & Vandello, 2011; Dukes et al., 2010; Rosen & Nofziger, 2019; Tisak et al., 2016). Pörhölä et al. (2020) suggest that certain cultures, especially the highly authoritarian ones, tend to normalize bullying behavior.

Rosen and Nofziger (2019) assert that the social construction of masculinity contributes significantly to bullying among male adolescents, and this becomes cyclical as the bullying behavior reinforces the notions of hegemonic masculinity. They added that when men's mas-

culinity is threatened, they are more likely to defend their manhood through displays of aggression, physically or verbally (Bosson & Vandello, 2011). Indeed, gender orientation can be influential in bullying victimization (Kosciw et al., 2012; Nansel et al., 2004; Peterson & Ray, 2006).

Framework of the study

Recent research in bullying orientates toward a socioecological framework as scholars recognize the complexity of this phenomenon compared to other forms of violence (e.g., Espelage & Swearer, 2011; Hong & Eamon, 2012; Hong & Espelage, 2012; Huang et al., 2013). Rather than being treated as an isolated representation of behavioral pattern, it has been studied from multidimensional perspectives, considering the interplay of individual contexts with those of the dynamics of other social groups such as family, school, and community. This approach originating from Bronfenbrenner's (1979) socioecological systems theory accounts for the complex relationships between the individual and their sociocultural environment. Using a social-ecological lens, problems attendant to bullying are viewed as systemic consequences rather than individually produced.

Bronfenbrenner's (1979, 1994/1997) socioecological theory or ecological model of development places the individual at the center and examines environmental influences, looking into factors or systems that might have influenced their personal, social, and moral development. He stresses that the five socially organized subsystems (i.e., microsystem, mesosystem, exosystem, macrosystem, and chronosystem) help, support, and guide human growth for healthy development to occur. For him, an individual or a child cannot be separated from their surroundings and thus, it is important to understand each one in the context of multiple environments that influence how they will grow and develop.

The microsystem encompasses the most immediate social environment, providing direct contact or interaction with the individual (e.g., family, friends, neighbors, and school). The mesosystem consists of interactions (roles) and links among those immediately surrounding the individual creating a network of microsystems (Bronfenbrenner, 1994/1997). In this system, the emphasis is on the importance of roles within an environment that may be different in another context. The process is taking place between two or more settings (e.g., relations between home and school, school student and teacher, administration and parents). The exosystem consists of "one or more settings that do not involve the individual as an active participant but in which events occur that affect or are affected by what happens in that setting" (Bronfenbrenner, 1979, p. 237). Examples include events that have a connection through the family or peer groups, affecting the individual (e.g., parents place of work and the family, university and the parent, neighborhood group and

teacher activities). The macrosystem, which according to (Bronfenbrenner, 1994/1997, p. 40) "may be thought of as a societal blueprint for a particular culture or sub-culture," refers to overarching themes and patterns between the other systems that create cultural norms (e.g., socioeconomic status, systems of beliefs, knowledge, opportunities, hazards, and life options). The chronosystem "encompasses change or consistency over time not only in the characteristics of the person but also of the environment in which that person lives" (Bronfenbrenner, 1994/1997, p. 40). Settings or influences that belong to this system include transfer of place of residence, socioeconomic status, divorce as a major life transition, degree of stress or instability in one's life among others.

Since the school serves as a human ecology where children and adolescents navigate social structures and strengthen interpersonal relationships with their peers and classmates, it has been identified as a primary setting where bully behaviors and involvement take place (Bowes et al., 2015; Gladden et al., 2014; Wolke & Lereya, 2015). Thus, bullying behaviors cannot be solely attributed to individual characteristics or family influence as Bronfenbrenner (1979) theorizes since many aspects in school may be associated to it. It must be noted that each school has its own cultural norms and beliefs regarding bullying situations, which may influence the perception on normative social behaviors of bullies, victims, and bystanders.

Methodology

Research design
This study made use of the mixed method expansion sequential research design (Polit & Beck, 2012), with Phase 1 providing the quantitative part and Phase 2 the qualitative part. The use of this method allowed us to widen the scope, breadth, and range of the study and derive new insights and perspective on bullying phenomenon, possibly leading to new theorizing or refinement of Bronfenbrenner's (1979, 1994/1997) socioecological theory or ecological model of development. Phase 1 covered the investigation on the prevalence of bullying along its three components: bullying role (bullies, victims, and bystanders), (common) form of bullying (covert indirect, cyberbullying, physical, and verbal), and effect of bullying (cognitive, affective, and behavioral). We excluded the bully-victims as a category in Phase 1 since a bully-victim exhibits characteristics that overlap with those of bullies and victims. We felt that to identify bully-victims categorically from bullies or victims, the quantitative method must be complemented with case studies among those who exhibited bully tendencies. Phase 2 focused on the actual bullying experiences, the school environment the individual participants were exposed to, and the potential psycho-social factors contributing to bullying phe-

Table 1. Distribution of respondents according to school

School type	School	Junior high school student population	Proportional allocation
Catholic	CS1	1,427	184
	CS2	653	85
	CS3	620	80
	Total	2,700	349
Non-sectarian	NS1	1,300	145
	NS2	610	68
	NS3	1,300	145
	Total	3,210	358
Public	PS1	1,019	48
	PS2	655	31
	PS3	6,506	304
	Total	8,180	383
Total population		14,090	1,090

Table 2. Distribution of respondents according to gender

School type		Male	Female	Total
Catholic		177	172	349
Non-sectarian		178	180	358
Public		191	192	383
	Total	546	544	1,090

nomenon.

Respondents and locale of the study
In Phase 1, we used stratified quota sampling and proportional allocation techniques to ensure that the three school types were represented in the study, with proportional allocation of representatives for each (see Table 1).

Taro Yamane's formula (1967, as cited in Adam, 2020) was used to determine the sample size of 1,090 from a population of 14,090. Proportional allocation was used to determine the sample size per sample unit of each school type (Catholic, non-sectarian, and public) (see Table 1). The 1,090 junior high school students were enrolled in Grades 7 to 10, 349 of whom came from Catholic schools, 358 from non-sectarian schools, and 383 from public schools within the 4th and 6th Districts in the province of Batangas. Out of 1,090 respondents, 546 are males and 544 are females (see Table 2), with ages ranging from 13 to 16 years old.

In Phase 2, purposive sampling was employed to identify key informants in the case study method. The selection was based on the results in the V-SCAIRD Acts of Bullying Inventory Tool from the nine secondary schools. Fifty male and female students with high scores (3.40–5.00) were identified as having the tendency to become bullies, victims, and bystanders, each given a parental

and informed consent letter. Since bullying is a critical and confidential issue particularly for parents and school administrators, some students were not permitted to participate in Study 2, resulting in the reduction of the number of students from 50 to 30. All the 30 students participated in the study with approved consent from their parents.

Data gathering instruments

For Phase 1, the Villamor, Serrano, Cañaveral, Alarcon, Ibasco, Royo, Dihiansan, Del Mundo, David (V-SCAIRD) (2014) Acts of Bullying Inventory Tool was administered to 1,090 junior high school students. A pen and paper type of test, the V-SCAIRD (2014) consists of 43 statements streamlined through factor analysis from the original 144 items. The tool looked at the bullying roles, the forms of bullying, and the effects of bullying on the students by asking respondents the extent to which they agreed or disagreed on a given statement such as "I get scared as I frequently receive threats at school" and "I think of mimicking or imitating mannerisms of some I am teasing." Each item was rated using a five-point Likert scale with 0 as Never (Not at All), 1 as Seldom (Rarely), 2 as Sometimes (Occasionally), 3 as Often (Repeatedly), and 4 as Always (At All Times). The interpretation used for each score and level consists of the following: 1.0−1.6 Low, 1.7−3.3 Moderate, and 3.4−5.0 High. Statistically, all items were accepted as reliable with Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .97 and with a high KMO of .90 while the Barlett's test of sphericity (degree of freedom = 10296) yielded a statistical significance at $p < .01$.

In Phase 2, the structured interview questionnaire was validated by five educational psychology experts to establish the nature of bullying experiences of students. The 15 questions included (a) "When thinking about the time when you were bullied by your classmate/s, what is the first thing that comes to your mind?" (b) "What metaphor can you give to bullying? Where can you associate the experience?" and (c) "Looking back, what were some of your thoughts and feelings when the incident/s happened?"

Data gathering procedure

Parental and informed consent was given to all students who voluntarily participated in the study. In Phase 1, the administration of the V-SCAIRD Acts of Bullying Inventory Tool and the interview were done on separate schedules. The retrieval of questionnaires was done through the assistance of the guidance counselors, academic coordinators, and advisers of the nine selected secondary schools in the 4th and 6th District in the province of Batangas. The data gathered were tabulated and made ready for statistical treatment. In Phase 2, the interview data were transcribed and interpreted, after which the transcribed data were subjected to content analysis to

Table 3. Prevalence of bullying by bullying role

Bullying role	f	Prevalence
Bully	32	8
Victim	52	14
Bystander	301	78

n = 385, prevalence is per 100

establish themes and subthemes.

Treatment of data

To determine the prevalence of bullying in the nine identified schools, the formula for a point prevalence rate *PR* was applied.

$$PR = \frac{\text{Number of cases with the condition or disease at a given point in time}}{\text{Number in the population at risk of being a case}} \times K$$

K was the number of people for whom the researcher worked to have the rate established (e.g., per 100 or 1000 population). When data are obtained from the sample, the denominator is the size of the sample, and the numerator is the number of cases with the condition, as identified in the study of Polit and Beck (2012). The proportional allocation sets the sample size in each stratum proportional to the number of sampling units in that stratum (Polit & Beck, 2012).

The prevalence of bullying (by bullying role, form of bullying, and effect of bullying) was determined across genders and school types. Independent sample *t*-tests were conducted to compare male and female differences in the bullying roles, the forms of bullying, and the effects of bullying across genders. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine the degree of significant differences in the bullying roles, the forms of bullying, and the effects of bullying across school types. Fisher's least significant difference test was run as post hoc test to confirm where the differences occurred between groups. All statistical analyses used SPSS Statistics 22, tested at $p < .05$.

Results

Phase 1
Prevalence of bullying according to bullying role, gender, and school types

Table 3 shows that out of the 1,090 respondents, 385 or 35.32% had shown high tendencies as bullies, victims, or bystanders with prevalence rates of 8%, 14%, and 78%, respectively. These figures indicate that per 100 students, eight manifested the tendency to become bullies, while 14 and 78 showed high chances of becoming victims and bystanders, respectively.

Table 4. Prevalence of bullying by gender and school type across bullying roles

Variable	Bully	Victim	Bystander
Gender			
Male (*n* = 186)	12	15	72
Female (*n* = 199)	5	11	79
School types			
Catholic (*n* = 127)	5	9	84
Non-sectarian (*n* = 130)	8	12	80
Public (*n* = 128)	16	19	63

n = 385, prevalence is per 100

Table 5. Prevalence of bullying by form of bullying and effect of bullying

Variable	*f*	Prevalence
Form of bullying		
Covert indirect	29	7
Cyberbullying	32	8
Physical	84	22
Verbal	36	9
Effect of bullying		
Cognitive	66	17
Affective	59	15
Behavioral	51	13

n = 385, prevalence is per 100

Table 6. Prevalence of bullying by form of bullying and effect of bullying across genders

Variable	Male	Female
Form of bullying		
Covert indirect	9	5
Cyberbullying	7	9
Physical	26	17
Verbal	17	5
Effect of bullying		
Cognitive	19	15
Affective	14	13
Behavioral	16	7

Male *n* = 186, female *n* = 199, prevalence is per 100

Table 7. Prevalence of bullying by form of bullying and effect of bullying across school types

Variable	Catholic	Non-sectarian	Public
Form of bullying			
Covert indirect	3	14	5
Cyberbullying	7	4	13
Physical	15	21	29
Verbal	5	9	16
Effect of bullying			
Cognitive	11	10	28
Affective	8	4	26
Behavioral	6	4	25

Catholic *n* = 127, non-sectarian *n* = 130, public *n* = 128, prevalence is per 100

Out of 100 students, 12 male students had the tendency to become bullies and 15 others were more likely to become victims, in contrast to five and 11, respectively, for the female group (see Table 4). As participants to bullying, more female students (79) tended to take a passive role as bystanders compared to their male counterparts (72).

Table 4 also indicates that per 100 students in public schools, 16 exhibited the tendency to become bullies compared to eight from non-sectarian schools and five from Catholic schools. Public school students also recorded higher prevalence as victims (19) compared to non-sectarian (12) and Catholic schools (9) per 100 students. Conversely, public school students (63) registered the lowest rate as bystanders compared to non-sectarian (80) and Catholic school (84) students.

Table 5 reveals that physical bullying was the most common form as reported by 84 of the 385 respondents, projecting the prevalence rate of 22 per 100 cases. On the effects of bullying, cognitive effect (17) had the highest prevalence among students who experienced bullying, followed by affective effect (15), and behavioral effect (13).

Compared to their female counterpart, the male group reported higher prevalence of bullying in all its four forms, with physical bullying (26) gaining the top list followed by verbal bullying (17), covert indirect bullying (9), and cyberbullying (7) (see Table 6). It also indicates that male students are more affected cognitively, affectively, and behaviorally as compared to female students.

On the forms of bullying and the effects of bullying on the students, public schools (29) registered the highest prevalence rate in physical bullying compared to non-sectarian schools (21) and Catholic schools (15) (see Table 7). Public schools also recorded the highest rates in verbal bullying (16) and cyberbullying (13). In contrast, students from non-sectarian schools reported the highest incidence of covert indirect bullying.

While Catholic schools exhibited the lowest prevalence of bullying in all its forms across school types, the presence of bullying in this school type is undeniable. In terms of the effects of bullying, it shows that students from public schools also had the highest prevalence in the cognitive (28), affective (26), and behavioral (25) effects of their bullying experiences.

Table 8. Differences in the bullying roles, forms of bullying, and effects of bullying across genders

Variable	Male		Female		t	df	p-value (2-tailed)
	M	SD	M	SD			
Bullying role							
Bully	2.59	0.57	2.39	0.44	−3.69	351.11	<.01*
Victim	2.74	0.59	2.55	0.51	−3.44	369.46	<.01*
Bystander	3.37	0.51	3.40	0.41	0.50	360.21	.62
Form of bullying							
Covert indirect	2.64	0.41	2.62	0.35	−0.39	369.66	.70
Cyberbullying	2.57	0.43	2.68	0.40	2.39	378.51	.02*
Physical	2.98	0.47	2.90	0.36	−1.77	351.60	.08
Verbal	2.68	0.56	2.57	0.39	−2.35	382.00	.02*
Effect of bullying							
Cognitive	2.99	0.50	2.90	0.44	−1.95	372.14	.05*
Affective	2.87	0.53	2.77	0.49	−2.12	376.04	.04*
Behavioral	2.76	0.60	2.65	0.46	−1.93	382.00	.05*

* $p < .05$

Differences in bullying roles, forms of bullying, and effects of bullying across genders and school types

To determine whether there are significant differences between the male and the female groups and across school types in terms of roles, forms of bullying, and effects of bullying, t-tests and ANOVA were conducted and the results are in Tables 8 and 9, respectively. To identify the sources of variances in the ANOVA results, Fisher's least significant difference (LSD) test was run and the results are in Table 10.

Table 8 shows the t-test results which confirmed the tendency of male students to be bullies (t_{382} = −3.69, p < .01, d = 0.39) and victims (t_{382} = −3.44, p < .01, d = 0.35) which is significantly higher than their female counterparts. No significant difference, however, was noted in bystander tendency (t_{382} = −.50, p = .62, d = −0.07) between the male (M = 3.37, SD = 0.51) and female (M = 3.40, SD = 0.41) groups.

The t-test also revealed that all forms of bullying (i.e., covert indirect, cyberbullying, physical, and verbal) were experienced by students regardless of gender. However, it appeared that the male students were more exposed to verbal bullying (t_{382} = −2.35, p = .02, d = 0.23) while the female students were more exposed to cyberbullying (t_{382} = 2.39, p = .02, d = −0.27). On the effects of bullying, gender differences also manifested in their cognitive (t_{382} = −1.95, p = .05, d = 0.19), affective (t_{382} = −2.12, p = .04, d = 0.20), and behavioral (t_{382} = −1.93, p = .05, d = 0.21) aspects, with the male students having experienced a higher degree of bullying effects in all three dimensions.

The ANOVA results in Table 9 revealed that in terms of the bullying role in a bullying situation, the school type has small significant effects on being bystanders ($F_{(2,381)}$ = 7.79, p < .01; η^2 = .04) and victims ($F_{(2,381)}$ = 8.66, p < .01, η^2 = .03), but it has no significant effect on bully tendencies.

The ANOVA results also pointed to the significant effects of school type on the forms of bullying, particularly in covert indirect bullying ($F_{(2,381)}$ = 9.21, p < .01, η^2 = .04), physical bullying ($F_{(2,381)}$ = 5.81, p < .01, η^2 = .06), verbal bullying ($F_{(2,381)}$ = 4.18, p = .01, η^2 = .04) and cyberbullying ($F_{(2,381)}$ = 2.72, p= .05, η^2 = .02), all indicating small effect sizes.

Concerning the effects of bullying on students across school types, the ANOVA results pointed to significant differences in all three dimensions: cognitive ($F_{(2,381)}$= 9 .23, p < .01, η^2 = .05), affective ($F_{(2,380)}$ = 16.50, p < .01, η^2 = .03), and behavioral ($F_{(2,381)}$ = 19.36, p < .01, η^2 = .04), all having small effect sizes.

Table 10 shows the LSD post hoc results which confirmed the significant differences found in victim role tendencies between Catholic and public schools (MD = −.14, p = .04), with the latter having a higher rate than the former. Evidently, students from both Catholic (MD = .18, p < .01) and non-sectarian schools (MD = .21, p < .01) registered a significantly higher tendency to become bystanders than those in public schools.

The LSD post hoc results also showed that non-sectarian schools had a significantly higher incidence of covert indirect bullying than Catholic (MD = .19, p < .01) and public (MD = .16, p < .01) schools. In terms of physical bullying, both public (MD = .15, p < .01) and non-sectarian (MD = .15, p < .01) schools showed significantly higher incidence in this form than Catholic schools. In verbal bullying, public schools also indicated a significant higher incidence compared to Catholic schools (MD = .17, p = .01). Notably, while the ANOVA results

Table 9. Differences in the bullying roles, forms of bullying, and effects of bullying across school types (ANOVA)

Variable		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p-value
Bullying role						
Bully	Between groups	1.01	2	0.51	1.93	.15
	Within groups	99.73	381	0.26		
Victim	Between groups	1.46	2	0.73	8.66	<.01*
	Within groups	117.67	381	0.31		
Bystander	Between groups	3.25	2	1.63	7.79	<.01*
	Within groups	79.53	381	0.21		
Form of bullying						
Covert indirect	Between groups	2.58	2	1.29	9.21	<.01*
	Within groups	53.35	381	0.14		
Cyberbullying	Between groups	0.94	2	0.47	2.72	.07
	Within groups	66.18	381	0.17		
Physical	Between groups	1.94	2	0.97	5.81	<.01*
	Within groups	63.69	381	0.17		
Verbal	Between groups	1.89	2	0.94	4.18	.01*
	Within groups	85.98	381	0.23		
Effect of bullying						
Cognitive	Between groups	3.96	2	1.98	9.23	<.01*
	Within groups	81.70	381	0.21		
Affective	Between groups	8.11	2	4.06	16.50	<.01*
	Within groups	93.44	381	0.25		
Behavioral	Between groups	10.05	2	5.02	19.36	<.01*
	Within groups	98.87	381	0.26		

* $p < .05$

showed no significant difference in cyberbullying across school types, the post hoc test results revealed that non-sectarian schools recorded a significantly higher rate of cyberbullying than Catholic schools (MD = .12, p = .03).

The LSD post hoc test results in Table 10 also identified which school types vary significantly in terms of effects of bullying. Based on the findings, the cognitive effects of bullying on students in public schools significantly differ from those in the Catholic (MD = .22, $p < .01$) and non-sectarian schools (MD = .21, $p < .01$). No significant difference was documented between Catholic and non-sectarian schools in this dimension (MD = .02, $p > 0.05$).

A similar pattern was observed in the affective dimension, indicating that students from public schools differ significantly in their experiences of the affective effects of bullying from those in the Catholic (MD = .31, $p < .01$) and non-sectarian schools (MD = .30, $p < .01$). In addition, just like in the cognitive effects of bullying, no significant difference was recorded in the affective effects of bullying on the students between Catholic and non-sectarian schools (MD = $-.01$, $p > 0.05$).

The same pattern was recorded in the behavioral effects of bullying on the students across school types.

Students from public schools reported higher degree of behavioral effects of bullying compared to their counterparts from Catholic (MD = .36, $p < .01$) and non-sectarian schools (MD = .32, $p < .01$). Notably, no significant difference was found between students from Catholic and non-sectarian schools in the behavioral dimension (MD = $-.03$, $p > .05$).

Phase 2
Experiences of students involved in bullying
The interview with the 30 participants disclosed that the victims of bullying were subjected to different forms of bullying in school (see Table 11). Some students were physically bullied by being pushed, punched, hit, bitten, or slapped, by having their clothes pulled off, or by being incited into a fist fight. Others were verbally bullied through name calling, teasing, mocking, or criticisms, primarily due to their distinctive physical appearances and deformities, sexual orientation, or perceived poor or superior intellectual capacity. Cyberbullying was also experienced through social media platforms, oftentimes by having offensive or insulting comments posted together with images such as pictures or memes that reinforce content. Ostracism or social exclusion and vandalism

Table 10. Differences in the bullying roles, forms of bullying, and effects of bullying across school types (LSD)

Variable	School type		Mean difference	Standard error	p-value
Bullying role					
Bully	Catholic	Non-sectarian	−.04	.06	.54
	Catholic	Public	−.12	.06	.06
	Public	Non-sectarian	.08	.06	.20
Victim	Catholic	Non-sectarian	−.12	.07	.09
	Catholic	Public	−.14	.07	.04*
	Public	Non-sectarian	.02	.07	.76
Bystander	Catholic	Non-sectarian	−.03	.06	.59
	Catholic	Public	.18	.06	<.01*
	Public	Non-sectarian	−.21	.06	<.01*
Form of bullying					
Covert indirect	Catholic	Non-sectarian	−.19	.05	<.01*
	Catholic	Public	−.02	.05	.61
	Public	Non-sectarian	−.16	.05	<.01*
Cyberbullying	Catholic	Non-sectarian	−.12	.05	.03*
	Catholic	Public	−.09	.05	.08
	Public	Non-sectarian	−.02	.05	.65
Physical	Catholic	Non-sectarian	−.15	.05	<.01*
	Catholic	Public	−.15	.05	<.01*
	Public	Non-sectarian	.01	.05	.90
Verbal	Catholic	Non-sectarian	−.06	.06	.32
	Catholic	Public	−.17	.06	.01*
	Public	Non-sectarian	.11	.06	.07
Effect of bullying					
Cognitive	Catholic	Non-sectarian	−.02	.06	.76
	Catholic	Public	−.22	.06	<.01*
	Public	Non-sectarian	.21	.06	<.01*
Affective	Catholic	Non-sectarian	−.01	.06	.86
	Catholic	Public	−.31	.06	<.01*
	Public	Non-sectarian	.30	.06	<.01*
Behavioral	Catholic	Non-sectarian	−.03	.06	.60
	Catholic	Public	−.36	.06	<.01*
	Public	Non-sectarian	.32	.06	<.01*

* $p < .05$

were cited as an indirect or covert type of bullying. Notably, the data points to home-related factors affecting bullying as some participants experienced verbal abuse from their own family members due to failed expectations such as perceived poor academic performance.

The bystanders witnessed physical, covert indirect, verbal, and cyberbullying across school types.

Many of the bully students were led or provoked to do acts of bullying due to various reasons, but primarily in retaliation to a bullying act inflicted on them. Most of them were reprimanded due to untoward behaviors and uncontrollable temper that led them to threaten, dominate, and provoke other students to fight. There were also bully students who felt empowered by the act of bullying itself as represented by the one who "felt happy *kapag nauunahan ko sila*, feeling *ko nasa akin lahat ang* attention, I have power over them" (I feel happy whenever I beat them; with the feeling that all attention seems to be on me, I have power over them).

The school environment

As perceived by the respondents, the school-related determinants to bullying behaviors include teachers' attitude in school, school discipline, and peer influence as principal factors that may have influenced the bullying phenomenon (see Table 12). Under teachers' attitude,

Table 11. Actual bullying experiences of bullies, victims, and bystanders

Bullies' situation that led to or provoked acts of bullying	Bullying experienced by victims	Bullying situation witnessed by bystanders
Seeking revenge	**Covert indirect**	**Covert indirect**
Sought revenge when getting into fights with groups	Had a classmate spit on her book and put 'vandals' (graffiti) on her chair, wanting to see her reaction; had classmates backbite and gossip about her	A female student was constantly an object of bad jokes, rumors, and malicious tricks in the classroom without her knowledge.
Was being bullied by friends because they got annoyed with her action, talking behind her back	Was discriminated against for "being a gay": "*hindi nila ako kinakausap* [they would not talk to me]"	A classmate was asked to put a colored soft gel on his friend's chair that made her uniform get so dirty; no one dared to tell her who did it.
Had his clothes pulled off by a classmate: "*hinubuan ako*" in front of the whole class, "*bumawi sa akin, napahiya ako sa buong klase, nagalit ako at sinuntok ko* [he got even with me, I was shamed in class, so I got mad and punched him]"	Was excluded from a circle of friends because he is fond of using the English language during conversation, which has a negative notion for the group; they used to say "*englishero o 'di kayá mayabang* [fond of speaking in English or boastful]."	**Cyberbullying**
		A classmate spread rumors by posting insulting comments on her friend's social networking profile.
"They edit[ed] my picture at FB [Facebook]; because of anger, *kinuha ko pagkain nila* [I took their food] and asked them to do something."	**Cyberbullying**	A classmate was harassed in Facebook and group chat, and blackmailed through a picture posted by the bullies.
Being reprimanded	Was sent rude text messages by her classmates to threaten her	A classmate sent rude text messages to another student with offensive comments.
Was reprimanded by teachers due to being rude, indifferent, and lacking empathy towards others	Was cyberbullied by friends and classmates through group chat by the use of pictures with an insulting and offensive statement on them	**Physical**
Releasing pent-up emotions	**Physical**	A classmate was bitten on the arm by another student; he cried so hard.
Threatened other students and provoked them into a fight because he was unable to control his temper	Was pushed by a male classmate	A student was threatened by a classmate to get him into a fight if he would not follow his instruction.
Easily got irritated and angry towards his classmates	Was played at: "*pinagti-tripan nila ako lagi, tinatago* bag *ko at kinukuha ang gamit ko* [they are always on a power trip, hiding my bag or getting my things] that led me into a fight with them"	A male friend was slapped, hit, and pushed, and got into a fist fight with other students; clothes had been torn off for fun.
Bullied a classmate by saying bad words, "*nainis at nagalit ako sa kanya dahil masyadong OA sa project* [I hate the person because he is over reacting on the project]"	**Verbal**	**Verbal**
Giving in to peer pressure	Was discriminated against in school by being made fun of and being given sarcastic remarks, often called the class clown, "*tinatago po nila ako sa ibat-ibang* [they call me by different] code name[s]"	A student was being teased a lot in an unpleasant manner, got played with a nasty joke, and got purposely hurt until the bullies and the victim got into a fight.
Did mischievous things due to peer pressure: "Just to fit in, I am fearful to be an outcast in the group; I wanted to belong with my peers."	Was called names by the whole class: "*baboy*" (pig), "*pangit*" (ugly), "*sumbungera*," "teacher's pet," "Miss Tapia" [a Philippine television show character] because of her eyeglasses	Bullies tormented a female class-mate by saying negative things and giving dirty looks whenever they were given a chance.
	Was called "*pangit-pangit*" because of the eyeglasses she used to wear: "*'di ka pwede sa amin, dun ka sa mga katulad mo* [you can't join us; join those who are like you]"	A classmate was being teased always by her male seatmates by making fun of the way she looks.
	Received hurtful words from classmates	
	Was belittled inside the classroom, called "*maarte, 'di naman kagandahan* [fussy, not that beautiful]," weakling	

Table 11 (continued).

Bullies' situation that led to or provoked acts of bullying	Bullying experienced by victims	Bullying situation witnessed by bystanders
Feeling of satisfaction "*Sobra nasasayahan kapag may nabu-*bully *lalo kapag pikunin sila* [I feel elated each time I bully others, especially if they get mad]." "Felt happy *kapag nauunahan ko sila*, feeling *ko nasa akin lahat ang* attention [if I beat them, I feel all attention is on me], I have power over them." Did not care what others will say: "*gusto ko magyabang at maging popular sa klase namin kaya ko ginawa* [I wanted to boast and be popular in our class, so I did it]." "*Nang-aasar ng barkada at kaklase kahit sino ang matipuhan, kapag napipikon sila sa akin at gusto akong gantihan* [I tease my friend, classmates and anyone I like, if they get mad and want to get even]." **Feeling superior** Tended to manipulate and dominate others	Was discriminated against in class for being thin and short: "*pandak-pandak, kelan ka kaya tatangkad*? [shorty, shorty, will you ever grow tall?]" Was called "*kawayan*, like a bamboo post, *hindi maabot* [Bamboo, like a bamboo post that can't be reached]" because he was the tallest guy in class Was mocked for "being a gay": "*hindi nila ako kinakausap, magladlad ka na bakla ka naman* [they would not talk to me, you show your true self that you are a gay]"; when he admitted it in front of the class "*oo, gay ako* [yes, I'm a gay]," they all laughed aloud Experienced bullying that started at home; "*ikaw, wala kang mararating sa buhay* [you don't have any future]," "'*di ka naman magaling sa* school, *maliit ka pa* [You have not been academically gifted ever since]"; in school, she was called "*bobo*" [dumb or stupid] because of her poor grade performance	A classmate was verbally bullied because of their physical disability and physical appearance. Students with disability or different physical appearance were bullied: "*yong may kapansanan na alam nila na hindi papatalo sa kanila* [those who have disabilities whom they know would not be subservient]." A female classmate was bullied because of her fat body image, eyeglasses, and hair pigtails. A male student was bullied because of his different look (very tall and muscular body). Classmates were subjected to name calling because of their "weird appearance." A group of friends was bullied by another section because of their weird look and appearance, finding them always different and out of fashion.

some of the salient aspects point to the teacher's negative attitude towards students, the teacher's temperament in handling students' behavior, unfair treatment of students, lack of information on what to do with students involved in bullying, and the need for teachers to have closer supervision of bullying situations.

Aspects of school discipline that were identified include poor disciplinary measures in the classroom and the school premises, lack of guidance from the teachers and staff on proper behavior, lack of personnel handling bullying behaviors of students, lack of discipline and respect among students, and the need to have a closer coordination between parents and schools to help students involved in bullying. Other school-related factors include having a large class population and the lack of concern from school personnel and staff.

In terms of peer influence, some of the aspects recurrently highlighted concern the presence of bad peer influence and misunderstanding among peers. As perceived by the students, bad peer influence might have caused some students to get involved in drinking, smoking, and other forms of vices. On the other hand, misunderstanding among peers may have potentially led to aggressive

demeanor.

Discussion

This study provided empirical evidence that bullying incidence is indeed present in the Philippine educational setting as reported by the junior high school students in the 4th and 6th Districts of Batangas. The prevalence rates of 8, 14, and 78 in 100 students translate to a potential scenario of one bully, two victims, and seven bystanders in every 10 high school students. The victimization prevalence rate of one in five students is nearly equal to the earlier findings of one in three students involved in bullying reported by Selim (2018), UNESCO Institute of Statistics (2018), and UNICEF Philippines (2019). While studies on bullying did not specify the prevalent rate considered as alarming level, scholars have reiterated that the presence of bullying at any rate can cause violence among the youth and must be urgently addressed, particularly in school settings (Campbell et al., 2017; Due et al., 2005; Gofin & Avitzour, 2012; Pörhölä et al., 2020; Selim, 2018; UNESCO Institute of Statistics, 2018; UNICEF Philippines, 2019).

A notable finding of this study is the presence of bully-

Table 12. School environment of bullies, victims, and bystanders that contribute to bullying behaviors

Bullies	Victims	Bystanders
Teacher's attitude in school		
Teacher's negative attitude towards students (3)	Teacher's negative attitude towards students (3)	Teacher's negative attitude towards students (2)
Teacher's temperament in handling students' behavior (3)	Teacher's temperament in handling students' behavior (2)	Teacher's temperament in handling students' behavior (3)
Teacher's lack of information on what to do with bullies, victims, and others (3)	Unfair treatment of students by teachers (2)	Unfair treatment of students by teachers (2)
	Need for closer supervision by the teacher on bullying situation (3)	Need for closer supervision by the teacher on bullying situation (3)
	Teacher's lack of information on what to do with bullies, victims, and others (2)	
School discipline		
Poor disciplinary measures in the classroom and the school premises (2)	Poor disciplinary measures in the classroom and the school premises (2)	Poor disciplinary measures in the classroom and the school premises (2)
Lack of clear school policy on bullying (2)	Lack of discipline and respect among students (2)	Lack of discipline and respect among students (3)
Lack of discipline and respect among students. (3)	Lack of personnel to handle bullying behaviors of students (3)	Lack of personnel to handle bullying behaviors of students (2)
	Lack of guidance from the teachers and staff on proper behavior	
Peer influences		
Bad peer influence in school; some get involved in drinking, smoking	Misunderstanding among peers that leads to aggressive behavior	Peer group hang out to tease or harass other students
Peer pressure	Peer pressure	Peer pressure
Other school environment influences		
Having a large class population	Having a large class population	Lack of concern by school personnel and staff

victims who reported being provoked to engage in the cycle of bullying, primarily to avenge themselves for the experiences of being bullied, resulting in the re-enactment of violence (Selim, 2018). In their desire to seek redress for the injustice at the hands of the perpetrators, they gave in to their negative emotions through various forms (i.e., physical, verbal, cyberbullying) (Seixas et al., 2013; Yang et al., 2016; Yang & Salmivalli, 2013). As they found satisfaction in releasing their anger and frustration, they began to espouse positive attitudes towards bullying (Psalti, 2012; Seixas et al., 2013) and view it a source of power and domination.

Based on the present findings, bullying is prevalent in all school types (i.e., public or private, sectarian or nonsectarian), and high school students regardless of gender have the potential to be involved in bullying. These findings support the claim that bullying has been a global issue documented as one of the most common forms of aggression suffered by children and youth (Antiri, 2016; Balatbat et al., 2014; Campbell et al., 2017; *CyberSafe: Survey 2015*, 2016; Hymel & Swearer, 2015; Rastrullo &

Francisco, 2015; Selim, 2018). The perpetuation of bullying in school could be explained by its antagonistic nature, which can be partly accounted to the people's perception and attitude towards bullying, which treats aggression as an innate trait of humans.

We also found that male students were highly affected by bullying episodes either as bullies or victims while their female counterparts had the tendency to become victims. Both male and female groups had the potential to be bystanders in the bullying incidence. These results converge with earlier findings that boys were involved in all kinds of bullying incidents to a significantly higher degree than girls were (Carbone-Lopez et al., 2010; Fernández et al., 2013; Hong & Espelage, 2012; Pörhölä et al., 2020; Rosen & Nofziger, 2019; Selim, 2018; Tisak et al., 2016; UNESCO Institute of Statistics, 2018; UNICEF Philippines, 2019).

On the forms of bullying, physical bullying was the most common form, regardless of gender. Compared to their female counterpart, the male group reported higher prevalence of bullying in all forms, with the *t*-test results

indicating significant differences in verbal bullying and cyberbullying but not in physical bullying and covert indirect bullying. These findings diverge from a large body of research, showing gender-specific correlates in physical bullying and covert indirect bullying with males engaging more on the former and females on the latter (e.g., Carbone-Lopez et al. (2010) and Neupane (2014)). However, the results converge with some studies revealing that males tend to engage more in verbal bullying than females (e.g., Pontzer, 2010).

As male students are more exposed to bullying than female students, they are more affected cognitively, affectively, and behaviorally as compared to female students. These gendered experiences in bullying can be partly accounted to the socially constructed view that physical aggression is associated with masculinity or manhood (Bosson & Vandello, 2011; Rosen & Nofziger, 2019). These results align with the social role theory of Eagly (1987), which states that people tend to behave consistently with their socially constructed gender roles.

Rosen and Nofziger (2019) assert that the social construction of masculinity contributes significantly to bullying among male adolescents, and this becomes cyclical as the bullying behavior reinforces the notions of hegemonic masculinity. In this environment, when men's masculinity is threatened, they are more likely to defend their manhood through displays of aggression, physically or verbally (Bosson & Vandello, 2011). Indeed, gender orientation can be influential in bullying perpetration and victimization (Eagly, 1987; Kosciw et al., 2012; Nansel et al., 2004; Peterson & Ray, 2006; Pörhölä et al., 2020).

Additionally, this study found that across school types, public school students have the highest prevalence tendency to become bullies and victims as compared to students in non-sectarian and Catholic schools. Conversely, public schools have the lowest rate as bystanders. Student-participants from public schools reported that due to their overcrowded or congested classrooms, they could hardly concentrate on their lessons. At the same time, the schedule of class shifts from morning, afternoon, and evening sessions may also be a factor. According to some teachers, the schedule of classes in most public schools which was shortened from 8 hours to 6 hours resulted in compacted curriculums which could be cognitively demanding for most students. Likewise, the teachers may not have enough time to spend on developing more innovative teaching methods such as cooperative learning and group work to enhance learning. They also observed that teachers could hardly monitor student behavior inside and outside the classroom due to their tight class schedules and other concerns.

As regards school psycho-social environment, we found three major factors possibly influencing the bullying phenomenon in schools: teachers' attitude in school, peer influence, and school discipline. Under teachers' at-

titude, some of the salient aspects include the teacher's negative attitude towards students, the teacher's temperament in handling students' behavior, unfair treatment of students, lack of information on what to do with students involved in bullying, and the need for teachers to have closer supervision of bullying situations. These findings resonate earlier findings that emphasize the extent of teacher intervention as well as quality and style of teaching as specific factors affecting the rate of bullying incidence in academic institutions (Ayers et al., 2012; Jordan, 2014; Kahn et al., 2012). These also highlight the importance of honing the teachers' competence in managing bullying situations in schools and of redirecting their views and attitude towards teaching not only as a profession but as a vocation.

Aspects of school discipline that were identified include poor disciplinary measures in the classroom and the school premises, lack of guidance from the teachers and staff on proper behavior, lack of personnel handling bullying behaviors of students, lack of discipline and respect among students, lack of concern by school personnel and staff, and the need to have a closer coordination between parents and schools to help students involved in bullying. Other factors include having a large class population and compacted schedule of classes.

Apparently, the need to upskill not only teachers but also staff in managing bullying incidence in schools through capacity building programs is underscored. In addition, school policies that enhance the school culture of peace, discipline, and respect seem to be needed. These findings indicate the need for hiring or (re)assigning staff primarily responsible for addressing bullying phenomenon in schools as it appears to be one of the priorities emphasized.

In terms of peer influence, some of the aspects recurrently highlighted concern the presence of bad peer influence and misunderstanding among peers. As perceived by the students, bad peer influence might have caused some students to get involved in drinking, smoking, and other forms of vices. On the other hand, misunderstanding among peers might have led to aggressive behavior. Peer influence on bullying cannot be undermined since the adolescence stage is highly associated with peer groups especially during junior high school (Rodkin et al., 2006). Rodkin et al. (2006) noted that adolescents with common interests tend to constellate with one another and together, they form a common identity and behaviors including aggressiveness. Søndergaard (2012) warned that the fear of being socially ostracized results in expressing anxiety, which in turn leads students to bully others to prevent themselves from falling victim to social marginalization. Ostracism or social exclusion from peers may also lead to adolescent depression and suicidal ideation (Heydenberk & Heydenberk, 2017).

In line with Bronfenbrenner's (1979, 1994/1997) eco-

logical model of development, this study recognizes that bullying is a social phenomenon happening through the various interactions between and among bullies, victims, and bystanders. Such a phenomenon is influenced by the psychological and environmental factors existing within and around them. The psychological factors refer to the interaction of the cognitive, affective, and behavioral patterns that describe how the bullies, victims, and bystanders are individually affected by the bullying situations (Bronfenbrenner, 1979, 1994/1997; Heydenberk & Heydenberk, 2017).

The environmental factors refer to the context of the students' surroundings, the quality of interaction between individuals and multiple systems which influence and affect human behavior. These include home and school environment factors, and the interplay of these factors can shape various forms of bullying and can lead to different effects on the respondents. As Bronfenbrenner (1979, 1994/1997) theorizes, bullying behaviors cannot be solely attributed to individual characteristics or family influence since many aspects in school may be associated to it. This study confirms other scholars' proposition that as part of the networks of microsystem and mesosystem in the lives of the individual students, the psycho-social variables such as the roles of peers, teachers, and staff in school as well as academic policies and programs strengthening the link between school and home are potential predictors of student bullying behavior (Ayers et al., 2012; Bronfenbrenner, 1979, 1994/1997). These school environment factors could have accounted for the differences noted between and among types of school in Phase 1 of this study.

Another key social variable to bullying that surfaced in the study is peer influence, perceived as an essential element in the development of an individual, their value systems, and their sense of social acceptance, particularly in the adolescence stage. Bronfenbrenner (1979, 1994/1997) considers friends, classmates, and significant others in school aside from family and neighbors as part of the microsystem that is influential to the quality of interactions and relationships experienced by an individual. Studies reviewed by Heydenberk and Heydenberk (2017) revealed that such relationships are critical to healthy levels of subjective wellbeing.

A more encompassing factor which can be considered as part of the macrosystem possibly affecting gender variations in bullying experiences is the social construction of masculinity, femininity, and aggression, particularly in Philippine society. Scholars have pointed out the socially constructed views that expression of aggression is natural to humans and that physical expressions of aggression index masculinity or manhood (Bosson & Vandello, 2011; Rosen & Nofziger, 2019). While we recognize the potential explanatory power of this ideological view, we also acknowledge the need to conduct further investigation on these constructs to solidify claims through empirical evidence.

Conclusions and recommendations

Bullying is generally perceived as dangerous and life-threatening as it can truly hurt and affect people mentally, emotionally, socially, and physically (Bosworth & Judkins, 2014; Espelage & Swearer, 2011; Gladden et al., 2014; Heydenberk & Heydenberk, 2017; National Center for Education Statistics, 2019; Olweus & Limber, 2010; Pörhölä et al., 2020; Psalti, 2012; Swearer et al., 2010). It is a global issue that has penetrated the Philippine educational setting (Ancho & Park, 2013; Balatbat et al., 2014; Selim, 2018) and thus must be urgently addressed. As confirmed by the present study, it is experienced by students regardless of gender and school type, primarily as bystanders. Male students are the most affected by bullying phenomenon as bullies and victims, but both genders have the potential to become bystanders. This concern is more evident in public schools as compared to private educational institutions, particularly physical bullying. In Catholic schools, bullying also undeniably exists despite having the lowest prevalence across school types. Cyberbullying more prevalent in non-sectarian schools has found a new platform in social media. Ostracism or social exclusion, a covert or indirect form of bullying associated with depression and suicidal ideation, has also been experienced in Philippine schools.

Indeed, bullying as a social phenomenon is of a complex nature as it is influenced by a myriad of factors, including psychological and environmental ones (Bronfenbrenner, 1979, 1994/1997; Heydenberk & Heydenberk, 2017; Pörhölä et al., 2020). School environment serves as an exogenous factor significantly affecting the existence of bullying in school (Bronfenbrenner, 1979, 1994/1997). In relation to the culture of bullying in schools, teachers' temperament in class, management of classes, sense of justice, and methods of teaching all contribute to the existence of bullying in schools. Bullying also tends to be reinforced by the number of school personnel attending to the students' individual needs (i.e., teachers, staff, guidance counselors), and the policy-articulation on discipline and bullying.

To address bullying in school, aside from providing continuing professional development to teachers, it is recommended that clear structure and school policy be created that emphasizes home and school partnership (Ross, 2002) and imposes certain discipline in school. Ttofi et al. (2011) found that certain elements become deterrents to bullying. These elements include parent training/meetings, improved playground supervision, disciplinary methods, classroom management, teacher training, whole-school anti-bullying policy, school conferences, intensity and duration of the program, and work with peers (e.g., peer mediation and peer mentoring).

Educational scholars also recommend strengthening home-school partnership and collaboration among parents, teachers, and administrators to address problems on bullying. Ross (2002) would even emphasize that in school, all personnel, other professionals, parents, and children must have a strong commitment and willingness to work together in putting up a prevention program. To assist parents, trainings on parental roles, parenting styles, and family relationships and similar topics may be provided to help address this social concern (Cook et al., 2010; Rose et al., 2011; Ttofi et al., 2011; Veltkamp & Lawson, 2008).

It is also recommended that clear structure and school policy be created that emphasizes home and school partnership (Ross, 2002). Ross (2002) suggests informing parents and students about the disciplinary processes and exemplary penalties involved in the gravity of bullying cases. Parents are encouraged then to actively monitor regularly their children's activities and problems both at home and in school. There must be a constant dialogue between them to foster positive and healthy relationships. The school must have a committee composed of school officials, teachers, guidance counselors, educational psychologists, parents, and community representatives to protect the children from all forms of violence that may be inflicted by adults, persons in authority, as well as their fellow students. They should be informed on enacted laws and policies on bullying. A serious advocacy program should be initiated and maintained to prevent bullying behaviors and to safeguard the youth from any danger or threat.

A sizeable proportion of scholarship on bullying as a social phenomenon had already been focused on the prevalence and forms of bullying, yet only a few incorporated in the investigation the psycho-social aspects of bullying that might have possibly influenced it, particularly in the Philippine educational context. The use of Bronfenbrenner's (1979, 1994/1997) theoretical lens in this study was essential in delineating the critical contribution of the psycho-social dynamics the school brings to the bullying experiences of the students, specifically as mediated by the teachers, administrators, and other school personnel.

It must also be noted that while significant differences in bullying behaviors were found across genders and school types, the effect sizes of the t-test and ANOVA results are relatively small. Thus, it is recommended that future research include a larger sample from the same grade level or similar age group to strengthen statistical results. Other factors, external and internal to the students, should also be considered to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the bullying phenomenon in the Philippines. Other stakeholders' (e.g., teachers, parents, administrators, and the bigger community) perspectives may also be considered for a more comprehensive understanding of this social phenomenon. Future research may also expand to include the determination of the Filipinos' perception and attitude towards bullying and aggression in general to trace the possible ideological influences on bullying perpetration. Future scholarship may also endeavor to refine the bullying inventory tools to identify more efficiently bully-victims from the other categories.

References

Adam, A. M. (2020). Sample size determination in survey research. *Journal of Scientific Research and Reports*, *26*(5), 90–97. https://doi.org/10.9734/jsrr/2020/v26i530263

American Psychological Association. (2018). *Bullying*. https://www.apa.org/topics/bullying/

Ancho, I. V., & Park, S. (2013). School violence in the Philippines: A study on programs and policies. *Advanced Science and Technology Letters*, *36*, 27–31. https://doi.org/10.14257/astl.2013.44.07

Antiri, K. O. (2016). Types of bullying in the senior high schools in Ghana. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *7*(36), 131–138.

Ayers, S. L., Wagaman, M. A., Geiger, J. M., Bermudez-Parsai, M., & Hedberg, E. C. (2012). Examining school-based bullying interventions using multi-level discrete time hazard modeling. *Prevention Science*, *13*(5), 539–550. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-012-0280-7

Balatbat, E., Rodriguez, G. L., & de Jesus, R. D. (2014). Nature and prevalence of bullying in the university high school. *Harvest*, *10*(1), 119–144.

Bosson, J. K., & Vandello, J. A. (2011). Precarious manhood and its links to action and aggression. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *20*(2), 82–86. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721411402669

Bosworth, K., & Judkins, M. (2014). Tapping into the power of school climate to prevent bullying: One application of schoolwide positive behavior interventions and supports. *Theory Into Practice*, *53*(4), 300–307. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2014.947224

Bowes, L., Joinson, C., Wolke, D., & Lewis, G. (2015). Peer victimisation during adolescence and its impact on depression in early adulthood: Prospective cohort study in the United Kingdom. *The BMJ*, *350*, Article h2469. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.h2469

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Harvard University Press.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1997). Ecological models of human development. In M. Gauvain & M. Cole (Eds.), *Readings on the development of children* (2nd ed., pp. 37–43). W. H. Freeman. (Reprinted from *International encyclopedia of education*, pp. 1643–1647, by T. Husen & T. N. Postlethwaite, Eds., 1994, Elsevier Sciences)

Campbell, M., Hwang, Y.-S., Whiteford, C., Dillon-Wallace, J., Ashburner, J., Saggers, B., & Carrington, S. (2017). Bullying prevalence in students with autism spectrum disorder. *Australasian Journal of Special Education*, *41*(2), 101–122. https://doi.org/10.1017/jse.2017.5

Carbone-Lopez, K., Esbensen, F.-A., & Brick, B. T. (2010). Correlates and consequences of peer victimization: Gender differences in direct and indirect forms of bullying. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, *8*(4), 332–350. https://doi.org/10.1177/1541204010362954

Cardona, R. S., Reyes, A. S., & Tangalin, M. M. (2015). The bullying experiences and classroom discipline techniques in an urban national high school in the Philippines: A basis for an anti-bullying program. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, *5*(2), 49–52.

Chen, X., Huang, X., Chang, L., Wang, L., & Li, D. (2010). Aggression, social competence, and academic achievement in Chinese children: A 5-year longitudinal study. *Development and Psychopathology*, *22*(3), 583–592. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579410000295

Cleverley, K., Szatmari, P., Vaillancourt, T., Boyle, M., & Lipman, E. (2012). Developmental trajectories of physical and indirect aggression from late childhood to adolescence: Sex differences and outcomes in emerging adulthood. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, *51*(10), 1037–1051. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaac.2012.07.010

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 observation. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *25*(2), 65–83. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020149

Cybersafe: Survey 2015. (2016). Stairway Foundation, Inc.; Department of Education, Philippines.

Deighton, J., Humphrey, N., Belsky, J., Boehnke, J., Vostanis, P., & Patalay, P. (2018). Longitudinal pathways between mental health difficulties and academic performance during middle childhood and early adolescence. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *36*(1), 110–126. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjdp.12218

Due, P., Holstein, B. E., Lynch, J., Diderichsen, F., Gabhain, S., Scheidt, P., Currie, C., & The Health Behaviour in School-Aged Children Bullying Working Group. (2005). Bullying and symptoms among school-aged children: International comparative cross sectional study in 28 countries. *European Journal of Public Health*, *15*(2), 128–132. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/cki105

Dukes, R. L., Stein, J. A., & Zane, J. I. (2010). Gender differences in the relative impact of physical and relational bullying on adolescent injury and weapon carrying. *Journal of School Psychology*, *48*(6), 511–532. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2010.08.001

Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Esguerra, M. A. d. V. (2020). *Prevalence and contributory factors on bullying behaviors among Filipino junior high school students* (Doctoral dissertation). Ateneo de Naga University, Naga City, Philippines.

Espelage, D. L., & Swearer, S. M. (Eds.). (2011). *Bullying in North American schools* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Fernández, M. V. C., Fernández, M. L., Castro, Y. R., Garrido, J. M. F., & Otero, M. C. (2013). Bullying in Spanish secondary schools: Gender-based differences. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, *16*, Article E21. https://doi.org/10.1017/sjp.2013.37

Fretwell, Q. (2015). *Addressing bullying in schools: The perceptions, thoughts and beliefs of middle-school principals* (Doctoral dissertation). Georgia State University, GA. https://doi.org/10.57709/7078728

Gladden, R. M., Vivolo-Kantor, A. M., Hamburger, M. E., & Lumpkin, C. D. (2014). *Bullying surveillance among youths: Uniform definitions for public health and recommended data elements, version 1.0*. National Center for Injury Prevention and Control; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; United States Department of Education.

Gofin, R., & Avitzour, M. (2012). Traditional versus internet bullying in junior high school students. *Maternal and Child Health Journal*, *16*(8), 1625–1635. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10995-012-0989-8

Hanish, L. D., Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., Spinrad, T. L., Ryan, P., & Schmidt, S. (2004). The expression and regulation of negative emotions: Risk factors for young children's peer victimization. *Development and Psychopathology*, *16*(2), 335–353. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579404044542

Harris, M. J. (Ed.). (2009). *Bullying, rejection, and peer victimization: A social cognitive neuroscience perspective*. Springer.

Haynie, D. L., Nansel, T., Eitel, P., Crump, A. D., Saylor, K., Yu, K., & Simons-Morton, B. (2001). Bullies, victims, and bully/victims: Distinct groups of at-risk youth. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, *21*(1), 29–49. https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431601021001002

Heydenberk, R. A., & Heydenberk, W. R. (2017). Bullying reduction and subjective wellbeing: The benefits of reduced bullying reach far beyond the victim. *International Journal of Well Being*, *7*(1), 12–22. https://doi.org/10.5502/ijw.v7i1.516

Hong, J. S., & Eamon, M. K. (2012). Students' perceptions of unsafe schools: An ecological systems analysis. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, *21*(3), 428–438. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-011-9494-8

Hong, J. S., & Espelage, D. L. (2012). A review of research on bullying and peer victimization in school: An ecological system analysis. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *17*(4), 311–322. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2012.03.003

Huang, H., Hong, J. S., & Espelage, D. L. (2013). Understanding factors associated with bullying and peer victimization in Chinese schools within ecological contexts. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, *22*(7), 881–892. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-012-9647-4

Hymel, S., & Swearer, S. M. (2015). Four decades of research on school bullying: An introduction. *American Psychologist*, *70*(4), 293–299. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038928

Jordan, K. J. (2014). *Administrators' and teachers' perceptions of bullying and bullying policies in middle schools in three South Carolina school districts* (Doctoral dissertation). South Carolina State University, Orangeburg, SC.

Kahn, J. H., Jones, J. L., & Wieland, A. L. (2012). Preservice teachers' coping styles and their responses to bullying. *Psychology in the Schools*, *49*(8), 784–793. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.21632

Kosciw, J. G., Greytak, E. A., Bartkiewicz, M. J., Boesen, M. J., & Palmer, N. A. (2012). *The 2011 national school climate survey: The experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender youth in our nation's schools*. Gay, Lesbian & Straight Education Network.

Lund, E. M., & Ross, S. W. (2016). Bullying perpetration, victimization, and demographic differences in college students: A review of the literature. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, *18*(3), 348–360. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838015620818

Maximo, S. I., & Loy, N. S. N. G. (2014). Bullying among high school students as influenced by parent-child attachment and parenting styles. *Philippine Journal of Psychology*, *47*(2), 125–152.

Moilanen, K. L., Shaw, D. S., & Maxwell, K. L. (2010). Developmental cascades: Externalizing, internalizing, and academic competence from middle childhood to early adolescence. *Development and Psychopathology*, *22*(3), 635–653. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0954579410000337

Nansel, T. R., Craig, W., Overpeck, M. D., Saluja, G., & Ruan, W. J. (2004). Cross-national consistency in the relationship between bullying behaviors and psychosocial adjustment. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine*, *158*(8), 730–736. https://doi.org/10.1001/archpedi.158.8.730

National Center for Education Statistics. (2019). *Student reports of bullying: Results from the 2017 school crime supplement to the national crime victimization survey*. United States Department of Education Institute of Education Sciences.

Neupane, D. (2014). Gender role in school bullying. *Journal of Chitwan Medical College*, *4*(1), 37–41. https://doi.org/10.3126/jcmc.v4i1.10847

Obradović, J., Burt, K. B., & Masten, A. S. (2010). Testing a dual cascade model linking competence and symptoms over 20 years from childhood to adulthood. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, *39*(1), 90–102. https://doi.org/10.1080/15374410903401120

Olweus, D., & Limber, S. P. (2010). Bullying in school: Evaluation and dissemination of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, *80*(1), 124–134. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1939-0025.2010.01015.x

Peterson, J. S., & Ray, K. E. (2006). Bullying and the gifted: Victims, perpetrators, prevalence, and effects. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, *50*(2), 148–168. https://doi.org/10.1177/001698620605000206

Plan Philippines. (2008). *Towards a child-friendly school environment: A baseline study on violence against children in schools* [Research Protocol for PLAN Area Research].

Polit, D. F., & Beck, C. T. (2012). *Nursing research: Generating and assessing evidence for nursing practice* (9th ed.). Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.

Pontzer, D. (2010). A theoretical test of bullying behavior: Parenting, personality, and the bully/victim relationship. *Journal of Family Violence*, *25*(3), 259–273. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-009-9289-5

Pörhölä, M., Cvancara, K., Kaal, E., Kunttu, K., Tampere, K., & Torres, M. B. (2020). Bullying in university between peers and by personnel: Cultural variation in prevalence, forms, and gender differences in four countries. *Social Psychology of Education*, *23*(1), 143–169. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-019-09523-4

Psalti, A. (2012). Bullies, victims, and bully-victims in Greek schools: Research data and implications for practice. *Hellenic Journal of Psychology*, *9*(2), 132–157.

Rastrullo, K. E. A., & Francisco, M. E. (2015). Bullying and school connectedness among high school students. *Lux Veritatis*, *1*(1), 88–104.

Republic act no. 10627 [An Act Requiring All Elementary and Secondary Schools to Adopt Policies to Prevent and Address the Acts of Bullying in Their Institutions]. (2013). Republic of the Philippines Congress of the Philippines.

Rodkin, P. C., Farmer, T. W., Pearl, R., & Van Acker, R. (2006). They're cool: Social status and peer group supports for aggressive boys and girls. *Social Development*, *15*(2), 175–204. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1467-9507.2006.00336.x

Rose, C. A., & Gage, N. A. (2017). Exploring the involvement of bullying among students with disabilities over time. *Exceptional Children*, *83*(3), 298–314. https://doi.org/10.1177/0014402916667587

Rose, C. A., Monda-Amaya, L. E., & Espelage, D. L. (2011). Bullying perpetration and victimization in special education: A review of the literature. *Remedial and Special Education*, *32*(2), 114–130. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741932510361247

Rosen, N. L., & Nofziger, S. (2019). Boys, bullying, and gender roles: How hegemonic masculinity shapes bullying behavior. *Gender Issues*, *36*(3), 295–318. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12147-018-9226-0

Ross, D. M. (2002). Bullying. In J. Sandoval (Ed.), *Handbook of crisis counseling, intervention, and prevention in the schools* (2nd ed., pp. 105–135). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Sanapo, M. S. (2017). When kids hurt other kids: Bullying in Philippine schools. *Psychology*, *8*(14), 2469–2484. https://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2017.814156

Seixas, S. R., Coelho, J. P., & Nicholas-Fischer, G. (2013). Bullies, victims and bully-victims: Impact on health profile. *Educação, Sociedade & Culturas*, *38*, 53–75. https://doi.org/10.34626/esc.vi38

Selim, L. (2018). *13 reasons why we need to end violence in school*. https://www.unicef.org/stories/13-reasons-why-we-need-end-violence-schools

Smith, P. K. (2004). Bullying: Recent developments. *Child and Adolescent Mental Health*, *9*(3), 98–103. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-3588.2004.00089.x

Søndergaard, D. M. (2012). Bullying and social exclusion anxiety in schools. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *33*(3), 355–372. https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2012.662824

Swearer, S. M., Espelage, D. L., Vaillancourt, T., & Hymel, S. (2010). What can be done about school bullying? Linking research to educational practice. *Educational Researcher*, *39*(1), 38–47. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X09357622

Tisak, M. S., Tisak, J., Baker, E. R., & Graupensperger, S. A. (2016). Relations among victimization, witnessing, and perpetration of aggression: Impact of gender among youth offenders. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *34*(10), 2158–2180. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260516659658

Ttofi, M. M., Farrington, D. P., Lösel, F., & Loeber, R. (2011). The predictive efficiency of school bullying versus later offending: A systematic/meta-analytic review of longitudinal studies. *Criminal Behavior and Mental Health*, *21*(2), 80–89. https://doi.org/10.1002/cbm.808

UNESCO Institute of Statistics. (2018). *New SDG 4 data on bullying*. https://uis.unesco.org/en/news/new-sdg-4-data-bullying

UNICEF Philippines. (2019). *Online bullying remains prevalent in the Philippines, other countries*. https://www.unicef.org/philippines/press-releases/online-bullying-remains-prevalent-philippines-other-countries

Vaillancourt, T., Brittain, H. L., McDougall, P., & Duku, E. (2013). Longitudinal links between childhood peer victimization, internalizing and externalizing problems, and academic functioning: Developmental cascades. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, *41*(8), 1203–1215. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-013-9781-5

Veltkamp, L. J., & Lawson, A. (2008). Impact of trauma in school violence on the victim and the perpetrator: A mental health perspective. In T. W. Miller (Ed.), *School violence and primary prevention* (pp. 185–200). Springer.

Villamor, A., Serrano, S. R., Cañaveral, N., Alarcon, C. R., Ibasco, H., Royo, K., Dihiansan, K. B., Del Mundo, M., & David, M. (2014). *V-SCAIRD acts of bullying inventory tool* (Unpublished senior project). Ateneo de Naga University, Naga City, Philippines.

Watkins, C. E. (2003). *Protecting against bullies throughout the life cycle*. http://www.baltimorepsych.com/Bullying_Thru_Life_Cycle.htm

Wolke, D., & Lereya, S. T. (2015). Long-term effects of bullying. *Archives of Disease in Childhood*, *100*(9), 879–885. https://doi.org/10.1136/archdischild-2014-306667

Yang, A., Li, X., & Salmivalli, C. (2016). Maladjustment of bully-victims: Validation with three identification methods. *Educational Psychology*, *36*(8), 1390–1407. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2015.1015492

Yang, A., & Salmivalli, C. (2013). Different forms of bullying and victimization: Bully-victims versus bullies and victims. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *10*(6), 723–738. https://doi.org/10.1080/17405629.2013.793596