ORIGINAL ARTICLE

BULLYING WITH SCHOOL TEENAGERS IN DIFFERENT EDUCATIONAL CONTEXTS*
BULLYING COM ADOLESCENTES ESCOLARES EM DIFERENTES CONTEXTOS EDUCACIONAIS
ACOSO CON ADOLESCENTES ESCOLARES EN DIFERENTES CONTEXTOS EDUCATIVOS

Francisco Ubaldo Vieira Junior[1], Katia Maria Rosa Vieira[2], Andrezza Campos Moretti[3]

ABSTRACT

Objective: to categorize victimization by bullying and cyberbullying in adolescents. *Method:* this is a quantitative, descriptive, exploratory, cross-sectional study with adolescent students from two public schools and two private schools that answered a questionnaire, then the Multidimentional Peer Victimation Scale instrument was used, adapted to measure bullying. The Kruskal-Wallis test was used to compare means and Pearson's correlation to relate the variables studied with the occurrences of victimization. *Results:* it is revealed that approximately 78% of school students reported at least one occurrence of bullying in the last six months and 17% suffered half of the total victimizations in the same period. Significant differences were shown by the mean of bullying between schools, and the comparison with data in the literature indicated concern in the moderate and severe degrees. *Conclusion:* it is concluded that the victimization classifications were consistent with the literature. Differences in the characteristics of the victims were observed in different educational contexts with the urgency of interdisciplinary actions against bullying. *Descriptors*: Bullying; Cyberbullying; Education; Adolescent Behavior; Students; Public Health.

RESUMO

Objetivo: categorizar a vitimização por *bullying* e *cyberbullying* em adolescentes. *Método:* trata-se de um estudo quantitativo, descritivo, exploratório, transversal, com estudantes adolescentes de duas escolas públicas e duas particulares que responderam um questionário, em seguida, empregou-se o instrumento *Multidimentional Peer Victimation Scale* adaptado para a mensuração do *bullying*. Utilizou-se o teste Kruskal-Wallis para a comparação entre médias e a correlação de Pearson para relacionar as variáveis estudadas com as ocorrências de vitimização. *Resultados:* revela-se que aproximadamente 78% dos estudantes das escolas relataram, pelo menos, uma ocorrência de *bullying* nos últimos seis meses e 17% sofreram metade das vitimizações totais no mesmo período. Mostraram-se, pela média do *bullying* entre as escolas, diferenças significantes, e a comparação com dados da literatura indicou preocupação nos graus moderado e severo. *Conclusão:* conclui-se que as classificações das vitimizações foram consistentes com a literatura. Observaram-se diferenças nas características das vítimas nos diferentes contextos educacionais com a premência de ações interdisciplinares contra o *bullying*. *Descritores*: Bullying; Cyberbullying; Educação; Comportamento do Adolescente; Estudantes; Saúde Pública.

RESUMEN

Objetivo: categorizar la victimización por *bullying* y *cyberbullying* en adolescentes. *Método*: este es un estudio cuantitativo, descriptivo, exploratorio, transversal con estudiantes adolescentes de dos escuelas públicas y dos escuelas privadas que respondieron a un cuestionario, luego se usó el instrumento *Multidimentional Peer Victimation Scale* adaptado para medir el acoso escolar. La prueba de Kruskal-Wallis se utilizó para comparar medias y la correlación de Pearson para relacionar las variables estudiadas con los casos de victimización. *Resultados:* se revela que aproximadamente el 78% de los estudiantes escolares informaron al menos una ocurrencia de acoso escolar en los últimos seis meses y el 17% sufrió la mitad de las victimizaciones totales en el mismo período. Las diferencias significativas se mostraron por la media de la intimidación entre las escuelas, y la comparación con los datos en la literatura indicó preocupación en los grados moderados y severos. *Conclusión:* se concluye que las clasificaciones de victimización fueron consistentes con la literatura. Se observaron diferencias en las características de las víctimas en diferentes contextos educativos con la urgencia de acciones interdisciplinarias contra el acoso escolar. *Descriptores*: Acoso Escolar; Ciberacoso; Educacíon; Conducta del Adolescente; Estudiantes; Salud Pública.

[1]Federal Institute of Education, Science and Technology of São Paulo/IFSP-CMP/State University of Campinas/UNICAMP. Campinas (SP), Brazil. [1] https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0419-6971 [2]State University of Campinas/UNICAMP. Campinas (SP), Brazil. [2]https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2988-7437 [3]Federal Institute of Education, Science and Technology of São Paulo/IFSP-SRO. Sorocaba (SP), Brazil. [3]https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6004-3246

How to cite this article
Vieira Junior FU, Vieira KMR, Moretti AC. *Bullying* com adolescentes escolares em diferentes contextos educacionais. J Nurs UFPE on line. 2020;14:e243622 DOI: https://doi.org/10.5205/1981-8963.2020.243622

INTRODUCTION

Bullying is characterized as any aggressive behavior consisting of three central elements: the intention to harm the victim, the repetitive nature of the aggressions and the imbalance of power between the aggressor and the victim.[1] It is a social phenomenon that occurs in schools, but it can be practiced anywhere else.

This theme became relevant from works carried out by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (Unesco) and the United Nations Children's Fund (Unicef), being considered a worldwide public health problem and that requires intervention.[2]

There is an association between bullying and suicide in adolescents, indicating the importance of educational programs and safety mechanisms in schools.[3] It manifests itself, whatever the behavior of bullying, by someone (individual or group) and targets another individual.

Multiple forms of victimization by traditional bullying and cyberbullying are included, being prevalent between primary and secondary education.[4] Studies show a high percentage of victimization, both in boys and girls, ranging from 9% to 97.9%,[1,3,5-6] can result in serious problems and even into adult life.[7-8]

It is understood that bullying among schoolchildren is a complex phenomenon and has distinct characteristics, and obtaining data involving different cultures, contexts and communities can assist in the design of intervention programs.[9-10]

It is known that the school has a fundamental role in reducing victimization by bullying. A study shows the importance of the school climate, feeling of alienation, environmental security and income as factors associated with the increase in violence among students.[11]

t is explained that the more a schoolchild has a feeling of belonging (pleasure, taste and security at school), the less the chance of being involved in bullying, either as an aggressor or victim.[12] Intervention programs against bullying are proposed and studied around the world. In some studies, school bullying has been reduced by 19-20%, in relation to aggression, and by 15-16%, in relation to victimization,[1] and strategies mediated by teachers, school staff and outside school professionals have shown good evidence of effectiveness.[13]

Various health promotion actions are used to mitigate bullying. By identifying the types of victimization and their characteristics, it is possible to assist in the creation of effective intervention programs in schools.

OBJECTIVES

● To categorize victimization by bullying and cyberbullying in adolescents.

● To identify the characteristics of victims in schools with different educational contexts.

METHOD

This is a quantitative, descriptive, exploratory, cross-sectional study, aimed at school adolescents enrolled in public and private urban schools in the morning, afternoon and evening periods, in the grades from the 1st to the 3rd year of High School and from the 1st to the 4th Teaching Module concurrent / subsequent technical.

Inclusion criteria were considered: the individual aged between 14 and 19 years old regularly enrolled in the grades from the 1st to the 3rd years of High School or 1st to the 4th modules of concurrent / subsequent technical education and being present in the classroom at data collection. Exclusion criteria were established: being over 19 years of age.

For convenience, two public schools (E1 and E4) and two private schools (E2 and E3) were selected, totaling 968 students enrolled with the following data collection scenarios:

E1 - Free federal public school, with technical courses integrated to high school in the morning and afternoon, with 192 students enrolled. Admission form: curriculum analysis. Operating time: four years. Structured socio-educational nucleus: present. Teachers working exclusively;

E2 - Private school, with high school courses in the morning and afternoon, with 254 students enrolled. Admission form: paid registration. Operating time: 105 years. Structured socio-educational nucleus: absent. Teachers paid according to activities performed;

E3 - Catholic confessional private school, with high school courses in the morning, with 153 students enrolled. Admission form: paid registration. Operating time: 66 years. Structured socio-educational nucleus: absent. Teachers paid according to activities performed;

E4 - Free state public school, with technical courses concurrent / subsequent to High School, with modular courses (six months each module) in the evening, with 522 students enrolled. Admission form: written selection test. Operating time: 35 years. Structured socio-educational nucleus: absent. Teachers paid according to activities performed.

Data was collected between August and September 2019 through a questionnaire containing four blocks of questions structured as follows:

Block 1: with questions related to general and family data;

Block 2: with sleep-related questions adapted from the Pittsburg Sleep Quality Index: "when you went to bed, it took you more than 30 minutes to sleep" and "you had bad dreams or nightmares"; with response pattern: No time = 0; Less than once a week = 1; once or twice a week = 2 and three times a week or more = 3;

Block 3: with questions related to the school, friends, teachers and self-image, with standard answers: Very bad = 1; Bad = 2; Regular = 3; Good = 4 and Very good = 5.

Block 4: with 12 questions about victimization by bullying adapted from the Peer Victimation Scale (PVS)[5] and three questions added by researchers related to cyberbullying: "they insulted me on the phone"; "Texted me with insults" and "posted pictures or videos of me that displeased me (social networks, WhatsApp)";[14] with response pattern: Never = 0; Once = 1 and More than once = 2, referring to the current school year (since the beginning of classes this year).

The original structure of the PVS was used, with self-report responses, on a Likert-type scale, for the measurement of physical, social, verbal, material and virtual bullying. In order to adapt the questionnaire and add three questions related to cyberbullying, the internal consistency of the questionnaire was evaluated.

The research was carried out in two stages. The first was for clarification on research and delivery of the Free and Informed Consent Term (FICT) to all students from all four schools for the signature of parents or guardians of minors.

The second stage was scheduled with a period varying between one and two weeks. It is informed that the questionnaire was answered by older students who agreed to participate and signed the FICT; underage students, who had their FICT signed by their parents or guardians and agreed to participate in the research, answered the questionnaire by signing the Free and Informed Assent Term (FIAT).

The degree of victimization by bullying was classified according to the following criteria:

Without victimization: when the total percentage of victims (physical, social, verbal, material and virtual) was zero;

Mild victimization: when the victimization percentage was 20%;

Moderate victimization: when the percentage of victimization was 30%;

Severe victimization: hen the percentage of victimization was 50%.

The degree of victimization by bullying was calculated by ordering the sum of total victimization in descending order and the number of students in each degree of victimization was counted from the cumulative percentage of 50% (severe), 30% (moderate) and 20% (Light).

It is added that students without victimization were the ones who marked the option "none" in all 15 questions in block 4.

The data were recorded with the aid of the electronic spreadsheet MS Excel and the statistical software BioEstat 5.2 was used for statistical analysis. The relationship between the degree of victimization by bullying and the other variables was analyzed using Pearson's correlation.

The Kruskal-Wallis test was used to compare means and the internal consistency of the PVS questionnaire was verified, adapted with the Cronbach's alpha coefficient. For all results, $p < 0.05$ was considered statistically significant.

The ethical parameters of Resolution No. 466/2012 of the National Health Council were followed, and the research was approved by the Ethics Committee Opinion 3.596.416.

RESULTS

Cronbach's alpha was calculated for the internal consistency measure of the PVS questionnaire adapted by the authors and the result was 0.87.

Table 1 shows the result of total victimization, the number of victims with respective percentage of participation distributed by school according to the degree of victimization and the total average of bullying in schools classified according to the degree of severity.

Table 1. Distribution of victimization according to the degree of severity and schools. São Paulo (SP), Brazil, 2019.

Degree of Victimization	School												Average of bullying
	E1			E2			E3			E4			
	TV	N	%	TV	N	%	TV	N	%	TV	N	%	
Inexistente	-	14	19.2	-	5	8.3	-	8	23.6	-	45	41.6*	---
Leve	80	30	41.1	48	28	46.7	58	12	35.4	72	30	27.8	2.58 (1.67)
Moderado	116	16	21.9	73	17	28.3	84	7	20.5	109	19	17.6	6.47 (2.78)
Severo	206	13	17.8	118	10	16.7	134	7	20.5	186	14	13.0	14.64 (46.7)
Total	402	73	100	239	60	100	276	34	100	367	108	100	---

Note: TV, Number of total victimizations; N, number of victims; Total mean (standard deviation), * $p < 0.05$.

It is noteworthy that, at school E1, 17.8% (13 students) of the participants reported having suffered approximately 50% of victimization (206 victimization); schools E2, E3 and E4 had: 16.7%

(ten students - 118 victimization); 20.5% (seven students - 134 victims) and 13.0% (14 students - 186 victims), respectively; only the degree without victimization showed a difference in the proportions of students between schools.

The characterization of participants according to schools is shown below:

E1 - 38% of students participated in the research with the following characteristics: age between 15 and 18 years; mean age of 16.2 and standard deviation of 0.81 years; 44.5% of the male gender; 42.5% white; 41.1% of mothers and 41.1% of fathers with higher education or postgraduate;

E2 – 21.5% of the target audience participated in the research with the following characteristics: age between 15 and 19 years; mean age of 16.0 and standard deviation of 0.97 years; 38.3% were male; 95.0% white; 93.3% of mothers and 93.3% of parents with higher education or postgraduate;

E3 – 38% of the target audience participated in the survey with the following characteristics: age between 15 and 18 years; mean age of 16.2 and standard deviation of 0.81 years; 44.5% of the

male gender; 82.3% white; 70.6% of mothers and 70.6% of parents with higher education or postgraduate;

E4 – 36.4% of students participated in the research with the following characteristics: age between 15 and 19 years; mean age of 17.7 and standard deviation of 0.93 years, who lived with adults of varying ages (20 to 58 years) in the school environment; 74.1% of the male gender; 50.0% white; 14.2% of mothers and 18.7% of parents with higher education or postgraduate.

It should be added that, until the time of data collection, only the E2 school carried out a structured action to combat bullying.

Table 2 shows the average (standard deviation) of victimization in schools distributed by type and degree of severity.

Table 2. Distribution of the means (standard deviation) of victimization by type of bullying according to the degree of severity in schools. São Paulo (SP), Brazil, 2019.

Degree	School	Type of bullying						
		Physical	Social	Verbal	Material	Virtual	P	Total
Light	E1	0.37(0.67)	**0.97(1.07)**	**0.87(1.07)**	0.37(0.67)	0.10(0.31)	<0.0001	2.67(1.42)
	E2	0.04(0.19)	**0.75(0.84)**	**0.71(0.71)**	0.14(0.45)	0.07(0.26)	<0.0001	1.71(0.81)
	E3	0.08(0.29)	**1.83(1.47)**	1.42 (1.62)	1.25(1.36)	0.25(0.62)	0.001	4.83(2.72)[†]
	E4	0.10(0.40)	0.50 (0.90)	**1.20(1.10)**	0.53(0.78)	0.07(0.37)	<0.0001	2.40(1.07)
Moderate	E1	1.06(1.39)	**2.25(1.88)**	**3.06(1.53)**	0.44(0.81)	0.44(0.81)	<0.0001	7.25(1.81)
	E2	0.18(0.39)	1.24 (1.44)	**2.00(1.32)**	0.65(1.11)	0.24(0.56)	<0.0001	4.29(1.31)
	E3	0.71 (076)	3.00 (1.41)	**4.14(1.07)**	2.00(1.73)	2.14(1.77)	0.004	12.00(1.15)[†]
	E4	0.84(0.74)	0.74 (1.48)	**2.58(1.39)**	1.05(1.43)	0.53(0.77)	0.0002	5.74(1.66)
Severe	E1	2.00 (1.73)	3.77 (1.96)	**4.77(1.17)**	2.62 (1.89)	2.69 (0.95)	0.0012	15.85(3.98)
	E2	0.60 (0.84)	3.40 (1.84)	**3.70(1.49)**	2.50 (1.95)	1.60 (1.65)	0.0005	11.8(3.46)
	E3	1.86 (1.46)	3.71 (2.21)	**5.71(0.76)**	3.86 (1.86)	**4.00(1.15)**	0.0054	19.14(3.72)[†]
	E4	1.71 (1.59)	3.21 (2.08)	**5.14(1.17)**	2.14 (1.83)	1.07 (1.21)	<0.0001	13.29 (4.70)

Note: (†) p<0.01

It is noteworthy that the average number of victims of bullying was different for the types (physical, social, verbal, material and virtual) in all schools and the most prevalent were social and verbal. It is also added that the institution E3 had the highest average of total victimization in all degrees of severity and the school E2 showed the lowest values.

Table 3 shows the correlation between the degree of severity of total victimization by bullying (None = 1, Mild = 2, Moderate = 3, Severe = 4) and the variables: year of course (1st year = 1, 2nd year = 2, 3rd year = 3); students' age (15, 16, 17 and over 18 years old); accompaniment of parents in school matters; relationship with friends at school; relationship with teachers; body

self-image; it takes more than 30 minutes to sleep and the presence of bad dreams or nightmares.

Table 3. Pearson's correlation coefficient between the degree of severity of total victimization by bullying according to the variables studied. São Paulo (SP), Brazil, 2019.

| Variable | School | | | |
	E1	E2	E3	E4
Age	0.149	-0.268*	-0.047	-0.165
School year	0.308†	-0.293*	-0.113	0.057
Monitoring of parents	0.052	-0.258*	-0.062	-0.114
Friends at school	-0.366†	-0.368†	-0.389*	-0.156
Teachers at school	-0.068	-0.091	-0.346*	-0.046
Body self-image	-0.160	-0.014	-0.342*	-0.086
It takes time to sleep	0.339†	-0.022	0.577†	0.1681
Bad dreams or nightmares	0.264*	-0.074	0.489†	0.029

Note: (*) $p < 0.05$, (†) $p < 0.01$.

It is noteworthy that the correlation between the school year and the degree of severity occurred in schools E1 and E2, with opposite trends, that is, the degree of severity increased with the progression of the school year in school E1 and decreased in school E2.

It correlated negatively with the degree of severity: the monitoring of parents at school E2; the relationship with friends at schools E1, E2 and E3; the relationship with teachers and body self-image - only at school E3.

It is added that the number of times per week that the student took more than 30 minutes to sleep and had bad dreams or nightmares correlated positively with the degree of severity in schools E1 and E3.

It was observed that the E4 school did not show any relationship with the investigated variables in relation to the degree of severity.

Table 4 shows the result of the correlation between virtual bullying and the other traditional types of measured bullying.

Table 4. Pearson's correlation between cyberbullying and other types of victimization. São Paulo (SP), Brazil, 2019.

| Types of bullying | Linear regression coefficient | | | |
	E1	E2	E3	E4
Physical	0.348†	0.286*	0.597†	0.112
Social	0.622†	0.450†	0.488*	0.546†
Verbal	0.623†	0.370†	0.663†	0.393†
Material	0.541†	0.284*	0.336*	0.119

Note: (*) $p < 0.05$, (†) $p < 0.01$.

There is, in all institutions, a positive correlation between virtual and social bullying and between virtual and verbal bullying. It is pointed out that the E4 school did not show a correlation between cyberbullying and physical and material bullying.

DISCUSSION

It should be noted that the PVS is a multidimensional scale[5] and adapted, in Portugal.[15] It is an instrument with self-report responses for the occurrence of specific victimization behaviors and is used as an instrument to analyze bullying in different situations in the world. Their psychometric properties were examined, with a systematic review of 34 published studies, considering a reliable, valid and solid measure to capture various facets of victimization by peers.[16]

It is noted that, originally, in PVS, there were no issues related to cyberbullying. In this work, the instrument was adapted in order to verify cyberbullying together with the traditional types (physical, social, verbal and material).

It is noteworthy that many researchers investigated victimization in terms of prevalence and frequency to obtain data for prevention and intervention, including policies against bullying,[15,17] with results that are often different.[18]

It was found that young people can experience several forms of bullying at the same time. Studies have shown that 50.3% of victims reported experiencing all forms in a single month.[19] It is believed that this is a serious public health problem and may be a precursor to personality disorders and violent behaviors, 20 and the use of an instrument capable of simultaneously quantifying traditional bullying and cyberbullying can assist in prevention actions.

It is noted that, in this investigation, the half-yearly average of total victimization by bullying in the four schools was 6.47 for the moderate grade and 14.64 for the severe grade. It is added that, from the point of view of averages, the PVS questionnaire brings undersized values, since the answer, related to the maximum number of victimizations possible to be selected by the respondents, was "more than once", and the in this case, considering two victimizations.

It was found that one of the instruments widely used for the classification of victimization is the Olweus questionnaire, which includes specific

questions related to bullying. It was indicated, by analysis, to have suffered bullying two or three times a month as a lower limit for the analysis of victimization.[21] In this research, in the severe degree, 2.44 victimizations per month were shown, compatible with the results of Olweus, however, with underestimated values.

It is noteworthy that the Olweus questionnaire was constructed with direct questions about bullying, such as, "How many times have you been bullied at school ...?", Offering options for answers on a scale that ranges from "I have never been bullied" ... "to" many times a week". The PVS questionnaire brings statements such as: "they tried to put me against my friends", whose answers are classified according to the physical, verbal, social and material type, so comparisons of results between instruments may not be very effective.

It is observed in a study[22] which proposed, as a cutoff point for victimization by bullying, the repetition of more than four episodes of a determined situation of school violence in a period of six months. It is evaluated, considering this parameter, that the results of this research showed that the moderate and severe classifications deserve attention.

It was evident, in a study with adolescents aged 12 to 17 years victimized by bullying, that the annual average of 6.60 for traditional bullying and 2.27 for cyberbullying were at the lower end of the study's range, which, under these conditions, indicated uncommon experiences related to suicide.[11]

In this study, it was shown that the average of traditional bullying among the four schools was 5.86 in the moderate classification and 12.5 in the severe classification and cyberbullying had an average of 0.61 in the moderate classification and 2.13 in the severe classification, for the six-month period. It is warned, considering the research that the moderate and severe classifications for traditional bullying deserve attention, as well as only the severe classifications in cyberbullying.[11]

In this work, a model was proposed for the relative classification of the severity of victimization by bullying in order to facilitate the visualization of the individual characteristics of each school, in different educational contexts, for actions against bullying. It is also noteworthy that it can be a tool to aid school management, with the possibility of evaluating the results of interventions with subsequent measurement, using the same instrument.

It was found that the highest averages of victimization by degree of severity and type of bullying were social, verbal and, in isolation, virtual, in only one school. It was related, the suicide in adolescents with bullying, and the most cited form, in his research, was verbal bullying.[11]

It is noteworthy that the private schools E2 and E3 showed the best and worst results of the averages of victimization, both with a predominance of white participants and parents with a high level of education. It is believed that the fact that the E3 school is a confessional institution did not ensure low victimization for bullying among students.

It is also noteworthy that the data obtained at school E4 did not correlate with any variable investigated, despite the fact that the total victimization values in the severe degree (13.29) are within the cutoff point for bullying. The adolescents of this institution may present with concomitant / subsequent courses, different characteristics due to the fact that the course is night and the students study or work in the evening and relate to adults of different ages in the school environment. It is emphasized that additional studies should be carried out in an attempt to identify the variables that may characterize students in this educational context.

It is observed that the E2 school showed an average victimization value for bullying in severe degree, 25.5% lower than the average of the other schools, being the only one that had a structured action in the fight against bullying. The effectiveness of programs against bullying in schools stands out, evidencing a reduction between 15 and 20% in victimization, with emphasis on intensive programs, including meetings with parents, disciplinary methods and improved supervision.[12,23] There is a relevant reduction in victimization at school E2, which may be related to actions against bullying.

Various methods of approaching and measuring traditional bullying and cyberbullying have been found in the international literature. It is clear that there seems to be a consensus that understanding differences in victimization experiences is essential to identify where to allocate resources for effective prevention programs.[4]

In this study, the school year was correlated with schools E1 and E2, and in school E1, the degree of severity of victimization increased with the progression of the school year and, in school E2, decreased. It is pointed out that, in some studies, students were less likely to experience traditional bullying in the last grades[2] and others showed the opposite.[4]

There was a statistical correlation (-0.346) between the degree of severity and the relationship of students with teachers only at school E3, which had the highest average of total bullying in all degrees of severity. For more severe victimizations, worse relations with teachers were indicated.

It stands out, in studies related to the teachers' perspective on the severity of bullying, which

identified, first, physical bullying, second, verbal and, third, relational or social, with greater sympathy from teachers for students who suffered physical or verbal bullying, with five times more chances of intervention by teachers, in these types, than in social.[24]

It is noteworthy that many adolescents may not tell teachers about their victimization experiences. In a study, it was shown that up to 50% of children, rarely or never, told their parents and, between 35% and 60%, did not report it to teachers.[25] It is considered that the weak relationship with teachers, seen in schools E1, E2 and E4, is suggestive of little perception, preparation or involvement of teachers in protecting victims of bullying.

Bullying is associated with sleep problems, twice as likely to report sleeping difficulties [26-7] and depression problems related to insomnia and nightmares.[28] It was found that, in schools E1 and E3, with the increase in the severity of bullying, students reported greater delay in sleeping and frequency of bad dreams or nightmares.

It is noteworthy that, in institutions E1, E2 and E3, the relationship with friends at school was a protective factor regarding the increase in the severity of bullying.

In this study, it was found that cyberbullying, reported by students, varied between 1.7 and 5.4% in the moderate degree and between 4.7 and 10.1% in the severe degree, on the total victimization. Traditional bullying varied between 25.0 and 28.9% in the moderate degree and between 38.4 and 45.6%, in the severe degree, on the total victimization. Studies have shown, despite the difference between cyberbullying and traditional bullying, that experiencing both forms has negative effects, with a likelihood of suicidal ideation among adolescents, with the potential to try to take their own life.[29-30]

In this research, a positive correlation was observed between cyberbullying and the other traditional types of victimization, with some differences between schools. It was pointed out in a study that students who experienced both forms of bullying were five times more likely to report suicidal ideation than those who did not suffer victimization.[11]

The urgency of implementing programs against bullying in schools, involving health and education professionals was highlighted, [20] with assistance, preventive and educational actions with students, teachers and school management, aiming to minimize the health problems of adolescents.

CONCLUSION

The internal consistency of the adapted PVS was verified as an instrument for measuring traditional bullying and cyberbullying.

It is concluded that, in general, the classifications of victimization in moderate and severe degrees were consistent with the literature and can serve as a tool to assist in actions against bullying. The differences in the characteristics of victimization in different educational contexts were also highlighted. One can contribute, knowing that victims are the weakest link in victimization relationships, by classification by degree of severity and knowledge of their respective characteristics, in the construction of priority interventions to combat bullying. It is noteworthy that Brazil is a country of continental dimensions with different socioeconomic and educational contexts. It is pointed out that it is not known, for sure, how many schools carry out interventions against bullying in the country, and the authors understand that this study can contribute to direct priority actions to the most vulnerable groups, with the participation of health and education professionals.

REFERÊNCIAS

1. Gaffney H, Ttofi MM, Farrington DP. Evaluating the effectiveness of school-bullying prevention programs: An updated meta-analytical review. Aggress Behav. 2019 Mar/Apr;45:111-33. DOI: 10.1016/j.avb.2018.07.001

2. Craig W, Harel-Fisch Y, Fogel-Grinvald H, Dostaler S, Hetland J, Simons-Morton B, et al. A cross-national profile of bullying and victimization among adolescents in 40 countries. Int J Public Health. 2009 Sep;54(Suppl 2):216-24. DOI: 10.1007/s00038-009-5413-9

3. Baiden P, Kuuire VZ, Shrestha N, Tonui BC, Dako-Gyeke M, Peters KK. Bullying victimization as a predictor of suicidal ideation and suicide attempt among senior high school students in Ghana: Results from the 2012 Ghana Global School-Based Health Survey. J Sch Violence. 2019 July;18(2):300-17. DOI: 10.1080/15388220.2018.1486200

4. Salmon S, Turner S, Taillieu T, Fortier J, Afifi TO. Bullying victimization experiences among middle and high school adolescents: Traditional bullying, discriminatory harassment, and cybervictimization. J Adolesc. 2018 Feb;63:29-40. DOI: 10.1016/j.adolescence.2017.12.005

5. Mynard H, Joseph S. Development of the multidimensional peer-victimization scale. Aggress Behav. 2000 Jan;26(2):166–78. DOI: 10.1002/(SICI)1098-2337(2000)26:23.0.CO;2-A

6. Vianna JA, Souza SM, Reis KP. Bullying in Physical Education classes: the perception of students. Ensaio: aval pol públ Educ on line. 2015 Jan/Feb;23(86):73-93. DOI: 10.1590/S0104-40362015000100003

7. Silva JL, Oliveira WA, Braga IF, Farias MS, Lizzi EAS, Gonçalves MFC, et al. The effects of a skill-

based intervention for victims of bullying in Brazil. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2016 Oct ;13(11):1042-52. DOI: 10.3390/ijerph13111042

8. Murphy S, Murphy J, Shevlin M. Negative evaluations of self and others, and peer victimization as mediators of the relationship between childhood adversity and psychotic experiences in adolescence: the moderating role of loneliness. Br J Clin Psychol. 2015 Sept;54(3):326-44. DOI: 10.1111/bjc.12077

9. Zequinão MA, Medeiros P, Lise FA, Trevisol MTC, Pereira MBFLO. Association between school bullying and country of origin: a transcultural study. Rev Bras Educ. 2019 Apr;24:(e240013). DOI: 10.1590/s1413-24782019240013

10. Harel-Fisch Y, Walsh SD, Fogel-Grinvald H, Amitai G, Pickett W, Molcho M, et al. Negative school perceptions and involvement in school bullying: a universal relationship across 40 countries. J Adolesc. 2010 Aug;34(4):639-52.DOI: 10.1016/j.adolescence.2010.09.008

11. Hinduja S, Patchin JW. Connecting adolescent suicide to the severity of bullying and cyberbullying. J Sch Violence. 2018 Aug;18(3):333-46. DOI: 10.1080/15388220.2018.1492417

12. Gaffney H, Farrington, DP, Ttofi MM. Examining the effectiveness of school-bullying intervention programs globally: a meta-analysis. Int J Bull Prevent. 2019 Mar;1(1):14-31. DOI: 10.1007/s42380-019-0007-4

13. Gonçalves GO, Deiques EL, Peres ALX, Izidoro Júnior CAR. Bullying as a systematic violence that leads to stigmatization in soccer schools. Kinesis. 2019 June;37:1-9. DOI: 10.5902/2316546430606

14. Raskauskas J, Stoltz AD. Involvement in traditional and electronic bullying among adolescents. Dev Psichol [Internet]. 2007 May [cited 2019 Aug 10];43(3):564-75. Available from: https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/f21d/b7d1f74cbd707e6d168f04ef9c5be91ee730.pdf

15. Veiga F H. Disruptive Behavior Scale Professed by Students (DBS-PS): Development and validation. Rev Int Psicol Ter Psicol. 2008 June;8(2):203-16. DOI:10.1037/t48825-000

16. Joseph S, Stockton H. The multidimensional peer victimation scale: A systematic review. Aggress Behav. 2018 Sept;42:96-114. DOI: 10.1016/j.avb.2018.07.009

17. Chen LM, Liu KS, Cheng YY. Validation of the perceived school bullying severity scale. Educ Psychol. 2012 May;32(2):169-82. DOI: 10.1080/01443410.2011.633495

18. Swearer SM, Espelage DL, Vaillancourt T, Hymel S. What can be done about school bullying? Linking research to educational practice. Educ Res. 2010 Feb;39(1):38-47. DOI: 10.3102/0013189X09357622

19. Waasdorp TE, Bradshaw CP. The overlap between cyberbullying and traditional bullying. J Adolesc Health. 2015 May;56(5):483-8. Doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2014.12.002

20. Sampaio JMC, Gerolin FR, Mello FCM, Mariano AC, Silva MAI. Bullying at school: analysis of conflict relations between adolescents. J Nurs UFPE on line. 2015 Apr;9(4):7267-71. DOI: 10.5205/reuol.7275-62744-1-SM.0904201511

21. Solberg ME, Olweus D. Prevalence estimation of school bullying with the Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire. Aggress Behav. 2003 Apr;29(3):239-68. DOI: 10.1002/ab.10047

22. Wolke D, Woods S, Bloomfield L, Karstadt L. Bullying involvement in primary school and common health problems. Arch Dis Child. 2001 May; 85:197-201. DOI: 10.1136/adc.85.3.197

23. Ttofi MM, Farrington DP. Effectiveness of school-based programs to reduce bullying: a systematic and meta-analytic review. J Exp Criminol. 2011 Mar; 7(1):27-56. DOI: 10.1007/s11292-010-9109-1

24. Ellis AA, Shute R. Teacher responses to bullying in relation to moral orientation and seriousness of bullying. Br J Educ Psychol. 2007 Jan; 77(3):649-663. DOI: 10.1348/000709906X163405

25. Wolke D, Lereya ST. Long-term effects of bullying. Arch Dis Child. 2015 Feb;100(9):879-885. DOI: 10.1136/archdischild-2014-306667

26. Tu KM, Spencer CW, El-Sheikh M, Erath SA. Peer Victimization Predicts Sleep Problems in Early Adolescence. J Early Adolesc. 2019 Jan;39(1):67-80. DOI:10.1177/0272431617725199

27. Van Geel M, Goemans A, Vedder PH. The relation between peer victimization and sleeping problems: a meta-analysis. Sleep Med Rev. 2016 Jun; 27:89-95. DOI:10.1016/j.smrv.2015.05.004

28. Herkama S, Turunen T, Sandman N, Salmivalli C. Sleeping problems partly mediate the association between victimization and depression among youth. J Child Fam Stud. 2019 Sept; 28(9):2477-86. DOI: 10.1007/s10826-018-1249-3

29. Mueller AS, James W, Abrutyn S, Levin ML. Suicide ideation and bullying among us adolescents: examining the intersections of sexual orientation, gender, and race/ethnicity. Am J Public Health. 2015 May;105(5):980-5. DOI: 10.2105/AJPH.2014.302391

30. Schneider SK, O'Donnell L, Stueve A, Coulter RWS. Cyberbullying, school bullying, and psychological distress: a regional census of high school students. Am J Public Health. 2012 Jan; 102(1):171-7. DOI: 10.2105/AJPH.2011.300308

Corresponding author
Katia Maria Rosa Vieira
Email: katia_rosa@terra.com.br