Roles of Gender, Forms, and Locations in Understanding Peer Victimization Experiences: Implications for Prevention and Intervention

Anne Williford, Paula Fite, Kathryn DePaolis, and John Cooley

The experience of peer victimization, or being the target of aggression, is common throughout childhood and adolescence and often results in negative developmental outcomes. Further knowledge of peer victimization is needed for effective prevention and intervention to promote positive youth development. The current study extends the victimization literature by (a) examining victimization rates at locations both within and outside of the school context, (b) identifying the forms of victimization most prevalent in these locations, and (c) determining whether the forms of victimization vary by gender across different locations. In a sample of 278 third through fifth graders, gender differences were examined across physical, relational, and cyber victimization. Findings indicate that physical and relational victimization are likely to occur in similar locations, with the playground and home noted as frequent locations. However, cyber victimization was reported as occurring at home and on the bus. Several notable gender differences emerged when examining these locations by the form of victimization. Findings suggest that encouraging adults both within and outside of the school environment to collaborate in their efforts to prevent and intervene with peer victimization may be particularly useful. Specific ways to improve adult training efforts are discussed.

KEY WORDS: *elementary school; gender; locations; relational/physical/cyber victimization*

The experience of peer victimization is common throughout childhood and adolescence, with over 60 percent of children reporting at least some exposure during elementary school (Cooley, Fite, & Pederson, 2017; Ladd, Ettekal, & Kochenderfer-Ladd, 2017). *Peer victimization* is defined as a relationship-based pattern of behavior that involves the use of aggression to oppress, humiliate, or dominate others (Vernberg & Biggs, 2010). Experiencing peer victimization often leads to a number of negative consequences, including internalizing symptomatology (Bonanno & Hymel, 2013; Kowalski & Limber, 2013; Reijntjes, Kamphuis, Prinzie, & Telch, 2010; Sugimura & Rudolph, 2012), poor academic outcomes (Bayar & Uçanok, 2012; Fite, Cooley, Williford, Frazer, & DiPierro, 2014; Ladd et al., 2017; Nakamato & Schwartz, 2010), and externalizing problem behaviors such as aggression (Cooley et al., 2017; Reijntjes et al., 2011). Of concern, these effects for some victims persist into adulthood with recent evidence finding increased levels of psychological distress in adults who were victimized during childhood (McDougall & Vaillancourt, 2015; Takizawa, Maughan, & Arseneault, 2014). As such, it is important to identify effective prevention and early intervention strategies targeting peer victimization. Although a number of prevention and intervention approaches have been developed and tested in recent decades, the impacts of these strategies have been modest at best (Smith, 2011), especially in the United States where intervention studies often report less robust effects when compared with studies from other countries (Bradshaw, 2015). Accordingly, studies are needed to reveal nuances in peer victimization experiences that may inform more effective prevention and intervention efforts.

Research suggests that girls and boys have different developmental needs and preferences for friendship formation and playmate selection beginning in early childhood that persist throughout childhood and into adolescence (for a review, see Rose & Rudolph, 2006). Thus, their involvement in aggression and victimization has been found to differ (see Card, Stucky, Sawalani, & Little, 2008). This developmental research implies that examining gender as a factor in selecting appropriate prevention and intervention approaches may be important for refining current efforts and improving their impact on peer victimization.

doi: 10.1093/cs/cdy004

Notably, some evidence suggests that girls and boys may have different experiences with adult intervention, especially when taking the form of victimization into account. For example, teachers may not identify acts of peer victimization when such acts occur in ways that do not conform to gender role expectations (Yubero & Navarro, 2006). In other words, teachers may be less likely to identify relationally aggressive incidents among boys and physically aggressive incidents among girls. Further research has also found that girls may be more likely to report their victimization experiences to school personnel (for example, Williford, Fite, & Cooley, 2015). Thus, adults may address victimization experiences differently for boys and girls. Consequently, priming adults to look for specific forms of victimization in certain locations may help them to effectively intervene. However, examining locations by the form of victimization has yet to occur. To that end, the goals of the present study were to determine what forms of victimization occur in locations inside and outside the school and to evaluate gender differences in the forms of victimization across locations.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Peer Victimization

Multiple forms of peer victimization exist during childhood. As noted earlier, more children than not experience at least some victimization (Cooley et al., 2017; Ladd et al., 2017), with relational, physical, and cyber forms evident among elementary school youths (DePaolis & Williford, 2015; Turner, Finkelhor, Hamby, Shattuck, & Ormrod, 2011). *Physical victimization* is characterized by being the target of physical threats or attacks, such as hitting, kicking, or punching (Little, Henrich, Jones, & Hawley, 2003). *Relational victimization* targets one's social status and social relationships through exclusion from peer group activities; gossip or false rumors; and being subjected to behaviors, including eye rolls, directed laughter, or mimicking (Crick & Grotpeter, 1995). The increasing development and availability of technology has provided additional mechanisms to inflict a new form of victimization. *Cyber victimization* is generally defined as experiencing unwanted and negative acts intended to harm or create discomfort through interactive communication technologies (ICTs), such as social media sites, text messaging, and online games (Smith, 2012; Tokunaga, 2010). Notably, evidence suggests that an increasing number of children and adolescents report owning or having access to smartphones and tablets (Common Sense Media, 2013; Madden, Lenhart, Duggan, Cortesi, & Gasser, 2013). These mobile ICTs allow youths the freedom to stay continuously connected from any location, making it difficult for them to escape the harassment. These devices also allow for content to be posted anonymously and reach a large audience quickly. As a result of these unique characteristics, many cyber victims report feeling sad, hopeless, and powerless because they cannot stop the harassment (Kowalski & Limber, 2013; Raskauskas & Stoltz, 2007).

Debate on gender differences across these forms of victimization persists. For example, studies have consistently found that boys are more likely to engage in physical forms of aggression (Card et al., 2008; Nansel et al., 2001) and, consequently, are more likely to be the victims of physical aggression. Although earlier work found that girls are more likely to aggress through relational or indirect forms (Crick & Grotpeter, 1995), more recent meta-analytic work found gender differences in indirect aggression to be negligible (Card et al., 2008). Some evidence suggests that boys and girls experience cyber aggression as both perpetrators and victims (Hinduja & Patchin, 2008; Werner, Bumpus, & Rock, 2010; Williams & Guerra, 2007), yet other evidence indicates that boys are more likely to be involved than girls (Fanti, Demetriou, & Hawa, 2012; Sourander et al., 2010). Understanding gender differences across these forms is important for identifying effective prevention and intervention strategies.

Locations of Victimization

Research regarding the locations in which victimization occurs, particularly for cyber victimization, remains limited. Although the literature is sparse, evidence suggests that victimization may occur in different locations in elementary, middle, and high school settings (Vaillancourt et al., 2010). Regardless of the age group, however, it appears that peer victimization is most likely to occur in locations in which supervision is limited, where fewer rules and constraints are imposed, and where the ratio of students to adults is high (Craig, Pepler, & Atlas, 2000; Low, Frey, & Brockman, 2010; Raskauskas, 2005). Specific to elementary school–age youths, the playground is consistently rated as a location where victimization often occurs at school (Fite et al., 2013; Vaillancourt et al., 2010). However, very few studies have examined locations of peer victimization outside

the school context. This is a notable omission considering data from a nationally representative sample that indicate approximately 27 percent of youths report only experiencing victimization outside of school (Turner et al., 2011). In one noteworthy exception, however, a study found that the home and neighborhood were common locations for victimization, with the playground being the only location more common among elementary school students (Fite et al., 2013). In addition, this study found that boys were more likely to experience victimization at a sporting event and girls were more likely to experience peer victimization at home. Thus, there is evidence to suggest that victimization occurs both inside and outside of school and may vary by form; yet, to our knowledge, no study to date has investigated locations where peer victimization occurs across relational, physical, and cyber forms or examined whether gender differences exist across these different locations by form.

CURRENT STUDY

The current study extends peer victimization literature in three ways: by (a) examining victimization rates at locations both within and outside the school context, (b) identifying the forms of victimization most prevalent in these locations, and (c) determining whether the forms of victimization vary by gender across different locations. Understanding gender differences in the context of locations within and outside the school environment addresses notable gaps in the literature and may have important implications for prevention and intervention efforts. Based on prior research, it was expected that (a) boys would experience higher levels of physical victimization than girls and (b) boys would report greater physical victimization at school-related events, whereas girls would report higher levels of exposure to relational and cyber forms of victimization at home or other locations outside the school.

METHOD

Participants

Participants included 278 third (35.6 percent), fourth (28.4 percent), and fifth (36 percent) graders from a small school district in a rural midwestern community in the United States, with all elementary school–age children from the district attending one elementary school. All full-time students not receiving special education services ($n = 387$) were recruited for participation in the study during parent–teacher conferences, which occurred in November 2013. Consent forms were also sent home to the remaining caregivers who did not attend these events. Overall, 77 percent ($n = 298$) of families completed the consent form, and permission was obtained for 72 percent ($n = 280$) of the eligible students to participate in the study. Data were missing for one student who moved prior to data collection and for another student who provided assent but did not complete the measure of peer victimization. The final sample for the current study consisted of 134 boys and 144 girls whose ages ranged from eight to 12 years ($M = 9.33$, $SD = .99$). School records indicated that most students were white, with fewer than 10 percent of the student body identifying as an ethnic or racial minority. Although socioeconomic data were not available for individual participants, 45 percent of students at the school were eligible for free or reduced-price lunch.

Measures

Peer Victimization. Child self-reports of peer victimization were assessed using a modified version of the Victimization of Self (VS) scale from the Peer Experiences Questionnaire (Vernberg, Jacobs, & Hershberger, 1999), which had previously been adapted to include language appropriate for children reading at or below a third-grade level (Dill, Vernberg, Fonagy, Twemlow, & Gamm, 2004) and to include items reflecting youths' experiences of cyber victimization (personal communication with E. Vernberg, professor, University of Kansas, Lawrence, August 1, 2014). The modified VS scale consists of four items that measure physical victimization (for example, "A kid hit, kicked, or pushed me in a mean way"), five items that measure relational victimization (for example, "A kid told lies about me so other kids wouldn't like me"), and three items that assess cyber victimization (for example, "A kid used e-mail, instant messaging, or a chat room to turn other kids against me"). Children were asked to report how often they had experienced each of these incidents since the beginning of the school year on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = never to 5 = several times a week. In the current study, a dichotomous variable representing whether participants endorsed any of the aforementioned items for each form of peer victimization was created and used for location analyses. The modified VS scale has previously demonstrated

good psychometric properties in samples of elementary school–age children (Dill et al., 2004; Williford et al., 2015).

Location of Peer Victimization. Following completion of each VS subscale, participants were asked to report where these acts of victimization had occurred. Participants were given a list of six locations within with the school context (lunchroom, hallway, bathroom, classroom, playground, on the bus) and eight locations outside of the typical school context (program or club, sporting activity, babysitter's house, at home, in my neighborhood, at a party, at another fun activity, at a friend's house) that were developed for the current study, and were asked to indicate whether they had experienced that form of victimization in each of the locations.

Procedure

All study procedures were approved by the research team's institutional review board and the school district's administrators prior to data collection, which occurred approximately 10 weeks into the fall semester in November 2013. Surveys were collected using group administration in the participants' homeroom classes. After obtaining verbal assent from participants (100 percent agreed), a trained research assistant then read standardized instructions and all survey items aloud while other research assistants answered questions and assisted children who had difficulty understanding particular items. To facilitate accurate responding, no teachers or nonparticipating students were present in the classroom. All classrooms, regardless of student participation, received a $50 donation for school supplies following the data collection.

Data Analysis

All analyses were conducted using IBM SPSS 24 statistical software. No missing data were found for the items used in the present study as 100 percent of students agreed to participate and completed all items relevant to the current study during administration. Descriptive statistics, including percentage of youths who reported experiencing the various forms of victimization, were first evaluated to describe victimization within the current sample. Gender differences in the forms of victimization were evaluated using *t* tests, with Cohen's *d* effect sizes reported. An effect size of .2 indicates a small effect, .5 indicates a medium effect, and .8 indicates a large effect (Cohen, 1988). In addition, the percentages of youths experiencing each form of victimization across locations were described. Cross-tabulations were then conducted to determine if gender differences were evident for the forms of victimization in the various locations. Pearson chi-square values were reported when cells in analyses included five or more cases, and Fisher's exact test *p* values were reported when fewer than five cases were included within cells. Phi coefficient effect sizes were reported, with an effect size of .1 considered a small effect, .3 a medium effect, and .5 a large effect (Rovai, Baker, & Ponton, 2013).

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive analyses found that 46.4 percent of youths reported experiencing physical victimization, 55.8 percent relational victimization, and 12.9 percent cyber victimization. Gender differences in mean levels of victimization were examined using *t*-test analyses. A small effect for boys ($M = 1.52$, $SD = 0.87$) to report higher mean levels of physical victimization than girls ($M = 1.32$, $SD = 0.60$) was found, $t = 2.167$, $p = .03$ $d = .27$. However, no gender differences in mean levels of relational (boys: $M = 1.51$, $SD = 0.91$; girls: $M = 1.50$, $SD = 0.84$) or cyber (boys: $M = 1.13$, $SD = 0.47$; girls: $M = 1.09$, $SD = 0.34$) victimization were evident ($ps > .39$, $ds < .10$).

Within the school setting, the playground was the location in which all forms of victimization were most likely to take place (see Table 1). However, fewer than 12 percent of victimized youths reported that cyber victimization took place on the playground. Other locations within the school were not as common for any form of victimization, with locations endorsed by fewer than 15 percent of youths for any type of victimization. Nonetheless, the classroom was the next common location for all three forms of victimization at school. The bus was another common location for all forms of victimization to take place, with at least 18 percent of students reporting this. Outside the school context, home was the location most commonly endorsed for all three forms of victimization. In particular, more than 50 percent of youths who reported experiencing cyber victimization said that it took place at home, whereas 31 percent reported physical victimization and 25.2 percent reported relational victimization at home. The neighborhood and at a friend's house were also common places outside the school context for all

forms of victimization, and at a fun activity was a common place for cyber victimization. Finally, a program or a club was a common location for victimization.

Gender Differences in Form of Victimization at Various Locations

Chi-square tests were used to examine gender differences in the forms of victimization experienced across the locations assessed (see Table 2). Boys and girls reported similar rates of victimization across locations (minimal to small effect sizes), with five exceptions. Boys appeared to be at more risk for physical victimization at a sporting activity and in the neighborhood than girls, and this was a small effect size. The only gender difference with regard to relational victimization was a marginally statistically significant trend for boys to be more likely to experience relational victimization in the neighborhood than girls, with the effect size of this association being small. Notably, girls were more likely than boys to report cyber victimization on the bus, and boys were more likely than girls to report cyber victimization at home, both medium effect sizes.

Table 1: Rates of Forms of Victimization in Various Locations

Location	Physical *n* = 129 %	Relational *n* = 155 %	Cyber *n* = 36 %
Lunchroom	4.7	9.0	2.8
Hallway	4.7	5.8	2.8
Bathroom	6.2	3.2	2.8
Classroom	9.3	12.3	5.6
Playground	**56.6**	**61.9**	11.1
On the bus	**18.6**	**21.9**	**25.0**
Program or club	**18.6**	11.6	11.1
Sporting activity	7.0	9.0	8.3
Babysitter's house	7.8	3.9	2.8
Home	**31.0**	**25.2**	**52.8**
Neighborhood	**20.9**	**21.3**	**16.7**
At a party	6.2	8.4	8.3
Fun activity	6.2	5.2	**16.7**
Friend's house	**17.1**	**16.1**	**19.4**

Note: Values greater than 15 percent are in boldface.

DISCUSSION

The current study advances the peer victimization literature by examining the locations in which various forms of victimization occur among elementary school–age youths, with a particular focus on gender differences. Several significant findings emerged. First, the bus, home, and neighborhood were common locations endorsed for all forms of victimization, suggesting that locations outside the school are key for understanding victimization risk. Second, boys reported greater physical victimization at a sporting activity and in the neighborhood than girls, indicating important gender differences. Next, although less common than traditional forms, both boys and girls in the present study reported cyber victimization; however, statistically and practically significant gender differences were found for several locations. Last, findings also suggest that victimization may

Table 2: Gender Differences in Forms of Victimization in Various Locations

	Physical				Relational				Cyber			
Location	Boys *n* = 70	Girls *n* = 59	*Phi*	*p*	Boys *n* = 73	Girls *n* = 82	*Phi*	*p*	Boys *n* = 21	Girls *n* = 15	*Phi*	*p*
Lunchroom	4	2	.06	.69	8	6	.06	.43	1	0	.14	1.0
Hallway	4	2	.06	.69	5	4	.04	.74	0	1	.20	.42
Bathroom	6	2	.11	.29	2	3	.03	1.0	0	1	.20	.42
Classroom	4	8	.14	.14	9	10	.00	.98	0	2	.29	.17
Playground	41	32	.04	.62	44	52	.03	.69	1	3	.24	.29
On the bus	11	13	.08	.36	12	22	.13	.12	2	7	.42	.02
Program or club	11	13	.08	.36	9	9	.02	.79	2	2	.06	1.0
Sporting activity	8	1	.19	.04	8	6	.06	.43	1	2	.15	.56
Babysitter's house	7	3	.09	.34	3	3	.01	1.0	0	1	.20	.42
Home	21	19	.02	.79	20	19	.05	.55	15	4	.44	.02
Neighborhood	20	7	.21	.02	20	13	.14	.08	2	4	.23	.21
At a party	6	2	.11	.29	6	7	.00	.94	2	1	.05	1.0
Fun activity	4	4	.02	1.0	5	3	.07	.48	2	4	.23	.21
Friend's house	12	10	.00	1.0	14	11	.08	.33	4	3	.01	1.0

Note: Number of children who endorsed "yes"; *p* values reported are for Pearson chi-square values of analyses in which cells include more than five cases, and Fisher's exact test for analyses in which cells include fewer than five cases. Significant results are in boldface.

commonly take place in locations, such as a friend's house or fun outing, where children are presumed to be engaging in activities with friends. These findings extend prior literature in several meaningful ways and have notable implications for prevention and intervention.

Findings from the present study suggest that the playground, home, neighborhood, and bus are the most common locations for any form of victimization both inside and outside the school context. Although largely consistent with prior evidence (that is, Fite et al., 2013; Turner et al., 2011; Vaillancourt et al., 2010), notable variability across the forms of victimization exists among this sample of youths. For traditional forms of victimization, results indicate that physical and relational victimization occur at similar rates in locations both inside and outside the school context, with the playground being the most common location. The bus, home, neighborhood, and a friend's house are other common locations outside the school context for experiencing these forms of victimization. Of note, prior evidence suggests that acts of physical victimization may be more likely identified by school personnel, whereas school staff may be less aware of relational victimization (Craig, Henderson, & Murphy, 2000). Thus, these findings suggest that school staff must look for both physical and relational incidents in these locations. Furthermore, bus drivers may be an important, yet underused resource in a school's response to peer victimization. In fact, deLara (2008) found that bus drivers often reported acts of bullying to school personnel, but found them often uninterested, which led some drivers to discontinue reporting incidents to the school. Thus, expanding outreach to adults on the periphery of the school, including bus drivers and parents and guardians, may be an important way to improve prevention and intervention efforts.

When examining gender differences across traditional forms of victimization, results revealed several notable differences. Boys in this sample were more likely to report both physical and relational victimization in their neighborhood and at a sporting activity when compared with girls, although the gender differences in relational victimization were only marginally statistically significant. A small effect for boys to be more likely than girls to report physical victimization at a sporting activity was also found. Although no differences were found for girls when examining locations for these traditional forms, findings suggest that the form of victimization may matter for boys. Prior evidence has found that boys report experiencing more overall victimization than girls, especially greater physical victimization (Card et al., 2008; Nansel et al., 2001). The present findings suggest that a sporting activity and the neighborhood may be important locations where physical victimization may occur. Again, these findings indicate that adults outside the school context, such as coaches, may play an important role in prevention and intervention efforts. Limited research has investigated the role of coaches in preventing peer victimization. However, one recent study found that recreation staff often received little training on addressing bullying and peer victimization within the context of sports and other recreation activities (Shannon, 2013). Thus, the present findings again suggest that further training of adults outside the school context would be a worthwhile strategy to address peer victimization.

Although participants reported higher rates of relational and physical victimization, approximately 13 percent reported experiencing cyber victimization, suggesting the need for adults to also target this form of victimization. It is important to note that a significant portion of the present study's sample was considered economically disadvantaged based on eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch. It is possible that access to technology might be more limited among this sample; thus, in more economically diverse samples, involvement in cyber victimization might be higher as seen in a prior study in which about 20 percent of elementary school students reported exposure to cyber victimization (DePaolis & Williford, 2015).

The current findings also suggest that cyber victimization occurs most often at home. The bus, neighborhood, another fun activity, and a friend's house are also locations where cyber victimization occurs. These results are consistent with evidence that suggests cyber victimization often occurs outside of school (Cassidy, Faucher, & Jackson, 2013), yet several notable gender differences emerged when examining these locations. Boys are more likely than girls to report cyber victimization at home and girls are more likely than boys to report cyber victimization on the bus, both medium effects suggesting important practical significance. It is possible that girls may be more likely to use smartphones, such as iPhones or Androids, to perpetrate cyber victimization,

whereas boys' victimization may be more likely to occur through a computer. A recent study noted that boys reported greater rates of cyber victimization through online games (DePaolis & Williford, 2015), a finding that supports the notion that boys' victimization may occur via computers or gaming devices at home. Another recent study on adolescents found that boys and girls might use technology differently to connect with friends. In this study, girls were more likely to connect with friends via social media and boys were more likely to connect with friends through online games (Pew Research Center, 2015). However, further research is needed to explore gender differences in technology use. Thus, interpretation of the present study's findings must be viewed cautiously. Notably, however, acts of cyber victimization are often not reported to adults (Tokunaga, 2010), making its prevention particularly difficult. One recent study found that only 54 percent of third- through fifth-grade students told an adult about their cyber victimization experiences (DePaolis & Williford, 2015). In a recent meta-synthesis, rates of reporting to parents were even lower, with children reporting cyber victimization less than 10 percent of the time (Tokunaga, 2010). Thus, it would be useful for adults to be mindful of certain locations, such as at home and on the bus, when seeking to prevent incidents of cyber victimization. These findings suggest that it may be important to encourage adults both within and outside of school to collaborate in their prevention and intervention efforts.

Current findings also extend previous location literature by indicating that a friend's house is a common location for all forms of victimization and that cyber victimization commonly takes place on fun outings, such as at the movies or the mall. It may be difficult for caregivers to effectively monitor behaviors within these larger spaces that contain many distractions. Furthermore, it may be that caregivers might not identify acts of victimization taking place within these contexts as easily, as children are presumed to be engaging in these activities with friends. Although having close friends has been found to be an important protective factor against peer victimization (Bollmer, Milich, Harris, & Maras, 2005; Jenkins & Demaray, 2012), close friends may also perpetrate victimization against each other (Crick & Nelson, 2002). These findings support the role of parents and guardians and other adults in effective prevention and intervention efforts.

Limitations

Several limitations exist for the present study. First, implications may be specific to middle childhood, as previous research has indicated that peer victimization may occur in different locations in middle and high school (Vaillancourt et al., 2010). Second, generalizability of the findings is limited given that the sample consisted of predominantly white children from a rural midwestern community in the United States attending one elementary school. Notably, research suggests that schools have unique climates based on a number of factors (Wang & Degol, 2016); thus, the composition of students, a school's overall climate, and its geographic location may influence victimization trends. Additional investigations are needed to examine patterns of peer victimization in diverse samples, in different geographic areas, and across different school contexts. Third, the current data are cross-sectional; it would be informative for future research to examine whether the locations of victimization change according to youths' trajectories of peer victimization over time. Finally, it was not possible to statistically evaluate differences in the forms of victimization at various locations. Although providing percentages, identifying significant differences in likelihood of victimization in a given location would elucidate even more specific implications for prevention and intervention.

Implications for Prevention and Intervention

Despite the limitations, the current study has important implications for prevention and intervention in elementary school settings. Overall, these findings further indicate the need for interventions to target not only the school, but also the larger community context. In fact, the present study findings suggest that other supportive adults, such as bus drivers, coaches, and parents and guardians, can play important roles in preventing and effectively intervening with peer victimization among youths. Consequently, a socioecological approach that involves the school in partnership with families and community providers may be most effective in addressing this problem. This kind of socioecological approach has been found to achieve meaningful reductions in bullying behavior (Espelage & Swearer, 2004; Ostrov & Kamper, 2015). Accordingly, school-based efforts to involve parents, caregivers, and community providers may be most effective in reducing exposure to victimization and promoting the well-being of students. Of note, school social

workers are an important resource for supporting the emotional, mental, and behavioral well-being of students (Franklin, Kim, & Tripodi, 2009). School social workers are also trained to appropriately broker supports for children in need. Thus, they are ideally positioned within the school environment to coordinate efforts with adults within and outside the school to prevent and intervene effectively with peer victimization.

Moreover, findings suggest that boys may need to be further monitored in the neighborhood and during a sporting activity for physical victimization and at home for cyber victimization. In contrast, girls may need additional monitoring for cyber victimization on the bus. These results suggest that prevention and intervention efforts may benefit from considering gender-specific locations for different forms of victimization. Consequently, adults both within the school building and just on its periphery (for example, bus drivers, coaches, and after-school program staff) may benefit from further training that enhances their knowledge of these gender-specific locations. As such, training efforts—that include adults both within and outside the school—would benefit from this nuanced understanding of relevant gender differences. Again, school social workers can play an important role in providing such training. In fact, capacity building, including the professional development of others, is recognized as an important aspect of school social work (Kelly et al., 2010). Accordingly, school social workers may serve as important resources for coordinating, developing, and delivering training to adults to support schools' efforts to prevent and intervene with peer victimization among students. CS

REFERENCES

Bayar, Y., & Uçanok, Z. (2012). School social climate and generalized peer perception in traditional and cyberbullying status. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice, 12*, 2352–2358.

Bollmer, J. M., Milich, R., Harris, M. J., & Maras, M. A. (2005). A friend in need: The role of friendship quality as a protective factor in peer victimization and bullying. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 20*, 701–712.

Bonanno, R. A., & Hymel, S. (2013). Cyber bullying and internalizing difficulties: Above and beyond the impact of traditional forms of bullying. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 42*, 685–697.

Bradshaw, C. P. (2015). Translating research to practice in bullying prevention. *American Psychologist, 70*, 322–332.

Card, N. A., Stucky, B. D., Sawalani, G. M., & Little, T. D. (2008). Direct and indirect aggression during childhood and adolescence: A meta-analytic review of gender differences, intercorrelations, and relations to maladjustment. *Child Development, 79*, 1185–1229.

Cassidy, W., Faucher, C., & Jackson, M. (2013). Cyberbullying among youth: A comprehensive review of current international research and its implications and application to policy and practice. *School Psychology International, 34*, 575–612.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Common Sense Media. (2013). *Zero to eight: Children's media use in America 2013*. San Francisco: Author.

Cooley, J. L., Fite, P. J., & Pederson, C. A. (2017). Bidirectional associations between peer victimization and functions of aggression in middle childhood: Further evaluation across academic years and informants. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*. Advance online publication.

Craig, W. M., Henderson, K., & Murphy, J. G. (2000). Prospective teachers' attitudes about bullying and victimization. *School Psychology International, 21*(1), 5–21.

Craig, W. M., Pepler, D., & Atlas, R. (2000). Observations of bullying in the playground and in the classroom. *School Psychology International, 21*(1), 22–36.

Crick, N. R., & Grotpeter, J. K. (1995). Relational aggression, gender, and social-psychological adjustment. *Child Development, 66*, 710–722.

Crick, N. R., & Nelson, D. A. (2002). Relational and physical victimization within friendships: Nobody told me there'd be friends like these. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 30*, 599–607.

deLara, E. W. (2008). Bullying and aggression on the school bus: School bus drivers' observations and suggestions. *Journal of School Violence, 7*(3), 48–70.

DePaolis, K. J., & Williford, A. (2015). The nature and prevalence of cybervictimization among elementary school children. *Child and Youth Care Forum, 44*, 377–393.

Dill, E. J., Vernberg, E. M., Fonagy, P., Twemlow, S. W., & Gamm, B. K. (2004). Negative affect in victimized children: The roles of social withdrawal, peer rejection, and attitudes toward bullying. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 32*, 159–173.

Espelage, D. L., & Swearer, S. M. (2004). *Bullying in American schools: A socio-ecological perspective on prevention and intervention*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Fanti, K. A., Demetriou, A. G., & Hawa, V. V. (2012). A longitudinal study of cyberbullying: Examining risk and protective factors. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 9*, 168–181.

Fite, P. J., Cooley, J. L., Williford, A., Frazer, A., & DiPierro, M. (2014). Parental school involvement as a moderator of the association between peer victimization and academic performance. *Children and Youth Services Review, 44*, 25–32.

Fite, P. J., Williford, A., Cooley, J. L., DePaolis, K., Rubens, S. L., & Vernberg, E. M. (2013). Patterns of victimization locations in elementary school children: Effects of grade level and gender. *Child and Youth Care Forum, 42*, 585–597.

Franklin, C., Kim, J. S., & Tripodi, S. J. (2009). A meta-analysis of published school social work practice studies: 1980–2007. *Research on Social Work Practice, 19*, 667–677.

Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. W. (2008). Cyberbullying: An exploratory analysis of factors related to offending and victimization. *Deviant Behavior, 29*(2), 129–156.

Jenkins, L. N., & Demaray, M. K. (2012). Social support and self-concept in relation to peer victimization and peer aggression. *Journal of School Violence, 11*, 56–74.

Kelly, M. S., Frey, A. J., Alvarez, M., Berzin, S. C., Shaffer, G., & O'Brien, K. (2010). School social work practice and response to intervention. *Children & Schools, 32*, 201–209.

Kowalski, R. M., & Limber, S. P. (2013). Psychological, physical, and academic correlates ofcyberbullying and traditional bullying. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 53*, S13–S20.
Ladd, G. W., Ettekal, I., & Kochenderfer-Ladd, B. (2017). Peer victimization trajectories from kindergarten through high school: Differential pathways for children's school engagement and achievement? *Journal of Educational Psychology*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1037/edu0000177
Little, T., Henrich, C., Jones, S., & Hawley, P. (2003). Disentangling the "whys" from the "whats" of aggressive behaviour. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 27*(2), 122–133.
Low, S., Frey, K. S., & Brockman, C. J. (2010). Gossip on the playground: Changes associated with universal intervention, retaliation beliefs, and supportive friends. *School Psychology Review, 39*, 536–551.
Madden, M., Lenhart, A., Duggan, M., Cortesi, S., & Gasser, U. (2013). *Teens and technology 2013*. Retrieved from http://www.pewinternet.org/2013/03/13/teens-and-technology-2013/
McDougall, P., & Vaillancourt, T. (2015). Long-term adult outcomes of peer victimization in childhood and adolescence: Pathways to adjustment and maladjustment. *American Psychologist, 70*, 300–310.
Nakamato, J., & Schwartz, D. (2010). Is peer victimization associated with academic achievement? A meta-analytic review. *Social Development, 19*, 221–242.
Nansel, T. R., Overpeck, M., Pilla, R. S., Ruan, W. J., Simons-Morton, B., & Scheidt, P. (2001). Bullying behaviors among US youth: Prevalence and association with psychosocial adjustment. *JAMA, 285*, 2094–2100.
Ostrov, J. M., & Kamper, K. E. (2015). Future directions for research on the development of relational and physical peer victimization. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology, 44*, 509–519.
Pew Research Center. (2015). *Teens, technology, and friendship*. Retrieved from http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/08/06/teens-technology-and-friendships/
Raskauskas, J. (2005). Bullying on the school bus: A video analysis. *Journal of School Violence, 4*(3), 93–107.
Raskauskas, J., & Stoltz, A. D. (2007). Involvement in traditional and electronic bullying among adolescents. *Developmental Psychology, 43*, 564–575. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.43.3.564
Reijntjes, A., Kamphuis, J. H., Prinzie, P., Boelen, P. A., van der Schoot, M., & Telch, M. J. (2011). Prospective linkages between peer victimization and externalizing problems in children: A meta-analysis. *Aggressive Behavior, 37*, 215–222.
Reijntjes, A., Kamphuis, J. H., Prinzie, P., & Telch, M. J. (2010). Peer victimization and internalizing problems in children: A meta-analysis. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 34*, 244–252.
Rose, A. J., & Rudolph, K. D. (2006). A review of sex differences in peer relationship processes: Potential trade-offs for the emotional and behavioral development of girls and boys. *Psychological Bulletin, 132*(1), 98–131.
Rovai, A. P., Baker, J. D., & Ponton, M. K. (2013). *Social science research design and statistics: A practitioner's guide to research methods and SPSS analysis*. Chesapeake, VA: Watertree Press.
Shannon, C. (2013). Bullying in recreation and sports: Exploring risk factors, prevention efforts, and intervention strategies. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration, 31*, 15–33.
Smith, P. K. (2011). Why interventions to reduce bullying and violence in schools may (or may not) succeed: Comments on this Special Section. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 35*, 419–423.
Smith, P. K. (2012). Cyberbullying and cyber aggression. In S. R. Jimerson, A. B. Nickerson, M. J. Mayer, & M. J. Furlong (Eds.), *Handbook of school violence and school safety* (pp. 93–103). New York: Routledge.
Sourander, A., Brunstein Klomek, A., Ikonen, M., Lindroos, J., Luntamo, T., Koskelainen, M., et al. (2010). Psychosocial risk factors associated with cyberbullying among adolescents. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 67*, 720–728.
Sugimura, N., & Rudolph, K. D. (2012). Temperamental differences in children's reactions to peer victimization. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology, 41*, 314–328.
Takizawa, R., Maughan, B., & Arseneault, L. (2014). Adult health outcomes of childhood bullying victimization: Evidence from a five-decade longitudinal British birth cohort. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 171*, 777–784.
Tokunaga, R. S. (2010). Following you home from school: A critical review and synthesis of research on cyberbullying victimization. *Computers in Human Behavior, 26*, 277–287.
Turner, H. A., Finkelhor, D., Hamby, S. L., Shattuck, A., & Ormrod, R. K. (2011). Specifying type and location of peer victimization in a national sample of children and youth. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 40*, 1052–1067.
Vaillancourt, T., Brittain, H., Bennett, L., Arnocky, S., McDougall, P., Hymel, S., et al. (2010). Places to avoid: Population-based study of reports of unsafe and high bullying areas at school. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology, 25*, 40–54.
Vernberg, E. M., & Biggs, B. (2010). *Preventing and treating bullying and victimization*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Vernberg, E. M., Jacobs, A. K., & Hershberger, S. L. (1999). Peer victimization and attitudes about violence during early adolescence. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 28*, 386–395. doi:10.1207/S15374424jccp280311
Wang, M., & Degol, J. L. (2016). School climate: A review of the construct, measurement, and impact on student outcomes. *Educational Psychology Review, 28*, 315–352.
Werner, N. E., Bumpus, M. F., & Rock, D. (2010). Involvement in Internet aggression during early adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 39*, 607–619.
Williams, K. R., & Guerra, N. G. (2007). Prevalence and predictors of Internet bullying. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 41*(6), S14–S21.
Williford, A., Fite, P. J., & Cooley, J. L. (2015). Student–teacher congruence in reported rates of physical and relational victimization among elementary-school-age children: The moderating role of gender and age. *Journal of School Violence, 14*, 177–195.
Yubero, S., & Navarro, R. (2006). Students' and teachers' views of gender-related aspects of aggression. *School Psychology International, 27*, 488–512.

Anne Williford, PhD, *is associate professor, School of Social Work, Colorado State University, 134A Education, 1586 Campus Delivery, Fort Collins, CO 80523-1586; e-mail: anne.williford@colostate.edu.* ***Paula Fite, PhD,*** *is associate professor, Clinical Child Psychology Program, University of Kansas, Lawrence.* ***Kathryn DePaolis, PhD,*** *is assistant professor, School of Social Work, Eastern Washington University, Cheney.* ***John Cooley, MS,*** *is a doctoral candidate, Clinical Child Psychology Program, University of Kansas, Lawrence.*

Original manuscript received February 9, 2017
Final revision received May 28, 2017
Editorial decision June 23, 2017
Accepted June 29, 2017
Advance Access Publication February 16, 2018