



HAL
open science

How Adolescents Cope with Bullying at School: Exploring Differences Between Pure Victim and Bully-Victim Roles

Catherine Potard, Violaine Kubiszewski, Céline Combes, Audrey Henry, Régis Pochon, Arnaud Roy

► **To cite this version:**

Catherine Potard, Violaine Kubiszewski, Céline Combes, Audrey Henry, Régis Pochon, et al.. How Adolescents Cope with Bullying at School: Exploring Differences Between Pure Victim and Bully-Victim Roles. *International Journal of Bullying Prevention*, 2022, 4 (2), pp.144-159. 10.1007/s42380-021-00095-6 . hal-03417378v1

HAL Id: hal-03417378

<https://hal.science/hal-03417378v1>

Submitted on 6 Aug 2022 (v1), last revised 29 Sep 2022 (v2)

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

How Adolescents Cope with Bullying at School: Exploring Differences Between Pure
Victim and Bully-Victim Roles

Catherine Potard^{1*}, Violaine Kubiszewski², Céline Combes¹, Audrey Henry³, Régis
Pochon³ and Arnaud Roy^{1,4}

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to:

Catherine Potard

Laboratoire de Psychologie des Pays de la Loire, EA 4638

Maison de la Recherche Germaine Tillion

Université d'Angers

5 bis, boulevard Lavoisier

49045 Angers Cedex 1

France

Tel.: +33 (0)2 41 22 63 94 E-mail: catherine.potard@univ-angers.fr

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to all the students who took part in the study. They would also like to thank the trainees for their help and the association ACVS-49 for its assistance in the data collection process. This study was funded by Angers University, France.

¹ EA 4638 Pays de la Loire Psychology Laboratory (LPPL), Department of Psychology, University of Angers, Angers, France. catherine.potard@univ-angers.fr; celine.combes@univ-angers.fr; arnaud.roy@univ-angers.fr

² EA3188 Psychology Laboratory & FR EDUC, University of Bourgogne/Franche-Comté, Besançon, France. violaine.kubiszewski@univ-fcomte.fr

³ EA 6291 Cognition, Health and Society (C2S) Laboratory, Department of Psychology, University of Reims Champagne-Ardenne, Reims, France. audrey.henry@univ-reims.fr; regis.pochon@univ-reims.fr

⁴ Reference Center for Learning Disabilities, Nantes University Hospital, Nantes, France

Abstract

The aim of the present study was to investigate the use of specific coping strategies by bullied adolescents, taking account of the distinction between pure victims and bully-victims, as well as gender-specific patterns. Participants were 967 adolescents aged 11-16 years, who responded to self-report questionnaires on school bullying victimization, cognitive coping, and situational coping. Adolescents in the pure victim, bully-victim and noninvolved groups did not differ in their use of approach coping. However, pure victims and bully-victims used more avoidance coping than noninvolved adolescents. Compared with the latter, pure victims reported greater use of avoidance coping strategies such as internalizing and self-blame, while female pure victims also reported greater use of rumination. Both male and female bully-victims were characterized by higher use of blaming others and self-blame strategies, compared with the noninvolved group. In addition, rumination, catastrophizing, cognitive distancing, and externalizing scores were higher for male bully-victims than for either noninvolved participants or pure bullies. Identifying these differing coping strategies may be useful in developing more effective counselling strategies for the victims of bullying.

Keywords: school bullying, peer victimization, coping, cognitive emotion regulation, adolescence

Declarations

Funding: This study was funded by Angers University, France.

Conflicts of interest: The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Availability of data and material: The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author, upon reasonable request.

Authors' contributions: The authors confirm contribution to the paper as follows: study conception and design: C.P.; data collection: R.P., A.H., C.P., V.K, C.C.; analysis and interpretation of results: C.P.; draft manuscript preparation: C.P. All authors discussed the results and contributed to the final manuscript.

How Adolescents Cope with Bullying at School: Exploring Differences Between Pure
Victim and Bully-Victim Roles

Introduction

School Bullying As a Stressor.

School bullying is a widespread and pervasive problem in high school that affects about one third of adolescents internationally (Zych et al., 2017). In general, *bullying* refers to intentional and repeated aggressive behaviors or harms characterized by an abuse of power between a perpetrator and a weaker victim (Olweus, 1994; Olweus, 2006; Olweus & Limber, 2010; Rigby, 2004). Although prevalence rates differ widely between studies, approximately 10-20% of adolescents have been victims of school bullying (Craig et al., 2009; Tsitsika et al., 2014). Furthermore, the majority of studies report higher rates of victimization for boys than for girls during adolescence (Craig et al., 2009; Guy et al., 2019; Smith et al., 2019; Tsitsika et al., 2014). People who experience victimization was identified as pure *victims* and or *bully-victims* (i.e., those who are both bullies and victims) (e.g., van Dijk et al., 2017; Yang & Kim, 2017). Whereas victims are generally described as being submissive and passive, bully-victims, also labeled provocative or aggressive victims, are characterized as exhibiting aggressive and hostile behavior (Schwartz et al., 2001). Thus, the prevalence of bullying involvement has been estimated at 13-20% for pure victims, 5-7% for bully-victims, (Guy et al., 2019), with significantly more males identified as bully-victims than as victims (Guy et al., 2019). Not surprisingly, peer victimization has systematically been associated with poor mental health, and psychosocial difficulties (for a review, see Gini & Pozzoli, 2009; Moore et al., 2017; van Geel et al., 2014), including in adulthood (Özdemir & Stattin, 2011; Sigurdson et al., 2014). Such negative outcomes may be understood as responses to chronic exposure to the stress of peer

victimization (Newman et al., 2005). From a stress perspective, being bullied can be seen as a severe and chronic stressor, especially during adolescence when peer relations become progressively more crucial (Östberg et al., 2018).

Lazarus's transactional stress and coping model (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Folkman et al., 1986) is the conceptual framework that is usually applied to understand the relationships among stress, coping, and health (Biggs et al., 2017). Based on transactional model of stress, two processes occur in response to a stressor (see Figure 1) : First, (1) a primary appraisal that the person understands the susceptibility and severity to stressors (i.e., appraisal of threat, challenge, or loss) and then, (2) a secondary appraisal which is to examine the resources and options of individual compatibility with stressors (i.e., appraisal of how to respond). This secondary appraisal process provides a global assessment of the individual's coping resources and ability to manage the stressful situation. Coping strategies are defined as "constantly changing cognitive and behavioral efforts to manage specific external or internal demands that are appraised as taxing or exceeding the resources of the person" (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984, p. 141). Thus, *coping* characteries an individual's action-oriented and intrapsychic efforts to manage environmental stress (i.e., directly manage the stressor) and the resulting emotions (i.e., regulate emotions arising as a consequence of the stressful encounter), by minimizing, mastering, or tolerating environmental and internal demands (Folkman et al., 1986; Lazarus, 2006).

Please insert Figure 1 here

According to the transactional perspective (Lazarus & Launier, 1978), coping with a stressful event such as bullying is an iterative and interactive process (i.e., to occur in a person-environment transaction or interaction), and depends on the nature of the stressful circumstances

(i.e., is context dependent). In that respect, coping may be viewed as either as a stable personal characteristic i.e., relatively stable coping styles – dispositional approach) or as a process or a state (i.e., coping strategies at a certain time point or in certain situations – situational approach). In this sense, situation-specific coping measures should be preferred, which is not necessarily the case in studies on school bullying. As, being bullied by one's peers in childhood is an inherently stressful experience, situational approach of coping may prove useful in understanding the processes that underpin victims' coping efforts (Hansen et al., 2012 ; Zimmer-Gembeck, 2016).

School Bullying and Coping Strategies.

Stress and coping researchers have identified an extensive range of coping strategies, such as escape, relaxation, and social support-seeking, including in an adolescent sample (Skinner & Zimmer-Gembeck, 2007). Despite this variety of coping strategies, these are usually regrouped in two dimensions of coping efforts, such as *avoidance* (minimization of the emotional impact of the stressful event) versus *approach* coping (cognitive and/or behavioral apprehension of the stressful event) (for a review, see Causey & Dubow, 1992; Compas et al., 2001; Roth & Cohen, 1986). In this way, active *problem solving* and *social support seeking* are the two main approach coping strategies (Roth & Cohen, 1986) – i.e. coping modalities that respond to the problem directly. By contrast, *avoidance* strategies involve a conscious effort to stay away from the negative stressor and escape the threatening stimuli (Ebata & Moos, 1991; Roth & Cohen, 1986). According to Roth and Cohen (1986), avoidance coping includes three main strategies: *cognitive distancing* (ignoring or minimizing the stressor, resisting thoughts about the negative experience), *internalization* (keeping negative emotions inside and avoiding the disclosure of these feelings to others), and *externalization* (outwardly projecting negative emotions, such as anger, onto other people or objects) (Causey & Dubow, 1992; Ebata & Moos,

1991). It essentially consists of emotion-focused coping, which can temporarily reduce stress, but is nevertheless regarded as less efficient, as it can interfere with the resolution of the problem (Roth & Cohen, 1986). Thus, approach strategies, regarded as beneficial or adaptive strategies (Roth & Cohen, 1986), are associated with positive outcomes (Lazarus, 2006; Rutherford & Endler, 1999), whereas avoidance strategies are associated with more emotional and behavioral difficulties (Doron et al., 2015; Herman-Stabl et al., 1995; Suls & Fletcher, 1985). Gender differences in strategies for coping with stressful events have also been identified, with males socialized to use more instrumental problem-solving strategies and females socialized to use more emotional or passive coping strategies or to seek social support (e.g., Matud, 2004).

In a context of school bullying, a large body of research suggests that young people who have not been bullied use different coping strategies (e.g., active coping, social support seeking) from those who have (Craig et al., 2007; Hansen et al., 2012; Hunter & Boyle, 2004). Smith et al. (2001) found that the most common coping strategies reported by victims were ignoring the bullies, walking away, telling them to stop, and standing up for themselves. However, qualitative and quantitative research on victims' coping during adolescence has yielded inconsistent findings. For example, while qualitative research has shown that social support seeking is the most approach coping strategy most commonly reported by victims, especially girls, (Evans et al., 2017; Tenenbaum et al., 2011), some authors adopting a quantitative approach have found that social support seeking (approach strategy) was a protective coping strategy in peer victimization (Machmutow et al., 2012; Skrzypiec et al., 2011), especially among girls (Murray-Harvey et al., 2012). Avoidance strategies such as distancing (Keith, 2018; Singh & Bussey, 2011) and externalizing (Keith, 2018; Kristensen & Smith, 2003; Murray-Harvey et al., 2012; Singh & Bussey, 2011) for their part are more frequently used by bullies, especially boys

(Hunter & Boyle, 2004). Some studies, however, have failed to find a significant relationship between victimization and distancing or externalizing (Skrzypiec et al., 2011).

Researchers (Andreou, 2001; Garnefski & Kraaij, 2007) have argued that although the types of coping strategies used need to be studied carefully, it is also necessary to clearly distinguish between their different cognitive and behavioral aspects. For example, placing the emphasis on avoidance coping strategies may oversimplify the coping-bullying interaction in adolescence. Coping strategies also include the cognitive emotion regulation strategies (also known as cognitive coping) that adolescent uses to manage emotional information (Thompson, 1991). Competencies to regulate negative emotions or feelings adaptively and to keep control when a stressful life event was experienced might be also relevant (e.g., Garnefski et al., 2001). Thus, it seems appropriate to focus on both general coping styles, and specific cognitive emotion regulation strategies in the particular context of bullying.

School Bullying and Cognitive Emotion Regulation Strategies.

In that sense, the emotion regulation model (Garnefski & Kraaij, 2007) underlined the importance of individual differences in the cognitive coping strategies - i.e. cognitive emotion regulation (CER) strategies - used to regulate the negative emotions related to a stressful or negative event (Aldao & Nolen-Hoeksema, 2010), such as victimization by peers (Aldao & Nolen-Hoeksema, 2010; Garnefski & Kraaij, 2007). Nine CER strategies have been identified: (1) *self-blame* (blaming oneself for what has happened); (2) *blaming others*; (3) *acceptance* (accepting that the event has happened and resigning oneself); (4) *refocus on planning* (thinking about the next steps and how to manage the negative event); (5) *positive refocusing* (focusing on positive experiences); (6) *ruminating* (being preoccupied by thinking about the feelings and thoughts generated by the negative situation); (7) *positive reappraisal* (assigning a positive

meaning to the negative situation); (8) *putting into perspective* (minimizing the importance of the negative event); and (9) *catastrophizing* (having recurrent thoughts about the severity of the event and how it is the worst experience that could happen to someone). Garnefski and Kraaij (2007) suggested making a distinction between adaptive CER (acceptance, refocus on planning, positive refocusing, positive reappraisal, and putting into perspective), associated with emotional problems in adolescents ; and maladaptive CER (self-blame, rumination, blaming others, and catastrophizing) strategies, associated with greater resilience.

To date, little research has explored the above-mentioned CER strategies in relation to bullying. Hampel, Manhal, and Hayer (2009) found that rumination was related to victimization. However, as underlined by Murray-Harvey et al. (2012), this study investigated general coping styles (trait), rather than either specific coping strategies in response to the specific context of bullying (state) or specific CER strategies, as defined by Garnefski and Kraaij (2007). Garnefski & Kraaij (2014), for their part, recently found strong positive correlations between victimization and rumination, catastrophizing and self-blame, and moderate correlations with blaming others, acceptance and planning. These promising findings underline the potential specific associations between CER strategies and victimization, but need to be replicated with larger samples, focusing on the distinction between pure victims and bully-victims. In Arató et al. (2020)'s study of cyberbullying, pure victims scored significantly higher than noninvolved participants on self-blame and rumination, while bully-victims scored higher than pure victims on blaming others. However, as cyberbullying only partially overlaps with school bullying (Thomas et al., 2015), it is currently unclear whether these CER strategies also characterize the victims of traditional bullying.

Considering Bullying Roles and Sex.

All these findings suggest that adolescents' coping strategies are associated with specific bullying profiles, and may play an important role in these situations. Although there is a large body of research examining how young people cope with bullying, the majority of studies so far have involved samples of children, or else have indiscriminately mixed adolescents and children. As the coping strategies used in response to bullying may differ with age (Griffin Smith & Gross, 2006; Naylor et al., 2001) and adolescents exhibit reduced adaptive coping (Williams & McGillicuddy-De Lisi, 1999; Zimmer-Gembeck & Skinner, 2011), it is difficult to know whether these results are relevant to adolescence. Secondly, with respect to sex differences in coping strategy use (e.g., Hunter & Boyle, 2004; Mahady Wilton et al., 2000), CER strategy use (Garnefski et al., 2005; Skrzypiec et al., 2011; Zlomke & Hahn, 2010) and bullying involvement (Smith et al., 2019).

Finally, few studies have made a distinction between different victimization roles. To our knowledge, only two studies, both focusing on cyberbullying, have considered the distinction between pure victims and bully-victims. The first one (Völlink et al., 2013) showed that pure victims and bully-victims of cyberbullying both tend to use more emotion-focused coping (e.g., externalization of anger), and that bully-victims use less avoidance coping than either pure victims or noninvolved adolescents. By contrast, the second study did not find any differences on avoidance coping between pure victims and bully-victims of cyberbullying (Chan & Wong, 2017). However, it should be noted that the authors of this study did not use a standardized tool to evaluate coping strategies. However, again, due to the specific features of cyberbullying, it is difficult to extend these results to traditional bullying. As recent studies have indicated that coping strategies may depend on the type of bullying behavior experienced and/or exhibited by victims (Andreou, 2001; Hunter & Boyle, 2004; Mark et al., 2019; Skrzypiec et al., 2011), our

study differentiated between pure victims and bully-victims as the latter tend to engage in different patterns of social adjustment and behavior than pure victims (Unnever, 2005).

Based on these observations, the aim of the present study was therefore to investigate the nature of coping strategies (avoidant-approach coping strategies and more specific CER strategies) employed by groups of noninvolved adolescents, pure victims, and bully-victims. We hypothesized that pure victims and bully-victims use more avoidance coping strategies, especially distancing and internalization, and maladaptive CER strategies, especially self-blame, rumination and catastrophizing, than noninvolved adolescents. We also hypothesized that pure victims differ significantly from bully-victims on their use of coping strategies, both in general and according to their sex. More specifically, we expected pure victims to make more use of internalizing, rumination, catastrophizing and self-blame, and bully-victims to make more frequent use of externalizing and blaming others. We investigated specific coping patterns in relation to victimization, controlling for age and considering potentially sex-related differences. gender differences in strategies for coping with stressful events

Methods

Participants

After excluding students with three or more missing values on the questionnaires ($n = 56$), our sample included 967 sixth to ninth graders from ten junior high schools located in five regions of France (Burgundy Franche-Comté, Centre-Val de Loire, Grand Est, Normandy, Pays de la Loire). It comprised 328 sixth graders (33.9%), 109 seventh graders (11.3%), 390 eighth graders (40.3%), and 140 ninth graders (13.6%). There were 529 (54.7%) girls and 438 (45.3%) boys, with no significant difference in sex ratio between age groups. Participants were French adolescents ranging in age from 11 to 16 years, with a mean age of 12.49 years ($SD = 1.20$).

There were nonsignificant differences between boys and girls, $t(965) = 1.911, p = .66$. The majority (53.70%, $n = 519$) of the adolescents we sampled lived in urban areas, with 31.5% ($n = 305$) living in rural areas, and 14.8% ($n = 143$) in peri-urban areas.

Measures

Bullying.

Bullying involvement was measured using the French version of the revised Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire (Fr-rBVQ; Kubiszewski et al., 2014). Before they start answering the questions, respondents are given a definition of bullying. This self-report questionnaire assesses experiences of being victimized (7 items), and experiences of bullying others (7 items) “in the past couple of months”. Various types of bullying are assessed: being bullied verbally, being ignored/excluded from a group, being bullied physically, having false rumors spread, having money and other things taken away or damaged, being threatened or forced to do things, and being bullied about one’s race or color. In the present study, one additional type, related to cyberbullying, was added for each part (victimization/aggression). Items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*Never*) to 5 (*Several times a week*). Two types of overall measures were used for analyses: (1) a continuous approach yielded two mean scores (one for the victimization items, and one for the bullying perpetration items); and (2) a categorical approach resulted in participants being classified as either pure victims, pure bullies, bully-victims or noninvolved, based on Solberg’s criteria (i.e., people who had been bullied/bullied others “2 or 3 times a month” or more often were categorized as involved in bullying; Solberg & Olweus, 2003). Cronbach’s alpha for the Fr-rBVQ in this study was .68 for victimization, and .75 for aggression.

Approach-avoidance Coping.

We used the French version of the Self-Report Coping Scale (SRCS; Hebert et al., 2007) to assess the use of strategies to cope with a peer conflict (situational form: social stressor version), based on the approach-avoidance conceptualization of coping. The SRCS consists of 34 items designed to assess *social support seeking* (8 items; e.g., tell a friend or family member what has happened), *problem-solving* (8 items; e.g., try to think of different ways of solving it), *distancing* (7 items; e.g., forget the whole thing), *internalizing* (7 items; e.g., go off by myself), and *externalizing* (4 items; e.g., yell to let off steam). Social support seeking and problem-solving coping were treated as approach coping strategies, and internalizing, externalizing and distancing as avoidance strategies. For each item, participants responded on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (*Never*) to 5 (*Always*). Overall scores were obtained by summing the scores for each subscale. A higher score indicated greater use of a given coping strategy. In our study, Cronbach's alpha was between .71 and .85.

CER Strategies.

We used the French version of the Cognitive Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (Jermann et al., 2006) to measure cognitive strategies for handling emotionally arousing information. In our study, we assessed the use of specific CER strategies to cope with a specific event referred to as "had a peer conflict". This self-report questionnaire consists of 36 items probing nine CER strategies: *self-blame* (e.g., "I think about the mistakes I have made in this matter"); *acceptance* (e.g., "I think that I have to accept the situation"); *focus on thoughts/rumination* (e.g., "I dwell upon the feelings the situation has evoked in me"); *positive refocusing* (e.g., "I think about pleasant experiences"), *refocus on planning* (e.g., "I think about how to change the situation"); *positive reappraisal* (e.g., "I look for the positive sides to the matter"); *putting into perspective* (e.g., "I think that it all could have been much worse");

catastrophizing (e.g., “I continually think how horrible the situation has been”); and *blaming others* (e.g., “I feel that basically the cause lies with others”). Participants responded on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*Almost never*) to 5 (*Almost always*). Scores on these subscales were summed to reflect two general coping styles: *adaptive coping or elaborative processes* (positive refocusing, refocus on planning, acceptance, positive focusing, and putting into perspective), and *maladaptive coping or automatic processes* (rumination, catastrophizing, self-blaming, and blaming others), with higher scores indicating greater use of the particular coping strategy. Internal reliability coefficients in the present study ranged from .84 to .71.

Procedure

This study was performed in line with the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki for psychological research involving human subjects, and was approved by the local educational authorities for each of the 9 educational sites. Recruitment emails were sent to school supervisors at twenty secondary schools, located in the previous five regions of France. Of the twenty school supervisors, six principals never replied to the recruitment email, five indicated that they had other commitments which prevented them from participating, and nine provided their agreement to participate. Participants completed self-report questionnaires during the 2018-2020 school years. The questionnaire and methodology for this study were approved by the relevant institutional review board for each of the nine schools, and an information letter was sent to each family and each adolescent. Written parental consent and child assent were obtained. The mean participation rate was 72%. The adolescents’ survey (paper-pencil questionnaire) was administered by school staff (supervised by a teacher), and they completed the questionnaire anonymously during lesson time. On average, it took 20 minutes to complete.

Data Analysis

In this study, we ran nonparametric tests, as most of the data were skewed. We began by calculating descriptive statistics on bullying roles. We then used chi-square analyses to determine possible sex-related differences for each victim subgroup. Independent sample *t* tests were also computed to compare mean differences between girls and boys on their bullying characteristics and the coping strategies they adopted. Partial Pearson correlations were performed to examine relationships between bullying and specific coping strategies, controlling for age. We ran multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) with bullying victimization as the outcome variable (pure victim and bully-victims) and with coping or CER strategies as independent variables. Univariate *F* follow-up tests were conducted within the multivariate significant overall differences, and significant results on the univariate tests were followed with Bonferroni's comparisons to determine whether victims, bully-victims and noninvolved students used different coping strategies. A 5% level of significance was used for all statistical tests. Data analysis was performed using IBM SPSS® Statistics Version 23.

Results

Prevalence of Bullying and Descriptive Analysis of Variables According to Sex

Before testing our research hypotheses, we calculated basic descriptive statistics of the study's focal variables. The means and standard deviations for boys' and girls' bullying and coping scores, and the *t* test results are shown in Table 1. Based on Olweus and Solberg's criteria, 19.0% (*n* = 184) of adolescents reported being pure victims, 4.9% (*n* = 47) reported being bully-victims and 8.9% (*n* = 86) reported being pure bullies. A group comparison analysis showed significant differences between the sexes with regard to bullying roles ($\chi^2 = 38.925$, $p < .001$). Pure victims were more frequently girls than boys (55.4% vs. 44.6%), whereas bully-victims were more frequently boys than girls (37% vs. 53%). Finally, 58.7% (*n* = 568) of

girls and 41.3% ($n = 399$) of boys reported no involvement in bullying. The continuous approach revealed higher victimization and aggression scores for boys ($t = 7.881, p < .01$) than for girls ($t = 60.017, p < .001$). We also investigated sex-related differences in the coping variables. Girls scored higher than boys on self-blame, rumination, social support seeking, problem-solving, and internalizing. By contrast, boys scored higher than girls on positive reappraisal, blaming others, distancing, and externalizing (see Table 1 for more details).

Please insert Table 1 here

Relationships Between Coping Strategies and Bullying According to Sex

Correlations among the measures for boys and girls, controlling for age, are provided in Table 2. Significant positive correlations (Bonferroni-corrected) between victimization scores and maladaptive coping strategies such as self-blame, rumination, catastrophizing, and blaming others ranged from .17 to .35 ($p < .001$). A significant sex-specific correlation was found with refocus on planning for boys ($r = .17, p < .001$). Internalizing and externalizing were also positively correlated with victimization (respectively, $r = .35-.33$ and $.18-.27, p < .001$). Social support seeking was positively associated with victimization, especially for boys ($r = .17, p < .001$).

Concerning the aggression dimension, a positive correlation was found with blaming others for both sexes ($r = .19-.17, p < .001$), and with maladaptive strategies for boys only ($r = .17, p < .001$). Aggression was also significantly related to *externalizing* ($r = .18-.27, p < .001$).

Please insert Table 2 here

Coping Strategies According to Sex and Bullying Role

We then investigated whether there were differences between the bullying roles in terms of coping strategies in response to peer conflict. Coping strategy means and standard deviations for pure victims, bully-victims and noninvolved students are provided in Table 3 for girls and Table 4 for boys. The MANOVAs comparing the three bullying roles (i.e., noninvolved, pure victim and aggressor-victim) and the five avoidance-approach coping strategies (i.e., *social support seeking*, *problem-solving*, *distancing*, *internalizing* and *externalizing*) across sex were significant ($F = 3.12$, $p = .001$, Pillai's Trace = .06, Partial $\eta^2 = .03$, and $F = 5.673$, $p = .001$, Pillai's Trace = .14, Partial $\eta^2 = .07$, respectively for girls and for boys). For girls, a series of ANOVAs conducted for girls revealed significant differences on avoidance coping (both internalizing and externalizing) between the pure victim and noninvolved groups. For each type of coping strategy, pure victims scored higher than their counterparts. Among the boys, internalizing, and externalizing were used significantly more by pure victims than by noninvolved adolescents. Boys classified as bully-victims reported engaging significantly more in social support seeking (approach coping), distancing, internalizing, and externalizing (avoidance coping) than those in the noninvolved group.

Cognitive Emotion Regulation According to Sex and Bullying Role

The results of MANOVAs showed that there was a significant main effect, indicating an overall difference in the reporting of nine cognitive coping strategies between the three bullying roles ($F = 1.985$, $p = .039$, Pillai's Trace = .04, Partial $\eta^2 = .03$, and $F = 1.710$, $p = .033$, Pillai's Trace = .08, Partial $\eta^2 = .04$, respectively for girls and for boys). Follow-up univariate ANOVAs indicated that, for girls, self-blame and rumination (maladaptive strategies) were more used by pure victims than noninvolved girls. Girls who reported being bully-victims scored also significantly higher on self-blame and blaming others than noninvolved

female students. Among the boys, maladaptive strategies, such as self-blame, catastrophizing, blaming others, were used significantly more by pure victims than noninvolved adolescents. Boys classified as bully-victims reported engaging significantly more in maladaptive CER strategies such as, self-blame, rumination, catastrophizing, blaming others than those in the noninvolved group.

Please insert Tables 3 and 4 here

Discussion

School bullying is a common stressor for adolescents that often requires personal resources and strategies to cope with the distress it causes. The purpose of the current study was to explore the relationship between bullying involvement and coping strategies, looking for sex-specific patterns. In the present sample, almost one of fifth of the adolescents (19%) reported having been victimized at school during the previous 2 months, whereas only 4.9% reported also being perpetrators (bully-victims). These prevalence rates are relatively close to those reported by Guy et al. (2019). Males were more likely to be bully-victims than girls, whereas girls were more frequently pure victims than boys. When we applied a continuum approach, boys were found to score higher on both the aggression and victimization dimensions than girls. These results are in line with the findings of previous studies, and suggest that boys are at greater risk of being bullied than girls (e.g., Chan & Wong, 2017; Guy et al., 2019).

With regard to coping strategies, in the present study, girls reported greater use of internalized cognitive coping strategies (e.g., self-blame and rumination) and approach coping strategies (e.g., social support seeking and problem-solving) than boys. Most previous studies had found that girls generally use more emotion-focused and social support strategies than boys (Zimmer-Gembeck & Skinner, 2011, 2015). Some studies also indicated that women use more

active coping (i.e., problem focused) than men do (Tamres et al., 2002), although there is no consensus on this finding (Hampel et al., 2009). Moreover, one previous study showed that male adolescents tend to use more CER strategies (e.g., positive reappraisal, distancing, and blaming others) than female adolescents do (Zlomke & Haln, 2010). Based on the theory of socialization, sex-related differences in coping in adolescence can be understood as reflecting traditional gender-role internalization (Armstrong et al., 2019; Lengua & Stormshak, 2000). Moreover, researchers have found that boys perceive externalizing, talking to adults about bullying, and cognitive distancing as more effective than other forms of coping (Kristensen & Smith, 2003).

Approach-avoidance Coping According to Sex and Bullying Roles.

We postulated that avoidance coping strategies, especially internalization and distancing, are more frequent among victims than among noninvolved students. Among both girls and boys, pure victims did indeed report greater use of internalization than noninvolved adolescents, but also of externalization (unexpected result), whereas for distancing, we only found a significant sex-specific difference for male bully-victims. First, these findings show that pure victims tend to resort to denial or to strategies that distract them from the bullying situation and the emotions it provokes. In line with a previous study among college participants, we found that victims tended to use avoidance or emotion coping strategies more frequently (Newman et al., 2011), which strengthens their negative emotional states (e.g, Chao, 2011) and sense of loss of control or ineffectiveness (Slee, 1993). Furthermore, based on the transactional model of stress and coping (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984), adolescents who are chronically bullied may felt that emotion-focused coping was the best way to cope with bullying, based on their previous experiences.

Adolescents who are bullied tend to use a variety of coping techniques falling into avoidance coping strategies, whereas approach coping styles were not related to victimization. These findings that mainly emotion-focused coping may be associated to victimization (and not the approach coping) suggest that interventions should focus on discouraging emotion-focused coping strategies in adolescence, and that by ignoring the situation or by not trying to cope actively with it, adolescents may be at greater risk of peer victimization. Nevertheless, one unexpected results should be highlighted. Our results revealed that seeking social support was a type of coping often used by male bully-victims of bullying. Seeking social support was a problem-focused coping strategies most often reported used among girls pure victims (Tenenbaum et al., 2011). This result is consistent with studies that tend to show that social support seeking no protects victimized boys (in contrary to girls ; Kochenderfer-Ladd & Skinner, 2002), due to (i) the nature of friendships for boys which are characterized less by intimacy and emotional support, and (ii) the stereotypically nonmasculine nature of social support seeking (Shelley & Craig, 2010).

CER Strategies According to Sex and Bullying Roles.

We also expected to observe greater use by victims of maladaptive CER strategies, in particular self-blame, rumination, and catastrophizing. Our findings partially confirmed this, for as expected, we identified specific coping patterns according to sex. *Self-blame* was more common among both male and female victims (pure and bully-victims) than among noninvolved adolescents. These results are in accordance with previous studies showing that gender is not associated with the use of self-blame (Parris et al., 2017). Victims of bullying tend to exaggerate the extent to which they are responsible for their situations, possibly leading to maladaptive outcomes, such as passivity. This is in accordance with previous studies showing significant

correlations between (cyber)victimization and self-blame among school students (Arató et al., 2020; Chen & Chen, 2019; Garnefski & Kraaij, 2014; Quintana-Orts et al., 2019; Shelley & Craig, 2010). Victims may criticize or blame themselves for the harassment, in an attempt to understand why it is happening. The use of self-blame may also allow victims to maintain the belief that they are in control of their lives and/or make sense of what is thus an understandable event. An alternative or concomitant explanation is that victims tend to internalize their perpetrators' victim blaming (Harsey et al., 2017). Cognitive restructuring of self-blaming attributions (e.g., acceptance and commitment therapy, ACT; Hayes et al., 2006) may be an effective form of intervention, as self-blame is associated with a higher risk of posttraumatic stress disorder and revictimization for victims of violence (Mokma et al., 2016).

With regard to *ruminatio*n, among girls, higher scores were observed for pure victims, whereas among boys, it was the bully-victims who exhibited this pattern. *Ruminatio*n characterizes the tendency to overthink the signs, causes and consequences of distress, instead of concentrating on solutions for overcoming it (Nolen-Hoeksema et al., 2008), and it has previously been linked to peer victimization (Arató et al., 2020; Erdur-Baker, 2009; Garnefski & Kraaij, 2014; Hampel et al., 2009; Quintana-Orts et al., 2019; Shapero et al., 2013). Ruminative thoughts have been found to interfere negatively with problem-solving abilities (e.g., problem-focused coping; Donaldson & Lam, 2004) and to generate increased stress in negative interpersonal situations (Hayes et al., 2006; Lyubomirsky & Nolen-Hoeksema, 1995). A vicious circle then emerges, as this coping process makes the targeted student more vulnerable and may thus result in higher levels of victimization (Candel & Jacob, 2015). Our results for males can be related to those of Rey and Extremera (2012), who showed that self-blame and rumination are predictive of levels of aggression, but only for boys. The most common ruminated emotional

response in victims may be anger (den Hamer & Konijn, 2016), which may manifest itself in aggressive behavior among boys (Bushman et al., 2001; Zsila et al., 2019), whereas girls are more socialized to respond in terms of avoidance and internalization of negative affects or experiences (e.g., Turton & Campbell, 2007).

Finally, a positive correlation was found between the level of victimization and the use of refocus on planning (adaptive CER) among males. *Refocusing on planning* refers to thinking about what steps to take and how to handle a negative event, and was previously associated to a higher level of resilience (e.g., Min et al., 2013). It has been shown that male adolescents are more inclined than female adolescents to use refocus on planning (Öngen, 2010). As planning (approach coping) was related to a feeling of personal control over stressors (Skinner & Zimmer-Gembeck, 2010), this CER strategy may lead males to be more competent in managing the peer victimization, which would explain why we do not find this result when considering victimization in a categorical approach (i.e., bullying roles that characterize chronically involved adolescents).

Differences in Coping Strategies Between Pure Victims and Bully-victims

Finally, we expected bully-victims to make specific use of coping strategies, compared with pure victims. We expected pure victims to report higher internalization, self-blame, rumination, and catastrophizing than bully-victims, and the latter to report greater use of externalization and blaming others than pure victims. No significant result was found concerning rumination and internalization, whereas use of blaming others and externalization were higher among bully-victims (i.e., aggressive coping strategies) than among pure victims. Results thus supported the hypothesis that bully-victims report more frequent use of externalizing strategies (e.g., blaming others) than pure victims possibly to recover a sense of control (Marsh et al.,

2011). The externalization of blame may become cognitively distorted, such that aggressive behavior appears justified (Barriga & Gibbs, 1996; Roos et al., 2015). More specifically, based on the cognitive model of shame (Lewis, 1992), we suggest that victims who take responsibility for the harassment situation experience a sense of shame, powerlessness and/or vulnerability that may be converted into an externalized form (i.e., use of externalization as a defense against these painful affects) such as blaming others, and may sometimes manifest itself in aggressive behavior (bully-victims). In the light of these findings, interventions based on accepting responsibility for one's own behavior (e.g., restorative approaches) and a sense of shame would appear to be a first step in mobilizing motivation for behavioral change in bully-victims (Evers et al., 2007).

We also found some specific results for males. Male bully-victims also reported higher catastrophizing (maladaptive CER) distancing strategy (avoidance coping) than male pure victims. *Catastrophizing* was a type of cognitive distortion that male victims seemed to share. They appeared to dwell on the worst possible outcome of negative events, and tended to see their future as more hopeless. This strategy may reduce their desire (or propensity) to influence the perpetrator. Male adolescent victims may tend to think that those who are bullied are *losers*, and that people cannot change (entity theory of personality; Yeager et al., 2013). This finding is in line with the above-mentioned studies, and offers a deeper understanding of gender specificity, which had not previously been investigated. In line with this finding, interventions encouraging adaptive cognitive responses (cognitive restructuring) by male bully-victims, such as maintaining an optimistic viewpoint and seeking new meanings, may facilitate the behavioral change process (Chandra et al., 2019).

Thus, like Parris et al. (2017, 2019), we found that male bully-victims also made greater use of cognitive distancing strategy (emotion-focused and avoidant coping). Previous studies have already shown that boys, specifically, considered distancing to be more effective than other forms of coping with bullying (Shelley & Craig, 2010). *Distancing* refers to the cognitive efforts of individuals to detach themselves from themselves and to minimize the meaning of a situation, in order to avoid intense emotions or painful feelings. The use of distancing to cope with traumatic events (e.g., being chronically bullied) tends to remove anxiety and depression from emotional responses, but these may be expressed in another ways, such as hostile or aggressive behavior among bully-victims. This may confirm the portrait of bully-victims as individuals who tend to displace their feelings of shame and inadequacy by externalizing blame and expressing anger (Marsh et al., 2011; Stuewig et al., 2010). It should also be noted that the CER strategies catastrophizing and blaming others are theoretically related to anger (Martin & Dahlen, 2005), which in turn is associated with potential revenge-seeking (Kochenderfer-Ladd, 2004). Further research should examine the cognitive restructuring role played by distancing among male bully-victims, especially since Arató et al. (2020) found the same result in a cyberbullying context. Cognitive defusion (Hofmann & Asmundson, 2008), used in ACT therapy to target problems related to secondary cognitive distortions (i.e., blaming others; Barriga & Gibbs, 1996) in reactive aggression, seems a promising technique (Oostermeijer et al., 2017).

Whereas female bullied reported utilizing rumination and self-blame in perspective in the face of stressful situation, men also reported blaming others and catastrophizing. These findings underline that bullied girls are more focus on the emotional aspects of stressful experiences, and engage in rumination, while bullied boys make higher use of external attribution of responsibility. Male bully-victims also tended to use more maladaptive cognitive emotion

regulation strategies (rumination) and avoidance coping (distancing) than male pure victims. Female bully-victims used more externalizing strategies (blaming others) than female pure victims. Results of the present study provide a first support for differential CER and coping strategies between gender.

Limitations and Future Research Directions

The present study had several limitations. First, we used a convenience nonprobability sample design that has limitations with regard to how far results can be generalized. Additionally, data collection was cross-sectional, thus limiting our ability to establish causality among the variables and to offer insights into the development of coping strategies. Future research should therefore seek to expand the current investigation through the adoption of a longitudinal design. Second, bullying was measured on a self-report scale, with the risk of a social desirability bias. More comprehensive research (with victims, aggressors, teachers, and parents as participants) might be more appropriate. Finally, some results could be explained by the small number of participants. In addition, analyses should be reproduced with the inclusion of other contextual and individual difference variables. Thus, the type of bullying experienced by victims and/or perpetrated by bullies (e.g., physical, verbal or sexual) may also influence adolescents' coping skills, and therefore needs to be examined. Future research could also include qualitative data to further investigate why males/females use certain coping strategies (and no others) when they experience bullying. Coping strategies are also dependent on dispositional (e.g., self-efficacy, self-esteem, attachment) and situational (social support, life events) factors, which need to be investigated in a future study. For example, additional research is needed to identify the role of perceived social support (peer and/or adults, i.e., parents, teachers, social workers) in the relationship between coping, gender and

victimization. Researchers will also need to further examine the role of polyvictimization in bullying involvement and concomitant psychosocial skills (e.g., assertiveness, self-esteem, coping orientations) among adolescents.

Conclusion

Our results showed that pure victims and bully-victims are characterized by specific emotion regulation and coping strategies. Bullied adolescents tend to use maladaptive emotion regulation strategies and disengagement to cope with their distress. However, these ways of coping maintain and even heighten stress or negative affects (Volkaert et al., 2020). Pure victims tend to internalize shame, and others' rejection of them is not discharged but internalized. Endorsement of self-blaming attributions puts them at increased risk of internalizing distress (Prinstein et al., 2005). Moreover, the focus on negative feelings and rumination may increase or exacerbate recall of the negative emotions/experiences, and decrease direct action to solve problems (Martin & Gillies, 2004). Both male and female bully-victims used blaming others to regulate their affective states, compared with pure victims. Male bully-victims tended to combine both internalized and externalized coping strategies (i.e., aggressive cognition) when they experienced bullying. These findings underscore the heterogeneity of bullying coping patterns during adolescence and the importance of considering sex in coping responses to peer victimization. Focusing on and encouraging adaptive (or efficient) personal coping resources may be important for promoting ways out of victimization and preventing bullying. These interventions must necessarily take into account the nature of the students, including their sex and the type of bullying they have experienced/perpetrated.

References

- Aldao, A., & Nolen-Hoeksema, S. (2010). Specificity of Cognitive Emotion Regulation Strategies : A Transdiagnostic Examination. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *48*(10), 974-983. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2010.06.002>
- Andreou, E. (2001). Bully/Victim Problems and their Association with Coping Behaviour in Conflictual Peer Interactions Among School-age Children. *Educational Psychology*, *21*(1), 59-66. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410125042>
- Arató, N., Zsidó, A. N., Lénárd, K., & Lábadi, B. (2020). Cybervictimization and Cyberbullying : The Role of Socio-Emotional Skills. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, *11*, 248. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2020.00248>
- Armstrong, S. B., Dubow, E. F., & Domoff, S. E. (2019). Adolescent Coping : In-Person and Cyber-Victimization. *Cyberpsychology*, *13*(4). <https://doi.org/10.5817/CP2019-4-2>
- Barriga, A. Q., & Gibbs, J. C. (1996). Measuring Cognitive Distortion in Antisocial Youth: Development and Preliminary Validation of the “How I Think” Questionnaire. *Aggressive Behavior*, *22*(5), 333-343. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1098-2337\(1996\)22:5<333::AID-AB2>3.0.CO;2-K](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-2337(1996)22:5<333::AID-AB2>3.0.CO;2-K)
- Biggs, A., Brough, P., & Drummond, S. (2017). Lazarus and Folkman’s Psychological Stress and Coping Theory. In C. L. Cooper & J. C. Quick (Eds.), *The Handbook of Stress and Health* (pp. 349-364). John Wiley & Sons. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118993811.ch21>
- Bushman, B. J., Baumeister, R. F., & Phillips, C. M. (2001). Do People Aggress to Improve Their Mood? Catharsis Beliefs, Affect Regulation Opportunity, and Aggressive Responding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *81*(1), 17-32. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.81.1.17>

- Candel, O. S., & Iacob, L.-M. (2015). Rumination, co-rumination and peer victimization in Romanian adolescents. *Annals of the Al. I. Cuza University, Psychology Series*, 24, 25-38.
- Causey, D. L., & Dubow, E. F. (1992). Development of a Self-Report Coping Measure for Elementary School Children. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 21(1), 47-59.
https://doi.org/10.1207/s15374424jccp2101_8
- Chan, H. C., & Wong, D. S. W. (2017). Coping with Cyberbullying Victimization: An Exploratory Study of Chinese Adolescents in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*, 50, 71-82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlcj.2017.04.003>
- Chandra, E. K., Wibowo, M. E., & Sunawan, S. (2019). Cognitive Behaviour Group Counseling with Self-Instruction and Cognitive Restructuring Techniques to Improve Students' Self-Confidence. *Islamic Guidance and Counseling Journal*, 2(1), 11.
<https://doi.org/10.25217/igcj.v2i1.305>
- Chao, R. C.-L. (2011). Managing Stress and Maintaining Well-Being: Social Support, Problem-Focused Coping, and Avoidant Coping. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 89(3), 338-348. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2011.tb00098.x>
- Chen, W.-R., & Chen, L.-M. (2019). Self-Blame Tendency of Bullied Victims in Elementary and Secondary schools. *Educational Studies*, 45(4), 480-496.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03055698.2018.1509772>
- Compas, B. E., Connor-Smith, J. K., Saltzman, H., Thomsen, A. H., & Wadsworth, M. E. (2001). Coping with Stress During Childhood and Adolescence: Problems, Progress, and Potential in Theory and Research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(1), 87-127.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.127.1.87>

- Craig, W., Harel-Fisch, Y., Fogel-Grinvald, H., Dostaler, S., Hetland, J., Simons-Morton, B., Molcho, M., Mato, M. G. de, Overpeck, M., Due, P., Pickett, W., Group, the H. V. & I. P. F., & Group, the H. B. W. (2009). A Cross-National Profile of Bullying and Victimization among Adolescents in 40 Countries. *International Journal of Public Health, 54*(2), 216-224. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00038-009-5413-9>
- Craig, W., Pepler, D., & Blais, J. (2007). Responding to Bullying: What Works? *School Psychology International, 28*(4), 465-477. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0143034307084136>
- den Hamer, A. H., & Konijn, E. A. (2016). Can Emotion Regulation Serve as a Tool in Combating Cyberbullying? *Personality and Individual Differences, 102*, 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.06.033>
- Donaldson, C., & Lam, D. (2004). Rumination, Mood and Social Problem-Solving in Major Depression. *Psychological Medicine, 34*(7), 1309-1318. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291704001904>
- Doron, J., Trouillet, R., Maneveau, A., Neveu, D., & Ninot, G. (2015). Coping Profiles, Perceived Stress and Health-Related Behaviors: A Cluster Analysis Approach. *Health Promotion International, 30*(1), 88-100. <https://doi.org/10.1093/heapro/dau090>
- Ebata, A. T., & Moos, R. H. (1991). Coping and Adjustment in Distressed and Healthy Adolescents. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 12*(1), 33-54. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0193-3973\(91\)90029-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0193-3973(91)90029-4)
- Erdur-Baker, Ö. (2009). Peer Victimization, Rumination, and Problem Solving as Risk Contributors to Adolescents' Depressive Symptoms. *The Journal of Psychology, 143*(1), 78-90. <https://doi.org/10.3200/JRLP.143.1.78-90>

- Evans, C. B. R., Cotter, K. L., & Smokowski, P. R. (2017). Giving Victims of Bullying a Voice: A Qualitative Study of Post Bullying Reactions and Coping Strategies. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 34(6), 543-555. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10560-017-0492-6>
- Evers, K. E., Prochaska, J. O., Van Marthes, D. F., Johnson, J. L., & Prochaska, J. M. (2007). Transtheoretical-Based Bullying Prevention Effectiveness Trials in Middle-Schools and High Schools. *Educational Research*, 49(4), 397-414. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131880701717271>
- Folkman, S., Lazarus, R. S., Gruen, R. J., & DeLongis, A. (1986). Appraisal, Coping, Health Status, and Psychological Symptoms. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50(3), 571-579.
- Garnefski, N., & Kraaij, V. (2007). The Cognitive Emotion Regulation Questionnaire. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 23(3), 141-149. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759.23.3.141>
- Garnefski, N., & Kraaij, V. (2014). Bully Victimization and Emotional Problems in Adolescents: Moderation by Specific Cognitive Coping Strategies? *Journal of Adolescence*, 37(7), 1153-1160. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2014.07.005>
- Garnefski, N., Kraaij, V., & Spinhoven, P. (2001). Negative life events, cognitive emotion regulation and emotional problems. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 30(8), 1311–1327. doi:10.1016/s0191-8869(00)00113-6
- Garnefski, N., Kraaij, V., & van Eten, M. (2005). Specificity of Relations Between Adolescents' Cognitive Emotion Regulation Strategies and Internalizing and Externalizing Psychopathology. *Journal of Adolescence*, 28(5), 619-631. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2004.12.009>

- Griffin Smith, R., & Gross, A. (2006). Bullying : Prevalence and the Effect of Age and Gender. *Child & Family Behavior Therapy*, 28(4), 13-37. https://doi.org/10.1300/J019v28n04_02
- Guy, A., Lee, K., & Wolke, D. (2019). Comparisons Between Adolescent Bullies, Victims, and Bully-Victims on Perceived Popularity, Social Impact, and Social Preference. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 10, 868. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2019.00868>
- Hampel, P., Manhal, S., & Hayer, T. (2009). Direct and Relational Bullying Among Children and Adolescents: Coping and Psychological Adjustment. *School Psychology International*, 30(5), 474-490. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0143034309107066>
- Hansen, T. B., Steenberg, L. M., Palic, S., & Elklit, A. (2012). A Review of Psychological Factors Related to Bullying Victimization in Schools. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 17(4), 383-387. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2012.03.008>
- Harsey, S. J., Zurbriggen, E. L., & Freyd, J. J. (2017). Perpetrator Responses to Victim Confrontation: DARVO and Victim Self-Blame. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 26(6), 644-663. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10926771.2017.1320777>
- Hebert, M., Parent, N., & Daignault, I. V. (2007). The French-Canadian Version of the Self-Report Coping Scale: Estimates of the Reliability, Validity, and Development of a Short Form. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 40(1), 4-15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07481756.2007.11909802>
- Herman-Stabl, M. A., Stemmler, M., & Petersen, A. C. (1995). Approach and Avoidant Coping: Implications for Adolescent Mental Health. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 24(6), 649-665. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01536949>

Hofmann, S. G., & Asmundson, G. J. G. (2008). Acceptance and Mindfulness-Based Therapy:

New Wave or Old Hat? *Clinical Psychology Review*, 28(1), 1-16.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2007.09.003>

Hunter, S. C., & Boyle, J. M. E. (2004). Appraisal and Coping Strategy Use in Victims of School

Bullying. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74(1), 83-107.

<https://doi.org/10.1348/000709904322848833>

Keith, S. (2018). How do Traditional Bullying and Cyberbullying Victimization Affect Fear and

Coping among Students? An Application of General Strain Theory. *American Journal of*

Criminal Justice, 43(1), 67-84. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-017-9411-9>

Kelly, E. V., Newton, N. C., Stapinski, L. A., Slade, T., Barrett, E. L., Conrod, P. J., & Teesson,

M. (2015). Suicidality, Internalizing Problems and Externalizing Problems Among

Adolescent Bullies, Victims and Bully-Victims. *Preventive Medicine*, 73, 100-105.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2015.01.020>

Kochenderfer-Ladd, B. (2004). Peer Victimization: The Role of Emotions in Adaptive and

Maladaptive Coping. *Social Development*, 13(3), 329-349. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9507.2004.00271.x)

[9507.2004.00271.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9507.2004.00271.x)

Kristensen, S. M., & Smith, P. K. (2003). The Use of Coping Strategies by Danish Children

Classed as Bullies, Victims, Bully/victims, and Not Involved, in Response to Different

(Hypothetical) Types of Bullying. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 44(5), 479-488.

<https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1467-9450.2003.00369.x>

Kubiszewski, V., Fontaine, R., Chasseigne, G., & Rusch, E. (2014). Évaluation du Bullying

Scolaire (Harcèlement Scolaire) chez les Adolescents Français: Validité de l'Adaptation

- Française du Questionnaire Agresseur/Victime Révisé d'Olweus (1996). *Annales Médico-Psychologiques*, , 172(4), 261-267. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amp.2012.09.018>
- Lazarus, R. S. (2006). *Stress and Emotion. A new synthesis*. Springer.
- Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1991). The concept of coping. In A. Monat & R. S. Lazarus (Eds.), *Stress and Coping: An anthology* (pp. 189–206). Columbia University Press.
- Lazarus, R.S. & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal and coping*, Springer Publishing.
- Lazarus, R. S., & Launier, R. (1978). Stress-Related Transactions between Person and Environment. In L. A. Pervin & M. Lewis (Eds.), *Perspectives in Interactional Psychology* (pp. 287-327). Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4613-3997-7_12
- Lengua, L. J., & Stormshak, E. A. (2000). Gender, Gender Roles, and Personality: Gender Differences in the Prediction of Coping and Psychological Symptoms. *Sex Roles*, 43(11/12), 787-820. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1011096604861>
- Lewis, M. (1992). *Shame: The exposed self*. The Free Press.
- Lyubomirsky, S., & Nolen-Hoeksema, S. (1995). Effects of Self-Focused Rumination on Negative Thinking and Interpersonal Problem Solving. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(1), 176-190. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.69.1.176>
- Machmutow, K., Perren, S., Sticca, F., & Alsaker, F. D. (2012). Peer Victimization and Depressive Symptoms: Can Specific Coping Strategies Buffer the Negative Impact of Cybervictimisation? *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*, 17(3-4), 403-420. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632752.2012.704310>
- Mahady Wilton, M. M., Craig, W. M., & Pepler, D. J. (2000). Emotional Regulation and Display in Classroom Victims of Bullying: Characteristic Expressions of Affect, Coping Styles and

Relevant Contextual Factors. *Social Development*, 9(2), 226-245.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9507.00121>

Matud, M. P. (2004). Gender Differences in Stress and Coping Styles. *Personality and*

Individual Differences, 37(7), 1401-1415. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2004.01.010>

Mark, L., Värnik, A., & Sisask, M. (2019). Who Suffers Most From Being Involved in Bullying-

Bully, Victim, or Bully-Victim? *Journal of School Health*, 89(2), 136-144.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/josh.12720>

Marsh, H. W., Nagengast, B., Morin, A. J. S., Parada, R. H., Craven, R. G., & Hamilton, L. R.

(2011). Construct Validity of the Multidimensional Structure of Bullying and Victimization:

An Application of Exploratory Structural Equation Modeling. *Journal of Educational*

Psychology, 103(3), 701-732. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024122>

Martin, J., & Gillies, R. M. (2004). How Adolescents Cope With Bullying. *Australian Journal of*

Guidance and Counselling, 14(2), 195-210. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1037291100002508>

Martin, R. C., & Dahlen, E. R. (2005). Cognitive Emotion Regulation in the Prediction of

Depression, Anxiety, Stress, and Anger. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 39(7),

1249-1260. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2005.06.004>

Min, J.-A., Yu, J. J., Lee, C. U., & Chae, J.-H. (2013). Cognitive emotion regulation strategies

contributing to resilience in patients with depression and/or anxiety disorders.

Comprehensive psychiatry, 54(8), 1190-1197.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comppsy.2013.05.008>

Mokma, T. R., Eshelman, L. R., & Messman-Moore, T. L. (2016). Contributions of Child Sexual

Abuse, Self-Blame, Posttraumatic Stress Symptoms, and Alcohol Use to Women's Risk for

- Forcible and Substance-Facilitated Sexual Assault. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, 25(4), 428-448. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10538712.2016.1161688>
- Moore, S. E., Norman, R. E., Suetani, S., Thomas, H. J., Sly, P. D., & Scott, J. G. (2017). Consequences of Bullying Victimization in Childhood and Adolescence: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *World Journal of Psychiatry*, 7(1), 60. <https://doi.org/10.5498/wjp.v7.i1.60>
- Murray-Harvey, R., Skrzypiec, G., & Slee, P. T. (2012). Effective and Ineffective Coping With Bullying Strategies as Assessed by Informed Professionals and Their Use by Victimized Students. *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 22(01), 122-138. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jgc.2012.5>
- Naylor, P., Cowie, H., & del Rey, R. (2001). Coping Strategies of Secondary School Children in Response to Being Bullied. *Child Psychology and Psychiatry Review*, 6(3), 114-120. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360641701002647>
- Newman, M. L., Holden, G. W., & Delville, Y. (2005). Isolation and the Stress of Being Bullied. *Journal of Adolescence*, 28(3), 343-357. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2004.08.002>
- Newman, M. L., Holden, G. W., & Delville, Y. (2011). Coping With the Stress of Being Bullied: Consequences of Coping Strategies Among College Students. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 2(2), 205-211. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550610386388>
- Nolen-Hoeksema, S., Wisco, B. E., & Lyubomirsky, S. (2008). Rethinking Rumination. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 3(5), 400-424. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6924.2008.00088.x>
- Olweus, D. (1994). Bullying at school. In L. Rowell Huesmann (Ed.), *Aggressive Behavior* (pp. 97-130). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-9116-7_5

- Olweus, D. (2006). Bullying at School: Basic Facts and Effects of a School Based Intervention Program. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 35(7), 1171-1190.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.1994.tb01229.x>
- Olweus, D., & Limber, S. P. (2010). The Olweus Bullying Prevention Program. In S. R. Jimerson, S. M. Swearer, & D. L. Espelage (Eds.), *The handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective* (p. 27). Routledge.
- Oostermeijer, S., Smeets, K. C., Jansen, L. M. C., Jambroes, T., Rommelse, N. N. J., Scheepers, F. E., Buitelaar, J. K., & Popma, A. (2017). The Role of Self-Serving Cognitive Distortions in Reactive and Proactive Aggression : Role of Cognitive Distortions in Aggression. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, 27(5), 395-408. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cbm.2039>
- Öngen, D. E. (2010). The relationships between adaptive and maladaptive perfectionism and aggression among Turkish adolescents. *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 20(1), 99-108. <https://doi.org/10.1375/ajgc.20.1.99>
- Östberg, V., Låftman, S. B., Modin, B., & Lindfors, P. (2018). Bullying as a Stressor in Mid-Adolescent Girls and Boys—Associations with Perceived Stress, Recurrent Pain, and Salivary Cortisol. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 15(2). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph15020364>
- Özdemir, M., & Stattin, H. (2011). Bullies, Victims, and Bully-Victims : A Longitudinal Examination of the Effects of Bullying-Victimization Experiences on Youth Well-Being. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research*, 3(2), 97-102.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/17596591111132918>

Parris, L., Varjas, K., Meyers, J., Henrich, C., & Brack, J. (2019). Coping with bullying: The Moderating Effects of Self-reliance. *Journal of School Violence, 18*(1), 62-76.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2017.1387131>

Prinstein, M. J., Cheah, C. S. L., & Guyer, A. E. (2005). Peer Victimization, Cue Interpretation, and Internalizing Symptoms: Preliminary Concurrent and Longitudinal Findings for Children and Adolescents. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology, 34*(1), 11-24.

https://doi.org/10.1207/s15374424jccp3401_2

Quintana-Orts, C., Rey, L., Mérida-López, S., Sánchez-Álvarez, N., & Extremera, N. (2019, July). *Cognitive Emotion Regulation Strategies in Adolescence: Are There Differences in Traditional Bullying Roles?* Poster session presented at the International Society for the Study of Individual Differences, Florence, Italy.

<https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.35711.56486>

Rey, L. & Extremera, N. (2012). Physical-Verbal Aggression and Depression in Adolescents: The Role of Cognitive Emotion Regulation Strategies. *Universitas Psychologica, 11*(4), 1245-1254.

Rigby, K. (2004). Addressing Bullying in Schools: Theoretical Perspectives and Their Implications. *School Psychology International, 25*(3), 287-300.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0143034304046902>

Rivers, I., & Smith, P. K. (1994). Types of Bullying Behaviour and Their Correlates. *Aggressive Behavior, 20*, 359-368.

Roos, S., Salmivalli, C., & Hodges, E. (2015). Emotion Regulation and Negative Emotionality Moderate the Effects of Moral (Dis)Engagement on Aggression. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 61*(1), 30. <https://doi.org/10.13110/merrpalmquar1982.61.1.0030>

- Roth, S., & Cohen, L. J. (1986). Approach, Avoidance, and Coping with Stress. *American Psychologist*, *41*(7), 813-819. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.41.7.813>
- Rutherford, A., & Endler, N. S. (1999). Predicting Approach-Avoidance: The Roles of Coping Styles, State Anxiety, and Situational Appraisal. *Anxiety, Stress & Coping*, *12*(1), 63-84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10615809908248323>
- Salmivalli, C., & Nieminen, E. (2002). Proactive and Reactive Aggression Among School Bullies, Victims, and Bully-Victims. *Aggressive Behavior*, *28*(1), 30-44. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.90004>
- Schwartz, D., Proctor, L. J., & Chien, D. H. (2001). *The aggressive victim of bullying: Emotional and behavioral dysregulation as a pathway to victimization by peers*. In J. Juvonen & S. Graham (Eds.), *Peer harassment in school: The plight of the vulnerable and victimized* (pp. 147–174). The Guilford Press.
- Shapiro, B. G., Hamilton, J. L., Liu, R. T., Abramson, L. Y., & Alloy, L. B. (2013). Internalizing Symptoms and Rumination: The Prospective Prediction of Familial and Peer Emotional Victimization Experiences During Adolescence. *Journal of Adolescence*, *36*(6), 1067-1076. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2013.08.011>
- Shelley, D., & Craig, W. M. (2010). Attributions and Coping Styles in Reducing Victimization. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology*, *25*(1), 84-100. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0829573509357067>
- Shute, R., Owens, L., & Slee, P. (2008). Everyday Victimization of Adolescent Girls by Boys: Sexual Harassment, Bullying or Aggression? *Sex Roles*, *58*(7-8), 477-778, 4sHarassment, Bullying or Aggression? cenSigurdson, J. F., Wallander, J., & Sund, A. M. (2014). Is Involvement in School Bullying Associated with General Health and Psychosocial

Adjustment Outcomes in Adulthood? *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 38(10), 1607-1617.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2014.06.001>

Singh, P., & Bussey, K. (2011). Peer Victimization and Psychological Maladjustment: The Mediating Role of Coping Self-Efficacy. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 21(2),

420-433. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2010.00680.x>

Skinner, E. A., & Zimmer-Gembeck, M. J. (2007). The Development of Coping. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58(1), 119-144. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.58.110405.085705>

Skinner, E. A., & Zimmer-Gembeck, M. J. (2010). *Perceived Control and the Development of Coping*. Oxford University Press.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195375343.013.0003>

Skrzypiec, G., Slee, P., Murray-Harvey, R., & Pereira, B. (2011). School Bullying by One or More Ways: Does it Matter and How do Students Cope? *School Psychology International*, 32(3), 288-311. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0143034311402308>

Slee, P. T. (1993). Bullying at School: It's hard not to feel helpless. *Children Australia*, 18(4), 14-16. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1035077200003667>

Smith, P. K., López-Castro, L., Robinson, S., & Görzig, A. (2019). Consistency of Gender Differences in Bullying in Cross-Cultural Surveys. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 45, 33-40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2018.04.006>

Smith, P. K., Shu, S., & Madsen, K. (2001). *Characteristics of victims of school bullying: Developmental changes in coping strategies and skills*. In J. Juvonen & S. Graham (Eds.), *Peer harassment in school: The plight of the vulnerable and victimized* (pp. 332–351). The Guilford Press.

- Solberg, M. E., & Olweus, D. (2003). Prevalence Estimation of School Bullying with the Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire. *Aggressive Behavior, 29*(3), 239-268.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.10047>
- Stuewig, J., Tangney, J. P., Heigel, C., Harty, L., & McCloskey, L. (2010). Shaming, Blaming, and Maiming: Functional Links Among the Moral Emotions, Externalization of Blame, and Aggression. *Journal of Research in Personality, 44*(1), 91-102.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2009.12.005>
- Suls, J., & Fletcher, B. (1985). The Relative Efficacy of Avoidant and Nonavoidant Coping Strategies: A Meta-Analysis. *Health Psychology, 4*(3), 249-288.
- Tamres, L. K., Janicki, D., & Helgeson, V. S. (2002). Sex Differences in Coping Behavior: A Meta-Analytic Review and an Examination of Relative Coping. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 6*(1), 2-30. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327957PSPR0601_1
- Tenenbaum, L. S., Varjas, K., Meyers, J., & Parris, L. (2011). Coping Strategies and Perceived Effectiveness in Fourth Through Eighth Grade Victims of Bullying. *School Psychology International, 32*(3), 263-287. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0143034311402309>
- Thomas, H. J., Connor, J. P., & Scott, J. G. (2015). Integrating Traditional Bullying and Cyberbullying: Challenges of Definition and Measurement in Adolescents - A Review. *Educational Psychology Review, 27*(1), 135-152. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-014-9261-7>
- Thompson, R. A. (1991). Emotional Regulation and Emotional Development. *Educational Psychology Review, 3*, 269-307. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01319934>
- Tsitsika, A. K., Barlou, E., Andrie, E., Dimitropoulou, C., Tzavela, E. C., Janikian, M., & Tsolia, M. (2014). Bullying Behaviors in Children and Adolescents: “An Ongoing Story”. *Frontiers in Public Health, 2*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2014.00007>

- Turton, S., & Campbell, C. (2007). Tend and Befriend Versus Fight or Flight: Gender Differences in Behavioral Response to Stress Among University Students. *Journal of Applied Biobehavioral Research, 10*(4), 209-232. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9861.2005.tb00013.x>
- Unnever, J. D. (2005). Bullies, Aggressive Victims, and Victims: Are They Distinct Groups? *Aggressive Behavior, 31*(2), 153-171. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.20083>
- van Dijk, A., Poorthuis, A. M. G., & Malti, T. (2017). Psychological Processes in Young Bullies Versus Bully-Victims. *Aggressive Behavior, 43*(5), 430-439. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21701>
- van Geel, M., Vedder, P., & Tanilon, J. (2014). Relationship Between Peer Victimization, Cyberbullying, and Suicide in Children and Adolescents: A Meta-Analysis. *JAMA Pediatrics, 168*(5), 435. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2013.4143>
- Volkaert, B., Wante, L., Van Beveren, M.-L., Vervoort, L., & Braet, C. (2020). Training Adaptive Emotion Regulation Skills in Early Adolescents: The Effects of Distraction, Acceptance, Cognitive Reappraisal, and Problem Solving. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 44*(3), 678-696. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10608-019-10073-4>
- Völlink, T., Bolman, C. A. W., Dehue, F., & Jacobs, N. C. L. (2013). Coping with Cyberbullying: Differences Between Victims, Bully-Victims and Children not Involved in Bullying. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 23*(1), 7-24. <https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.2142>
- Williams, K., & McGillicuddy-De Lisi, A. (1999). Coping Strategies in Adolescents. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 20*(4), 537-549. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0193-3973\(99\)00025-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0193-3973(99)00025-8)

- Yang, S. A., & Kim, D. H. (2017). Factors Associated with Bystander Behaviors of Korean Youth in School Bullying Situations: A Cross-Sectional Study. *Medicine*, *96*(32), e7757. <https://doi.org/10.1097/MD.00000000000007757>
- Yeager, D. S., Trzesniewski, K. H., & Dweck, C. S. (2013). An Implicit Theories of Personality Intervention Reduces Adolescent Aggression in Response to Victimization and Exclusion. *Child Development*, *84*(3), 970-988. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12003>
- Zimmer-Gembeck, M. J. (2016). Peer Rejection, Victimization, and Relational Self-System Processes in Adolescence: Toward a Transactional Model of Stress, Coping, and Developing Sensitivities. *Child Development Perspectives*, *10*(2), 122-127. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12174>
- Zimmer-Gembeck, M. J., & Skinner, E. A. (2011). Review: The Development of Coping Across Childhood and Adolescence: An Integrative Review and Critique of Research. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, *35*(1), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025410384923>
- Zimmer-Gembeck, M. J., & Skinner, E. A. (2015). Adolescent Vulnerability and the Distress of Rejection: Associations of Adjustment Problems and Gender with Control, Emotions, and Coping. *Journal of Adolescence*, *45*, 149-159. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2015.09.004>
- Zlomke, K. R., & Hahn, K. S. (2010). Cognitive Emotion Regulation Strategies: Gender Differences and Associations to Worry. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *48*(4), 408-413. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2009.11.007>
- Zsila, Á., Urbán, R., Griffiths, M. D., & Demetrovics, Z. (2019). Gender Differences in the Association Between Cyberbullying Victimization and Perpetration: The Role of Anger

Rumination and Traditional Bullying Experiences. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, 17(5), 1252-1267. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-018-9893-9>

Zych, I., Farrington, D. P., Llorent, V. J., & Ttofi, M. M. (2017). School Bullying in Different Countries: Prevalence, Risk Factors, and Short-Term Outcomes. In *Protecting Children Against Bullying and Its Consequences* (pp. 5-22). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-53028-4_2

Table 1

Male and Female Participants' Mean (Standard Deviation) Age, Bullying Scores and Coping Scores, and Summary of t-tests

Variables	Mean (SD)		<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>		
	Girls	Boys				
Age in years	12.52 (1.18)	12.45 (1.2)	1.147	<i>ns</i>		
Bullying	10.28 (3.32)	10.69 (3.83)	1.106	**		
	8.62 (1.15)	9.42 (2.64)	5.545	***		
CER strategies	Adaptative	Acceptance	11.57 (3.89)	11.13 (3.94)	1.814	<i>ns</i>
		Positive refocusing	10.92 (4.45)	11.43 (4.39)	1.877	<i>ns</i>
		Refocus on planning	11.74 (4.16)	12.05 (4.14)	1.570	<i>ns</i>
		Positive reappraisal	10.72 (4.05)	11.32 (4.04)	2.514	**
		Putting into perspective	11.67 (4.09)	11.72 (4.15)	.196	<i>ns</i>
		Adaptive coping (total)	56.62 (16.29)	57.66 (16.98)	1.314	<i>ns</i>

		9.80	9.20		
	Self-blame	(3.96)	(3.63)	2.004	*
		11.75	10.47		
	Rumination	(4.34)	(4.15)	4.618	***
		9.25	9.30		
	Catastrophizing	(4.04)	(3.95)	.41	<i>ns</i>
		8.16	8.93		
	Blaming others	(3.41)	(3.59)	3.563	***
		38.95	37.89		
	Maladaptive coping	(12.42)	(12.43)	1.252	<i>ns</i>
	(total)				
		21.72	20.43		
	Seeking social	(7.07)	(7.40)	2.580	**
	support				
		25.43	24.31		
	Problem-solving	(7.07)	(7.57)	2.285	*
		16.91	17.84		
	Distancing	(5.13)	(5.40)	2.02	*
		18.00	16.18		
	Internalizing	(5.57)	(5.77)	4.949	***
		8.38	8.83		
	Externalizing	(3.70)	(3.78)	1.884	<i>ns</i>

Note. CER: cognitive emotion regulation; *U*: Mann–Whitney *U* test; *ns*: nonsignificant. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 2

Correlations Between Bullying and Cognitive Emotion Regulation Strategies For Boys and Girls, Controlling for Age (Pearson Partial Correlations)

Variables		Victimization		Aggression		
		Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	
CER strategies	Acceptance	.10 ^t ns	.08 ns	.03 ns	.08 ns	
	Putting into perspective	.01 ns	.07 ns	.01 ns	.01 ns	
	Adaptative	Positive refocusing	-.03 ns	.08 ns	-.04 ns	.02 ns
		Refocus on planning	.02 ns	.17***	-.08 ns	.01 ns
		Positive reappraisal	.01 ns	.07 ns	-.03 ns	.03 ns
		Adaptive coping (total)	.02 ns	.11 ^t ns	-.03 ns	.03 ns
	Maladaptive	Self-blame	.25***	.21***	.03 ns	.14 ^t ns
		Rumination	.25***	.20***	.05 ns	.12 ^t ns
		Catastrophizing	.17***	.24***	.07 ns	.13 ^t ns
		Blaming others	.19***	.17***	.19***	.17***
Maladaptive coping (total)		.27***	.25***	.10 ns	.17***	
Coping strategies	Approach	Seeking social support	.01 ns	.17***	-.11 ^t ns	.04 ns
		Problem-solving	.01 ns	.09	-.10 ^t ns	.04 ns
	Avoidance	Distancing	.02 ns	.15 ^t ns	.03 ns	.09 ns
		Internalizing	.35***	.33***	.03 ns	.15 ^t ns
		Externalizing	.18***	.27***	.18***	.27***

Note. CER: cognitive emotion regulation; ns: nonsignificant. *** $p < .0011$ (Bonferroni-corrected). ^t not significant after Bonferroni correction.

Table 3

Means (Standard Deviation) for Coping and CER Strategies Among Girls According to Bullying Role (MANOVA and Post Hoc Comparisons)

Variables		Noninvolved		Pure victims		Bully-victims		Group comparisons		Bonferroni		
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F	p	Partial η ²	hoc comparisons	
CER strategies	Adaptative	Acceptance	11.44	3.93	11.98	3.71	13.00	2.92	1.314	ns	.005	--
		Positive refocusing	10.94	4.42	10.74	4.73	11.86	6.15	.266	ns	.001	--
		Refocus on planning	11.72	4.29	11.97	3.72	11.63	4.17	.152	ns	.001	--
		Positive reappraisal	10.75	4.11	10.53	3.70	11.63	3.93	.721	ns	.001	--

BULLYING ROLES AND COPING

	Putting into perspective	11.65	4.04	11.46	4.13	13.75	4.98	.310	<i>ns</i>	.005	--
	Adaptive coping	56.50	16.56	56.68	15.39	61.86	19.29	.422	<i>ns</i>	.002	--
	Self-blame	9.59	4.01	10.76	3.80	12.75	4.65	5.519	**	.022	PV & BV > NI
	Rumination	11.48	4.40	12.76	3.88	13.38	5.15	4.143	**	.017	PV > NI
Maladaptive	Catastrophizing	9.03	3.94	9.87	4.17	11.00	4.17	2.559	<i>ns</i>	.010	--
	Blaming others	7.92	3.29	8.55	3.48	11.38	4.66	5.281	**	.021	BV > NI & PV
	Maladaptive coping (total)	38.03	12.38	41.94	11.89	48.50	17.79	6.427	**	.026	PV & BV > NI
Coping strategies	Approach										
	Seeking social support	22.03	7.53	21.47	6.87	21.63	6.56	.234	<i>ns</i>	.001	--
	Problem-solving	25.65	7.03	25.30	7.41	22.86	7.22	.665	<i>ns</i>	.003	--

Avoidance	Distancing	16.94	5.17	16.99	4.87	18.25	4.77	.260	<i>ns</i>	.001	--
	Internalizing	17.41	5.43	20.36	5.61	20.63	7.85	12.470	***	.048	PV > NI
	Externalizing	8.06	3.66	8.86	3.67	10.00	3.70	3.180	*	.012	BV > PV > NI

Note. CER: cognitive emotion regulation; K-W: Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance; PV: pure victims; BV: bully-victims; NI:

noninvolved; *ns*: nonsignificant * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 4

Means (Standard Deviation) for Coping and CER Strategies Among Boys According to Bullying Roles (MANOVA and Post Hoc Comparisons)

Variables		Noninvolved		Pure victims		Bully-victims		Group comparisons			
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F	p	Partial η^2	Bonferroni hoc comparisons
CER strategies	Adaptative										
	Acceptance	11.02	3.90	11.02	4.08	11.59	4.11	.364	ns	.002	--
	Positive refocusing	11.29	4.27	11.39	4.32	12.15	5.00	.688	ns	.004	--
	Refocus on planning	11.81	4.25	12.46	3.88	12.77	3.93	1.444	ns	.007	--
	Positive reappraisal	11.27	4.05	11.19	3.88	11.56	4.55	.114	ns	.001	--
	Putting into perspective	11.50	4.16	12.15	4.05	11.92	4.10	.846	ns	.004	--

	Adaptive coping	56.87	17.17	58.22	16.23	60.00	17.21	.678	<i>ns</i>	.003	--
	Self-blame	8.81	3.48	9.41	4.05	10.08	3.67	3.905	*	.020	PV & BV > NI
	Rumination	10.09	4.15	10.76	4.07	12.03	4.19	4.073	**	.021	BV > NI
	Catastrophizing	8.80	3.77	10.13	4.13	11.03	3.77	8.115	***	.040	BV > PV > NI
	Blaming others	8.40	3.41	9.65	3.77	10.02	3.82	6.569	**	.033	BV > PV > NI
	Maladaptive coping	36.10	12.17	40.38	12.41	43.18	12.38	8.185	*	.041	PV & BV > NI
Coping strategies	Approach										
	Seeking social support	19.68	7.07	21.42	7.44	23.33	8.15	5.367	**	.027	BV > NI
	Problem-solving	24.02	7.47	24.45	7.84	26.03	8.56	1.190	<i>ns</i>	.006	--

	Distancing	17.04	5.22	17.54	5.77	19.77	5.14	4.471	*	.023	BV > NI & PV
Avoidance	Internalizing	15.11	5.19	17.90	6.40	19.10	6.51	14.047	***	.068	PV & BV > NI
	Externalizing	8.06	3.33	9.13	3.59	11.97	4.69	21.734	***	.101	BV > PV > NI

Note. CER: cognitive emotion regulation; -W: Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance; PV: pure victims; BV: bully-victims; NI: noninvolved; *ns*: nonsignificant. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Figure 1.

Transactional model of stress and coping

