

## Beyond the surface: Investigating bullying across social contexts through individual characteristics and perceived discrimination

Carmen M. LEON<sup>1</sup> & Eva AIZPURUA<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Castilla-La Mancha; <sup>2</sup>National Centre for Social Research

**Abstract:** In Spain, as in many other countries, there is growing recognition that bullying and cyberbullying are problematic behaviors among young people. Research indicates that victimization experiences are widespread within this population, and the perpetration of bullying behaviors is also notably high. Furthermore, certain groups, such as the LGBT community, individuals with disabilities, immigrants, and ethnic and religious minorities, are at an increased risk of experiencing bullying victimization. This study uses data from the 2021 Youth and Gender Barometer conducted by the Centro Reina Sofía ( $N = 1,201$ ; 50.6% women) to examine the prevalence of bullying victimization across various social contexts and types of relationships, including school bullying, cyberbullying, workplace bullying, and bullying perpetrated by friends. It also explores the perpetration of bullying among young people in Spain (aged 15–29 years). Additionally, the current study investigates the influence of individual characteristics and perceived discrimination on involvement in bullying. The results reveal that 50.1% of respondents reported experiencing at least one form of victimization, with school bullying being the most prevalent (42.4%). Moreover, it was found that perceived discrimination is associated with both bullying victimization and perpetration. These findings underscore the intricate relationship between discriminatory processes and bullying involvement, providing valuable insights for identifying groups that may be particularly vulnerable to bullying.

**Keywords:** bullying, discrimination, perpetration, online survey, victimization, young people.

## SUMMARY

1. INTRODUCTION .....	3
1.1. Defining bullying in the current research .....	5
1.2. The relationship between bullying victimization and perpetration .....	5
1.3. The relationship between individual characteristics and bullying involvement .....	6
2. CURRENT STUDY .....	7
3. METHOD .....	8
3.1. Participants and data collection .....	8
3.2. Measures .....	8
3.2.1. Outcome variables .....	8
3.2.2. Explanatory and control variables .....	9
3.3. Analytic strategy .....	9
4. RESULTS .....	10
4.1. Description of the sample .....	10
4.2. Prevalence of bullying victimization and perpetration .....	11
4.3. The relationship between bullying victimization and perpetration .....	12
4.4. The relationships between individual characteristics, perceived discrimination, and bullying involvement .....	12
5. DISCUSSION .....	17
6. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS .....	19
7. CONCLUSION .....	20
8. REFERENCES .....	21

9. SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL .....29

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Bullying and cyberbullying are serious global issues that adversely impact both victims and the broader community (Demmrich & Akgül, 2020; Islam et al., 2022). Previous research has demonstrated that victims of these behaviors experience higher levels of depression, suicidal ideation, and self-harm compared to non-victims (Barzilay et al., 2017; Heerde & Hemphill, 2018). Additionally, victims of bullying and cyberbullying are more likely to engage in aggressive behavior, substance use, and delinquency (Ttofi et al., 2016; Wolke & Lereya, 2015).

Despite being recognized as critical social issues for decades, bullying and cyberbullying remain prevalent, particularly among young people (García-Fernández et al., 2023; Hinduja & Patching, 2022; Zych & Llorent, 2023). In Spain, where the current study was conducted, the Spanish Constitution and the Convention on the Rights of the Child provide a foundational legal framework for protecting children from all forms of violence, including bullying. Furthermore, the Organic Law 3/2020, of December 29, on Education stresses the importance of ensuring a safe school environment, while the Ministry of Education has developed protocols for schools to prevent, detect, and address bullying (Cantera et al., 2019).

However, the Spanish Penal Code does not specifically recognize bullying as a distinct criminal offense. Sánchez (2023) argues that the creation of a separate criminal provision is unnecessary, as most perpetrators are under the legal age of 14. Nevertheless, recent research involving secondary school students revealed that approximately one in three adolescents (34.4%) had been involved in bullying in the past two months: 16.4% as victims, 5.9% as perpetrators, and 12.1% as bully-victims (Pichel et al., 2022). Bullying rates are notably higher among specific social groups, including the LGBT community, individuals with disabilities, and immigrants (Garaigordobil & Larrain, 2020; Llorent et al., 2016).

Empirical research has demonstrated significant associations between experiencing discrimination and bullying (Galán et al., 2021; Garnett et al., 2014; Hong et al., 2018), with much of the research focusing on racial and sexual orientation discrimination. However, emerging evidence underscores the relevance of other forms of discrimination in bullying victimization, including those based on physical appearance, disability, and religious beliefs (Christensen et al., 2012; Dupper et al., 2015; Farooqui & Kaushik, 2021; Puhl & Latner, 2007). Despite this, there is limited research exploring the association between these specific forms of discrimination and bullying.

The relationship between discrimination and bullying is complex and multifaceted. Individuals who face discrimination based on characteristics such as race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, disability, or religion are often more vulnerable to bullying. Discrimination creates an environment where these individuals are targeted more frequently (Dietrich & Ferguson, 2020; Sapouna et al., 2023). Additionally, the perception of discrimination can increase the risk of both being bullied and becoming a bully. This perception can lead to feelings of isolation, anger, and frustration, which may manifest in bullying behaviors (Galán et al., 2021). Bullying can also reinforce negative stereotypes and prejudices, further entrenching discriminatory attitudes within communities or social groups (Bradford & Hedberg, 2018; Burkholder et al., 2019). This creates a cyclical relationship where discrimination and bullying perpetuate one another.

Given the complex nature of bullying and discrimination, as well as the myriad factors influencing the likelihood of such behaviors, this study examines the prevalence of bullying victimization across various social contexts and types of relationships. It also investigates bullying perpetration among young people in Spain. Additionally, the study analyzes the relationships among different forms of bullying (*i.e.*, school bullying, cyberbullying, workplace bullying, and bullying perpetrated by friends) and explores the association between being a victim and a perpetrator. Furthermore, this research investigates the role of individual characteristics and self-perceived discrimination in bullying involvement. Understanding these relationships is crucial for developing effective interventions and support systems to protect vulnerable groups and reduce the prevalence of both bullying and discrimination.

## 1.1. Defining bullying in the current research

Despite extensive research efforts to understand the phenomenon of bullying, varying conceptual definitions have led to inconsistencies in how this form of violence is operationalized and measured (Beltrán-Catalán et al., 2018; Chang, 2021). The most widely accepted definition of bullying describes it as negative behaviors that persist over an extended period within relationships characterized by an imbalance of power (Olweus, 1993). According to this definition, three key components characterize bullying behaviors: 1) they are intentional and aim to cause harm; 2) they are repeated over time; and 3) they reflect an imbalance of power between the victim and the perpetrator(s).

Although the study of bullying initially focused on peer-to-peer interactions among schoolchildren, some researchers argue that the concept can also be extended to encompass aggressive behaviors with similar characteristics, antecedents, and consequences in other social contexts (*e.g.*, the workplace) and within various types of relationships (*e.g.*, friends, co-workers) (Monks & Coyne, 2011). Bolea (2017) further emphasizes that while different forms of harassment may appear phenomenologically distinct, they represent a unified issue from a legal perspective: the violation of moral integrity.

Aligning with the argument for broadening the scope of bullying, the current study adopts the definition proposed by Monks and Coyne (2011) to explore the prevalence of bullying victimization across different social contexts and types of relationships. According to these authors, bullying refers to a series of aggressive behaviors that can occur in diverse social contexts –such as schools and workplaces– and within relationships involving peers, co-workers, and friends.

## 1.2. The relationship between bullying victimization and perpetration

An area of particular interest in the bullying literature is the extent to which individuals can simultaneously play dual roles as both victims and perpetrators. Olweus (1993) was the first to identify a proportion of victims, referred to as “bully-victims”, who not only experience bullying but also engage in bullying others. Since then, numerous studies have documented the bidirectional relationship between bullying victimization and

perpetration (Lozano-Blasco et al., 2020; Walters, 2020, 2021).

In addition to the relationship between bullying victimization and perpetration, there is evidence of a positive correlation between traditional bullying and cyberbullying victimization (Caravaca et al., 2016; Messias et al., 2014). Similar patterns are observed across other forms of bullying. For example, Scheithauer and colleagues (2006) found that victims often experienced multiple types of bullying, including physical, relational, and verbal forms. While 67% of victims reported experiencing a single form of victimization, 22% reported two forms, and 11% reported three forms of victimization.

However, research exploring the relationships among various forms of bullying across different social contexts and types of relationships, beyond the well-established connection between traditional bullying and cyberbullying, remains limited. The current study addresses this gap by investigating the interconnections among school bullying, cyberbullying, workplace bullying, and bullying perpetrated by friends.

### **1.3. The relationship between individual characteristics and bullying involvement**

Bullying research has increasingly focused on discriminatory harassment, which involves harmful actions directed at members of socially subordinated groups (*e.g.*, immigrants, LGBT individuals, those who are obese). In fact, bullying and discrimination often resemble one another (Rodríguez-Hidalgo et al., 2019). For instance, a study involving 1,748 adolescents in Spain found that the prevalence of victims and cyber-victims was higher among non-heterosexual individuals (Garaigordobil & Larrain, 2020). However, the study reported no differences in the prevalence of aggressors or cyber-aggressors between heterosexual and non-heterosexual groups. Similarly, research conducted by Christensen et al. (2012) in the US indicated that adolescents with intellectual disabilities are at increased risk of being bullied than their peers without disabilities. Research also reveals rising episodes of anti-Muslim religious bullying (Dupper et al., 2015; Farooqui & Kaushik, 2021).

Certain individual characteristics can act as risk factors for bullying involvement. Gender has received great attention, with studies indicating that men are overrepresented among

bullies and bully-victims, whereas gender differences are less pronounced among victims (Cosma et al., 2022). Age has also been a focus of research, with findings showing that the prevalence of cyberbullying increases from childhood to mid-adolescence and decreases thereafter (Zych & Farrington, 2021).

The relationship between racial or ethnic background and bullying involvement remains mixed. A systematic review of seven studies focusing on minorities and cyberbullying found varying results: some studies reported higher involvement among minorities (whether as bullies, victims, or bully-victims), others among majorities, and still others found no differences between groups (Hamm et al., 2015). Regarding victimization, a study conducted with adolescents in Spain revealed that individuals from the majority group experienced less peer bullying compared to those from ethnic/cultural minority groups (Rodríguez-Hidalgo et al., 2014).

Despite previous research analyzing the effects of individual characteristics on bullying involvement, the impact of self-reported discrimination based on personal characteristics has been less frequently explored. It is posited that respondents' perceptions of discrimination may provide a more accurate reflection of individuals' experiences than assumptions of discrimination based solely on group membership, offering a more nuanced understanding of the diversity of experiences within groups. Therefore, the current study examines respondents' perceptions of discrimination based on personal characteristics to determine the extent to which these perceptions are associated with bullying involvement.

## 2. CURRENT STUDY

Given the limited research analyzing the co-occurrence of bullying victimization across different social contexts and types of relationships, as well as the scarcity of studies investigating the role of individual characteristics and perceived discrimination in bullying involvement, this study addresses the following research questions:

- 1) What is the prevalence of bullying victimization and bullying perpetration among young people in Spain?
- 2) What is the relationship between bullying victimization and perpetration?



- 3) How are different forms of bullying victimization, based on various social contexts and types of relationships, related to each other?
- 4) Is perceived discrimination associated with bullying involvement?

### 3. METHOD

#### 3.1. Participants and data collection

This study uses data from the third wave of the Spanish Barometer of Youth and Gender, conducted by the Centro Reina Sofía in 2021. This wave of the survey collects information on gender stereotypes; relationships, inequalities, and discrimination; and experiences of harassment, gender-based violence, and intimate partner violence among individuals aged 15–29 living in Spain.

The sample comprised 1,201 respondents (50.6% women;  $M = 22.4$  years old), with a participation rate of 36.6%. The scope of the survey was national, and participants were drawn from the CINT panel<sup>1</sup> using proportional allocation based on age and education level quotas. Data was collected through a self-administered online questionnaire, available in Spanish, which took approximately 20–25 minutes to complete. The data collection took place in April and May of 2021. Both the microdata file and the questionnaire are publicly available on the Centro Reina Sofía website.<sup>2</sup>

#### 3.2. Measures

##### 3.2.1. Outcome variables

*Bullying victimization.* Respondents were asked if they had ever experienced or were currently experiencing any of the following victimization experiences (“Have you ever suffered or do you suffer bullying...?”): a) in school; b) online; c) at work; and d) perpetrated by friends. These items were measured using yes/no questions, with an additional response option of “Don’t know/Prefer not to respond”.

*Bullying perpetration.* Following the victimization items, respondents were asked about perpetration with the question: “Have you ever exercised any kind of bullying?”. This



item was answered using a yes/no scale and included the option “Don’t know/Prefer not to respond”.

### 3.2.2. Explanatory and control variables

*Perceived discrimination.* To examine the association between perceived discrimination and bullying involvement among young people, respondents were asked: “A person (or group of people) is said to be discriminated against when they are treated less favorably than another due to their personal characteristics. Have you ever felt discriminated against for any of the following reasons in your daily life?”. Respondents could identify experiences of discrimination based on a wide array of characteristics, including gender identity, racial or ethnic background, physical appearance, and disability. The response categories “I have never felt discriminated against” and “Don’t know/Prefer not to respond” were also offered and were exclusive. For other categories, respondents could select as many options as applied.

Sociodemographic variables included *gender*; *age* (in ranges); *nationality* (Spanish, non-Spanish), and *self-reported social class* (low, middle, upper class). *Comfort of living*, an additional social class indicator, was measured using a scale of eight dichotomous questions asking whether respondents have been able to afford various items, such as going on holidays for one week a year ( $KR20 = .73$ ).<sup>3</sup> *Political orientation* was measured using an 11-point left-right scale, and *sexual orientation* distinguished between individuals who identified as heterosexual or non-heterosexual.

### 3.3. Analytic strategy

Statistical analyses were conducted using Stata 16. First, we examined the distribution of all study variables. To explore the relationships among bullying victimization across various social contexts and types of relationships, we used tetrachoric correlations due to the dichotomous nature of these variables. These correlations were also used to analyze the relationship between bullying victimization and perpetration. Finally, we estimated a series of logistic regression models to analyze potential associations between individual characteristics, self-perceived discrimination, and bullying involvement. Variance

Inflation Factors (VIF) fell within appropriate limits, suggesting no multicollinearity problems ( $1.01 \leq VIF \leq 1.53$ ).

Because some variables had missing data, multiple imputation procedures were applied. *Political orientation* (13.1%) and *bullying perpetrated by friends* (6.4%) exhibited the highest proportion of missing data, while all other variables had less than 5% missing observations (for further details, refer to the Supplemental Material). Multiple imputation was used to create and analyze 20 multiply imputed datasets, with incomplete variables imputed under fully conditional specification.

## 4. RESULTS

### 4.1. Description of the sample

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics for all study variables. Most of the sample were of Spanish nationality (86.7%), and approximately half of the respondents identified as middle class (55.0%). In terms of political orientation, respondents leaned toward the center ( $M = 4.76$ , on a scale from 0 to 10). About eight in 10 respondents identified as heterosexual (80.1%).

Regarding perceived discrimination, 38.3% of respondents reported experiencing discrimination based on physical appearance, followed by 31.3% indicating discrimination for being young, and 18.3% citing gender identity discrimination.

**Table 1**

*Descriptive Statistics for All Study Variables*

Variable	% (n)	M (SD)
<b>Outcome variables</b>		
<i>Bullying victimization*</i>		
At school	42.4% (486)	
Online	20.1% (230)	
At work	10.9% (124)	
Perpetrated by friends	19.8% (222)	

Variable	% (n)	M (SD)
<b>Bullying perpetration</b>	10.3% (118)	
<b>Explanatory and control variables</b>		
<b>Gender</b>		
Men	49.4% (591)	
Women	50.6% (605)	
<b>Age</b>		22.4 (3.9)
15–19 years old	32.0% (384)	
20–24 years old	32.0% (384)	
25–29 years old	36.1% (433)	
<b>Nationality</b>		
Spanish	86.7% (1,040)	
Non-Spanish	13.3% (159)	
<b>Self-reported social class</b>		
Low class	25.4% (298)	
Middle class	55.0% (645)	
Upper class	19.6% (230)	
<b>Comfort of living</b> (range 0–8) ( <i>KR20</i> = .73)		5.69 (2.05)
<b>Political orientation</b> (0 Left – 10 Right)		4.76 (2.32)
<b>Sexual orientation</b>		
Heterosexual	80.1% (937)	
Non-heterosexual	19.9% (233)	
<b>Perceived discrimination*</b>		
Sex or gender identity	18.3% (220)	
Racial or ethnic background	9.0% (108)	
Physical appearance	38.3% (460)	
Nationality	10.6% (127)	
Political beliefs	17.9% (215)	
Disability	2.8% (34)	
Religious beliefs	10.7% (129)	
Being young	31.3% (376)	
Sexual orientation	10.8% (130)	

Note: M = Mean; SD = Standard Deviation.

\*Percentages do not sum up to 100% because respondents could select multiple options.

## 4.2. Prevalence of bullying victimization and perpetration

Nearly half of the respondents (49.9%) reported not having experienced any of the forms of bullying under study. Slightly over one in four (22.7%) indicated experiencing a single form of victimization, while 27.4% reported experiencing bullying across multiple contexts and types of relationships. The most prevalent form of bullying was school

bullying (42.4%), followed by cyberbullying (20.1%), bullying perpetrated by friends (19.8%), and workplace bullying (10.9%). Additionally, approximately one in ten respondents (10.3%) admitted to having perpetrated bullying.

### 4.3. The relationship between bullying victimization and perpetration

A substantial proportion (82.2%) of respondents who admitted to perpetrating bullying also reported being victims themselves. Nearly half of the sample (48.7%) experienced victimization without engaging in perpetration, while 17.8% indicated engaging in bullying behaviors without having been victimized.

Table 2 displays tetrachoric correlations among all forms of bullying victimization and the indicator of bullying perpetration. All correlations were positive and ranged from moderate to strong in magnitude. The strongest correlation was observed between school bullying and bullying perpetrated by friends ( $r_{tet} = .60$ ), followed by school bullying and cyberbullying ( $r_{tet} = .55$ ). In terms of perpetration, the strongest relationship was with bullying perpetrated by friends ( $r_{tet} = .53$ ).

**Table 2**

*Tetrachoric Correlations Among Bullying Variables*

	1	2	3	4	5
1. School bullying	1				
2. Cyberbullying (n = 1,146)	.540***	1			
3. Workplace bullying (n = 1,128)	.449***	.358***	1		
4. Bullying by friends (n = 1,116)	.583***	.530***	.497***	1	
5. Perpetration (n = 1,111)	.404***	.203*	.369***	.549***	1

Note: \* $p \leq .05$ , \*\*\* $p \leq .001$

### 4.4. The relationships between individual characteristics, perceived discrimination, and bullying involvement

The findings from the regression models examining the correlates of bullying victimization are presented in Table 3. The only variable consistently significant across

models was self-reported social class, with individuals identifying as upper class having higher odds of reporting bullying victimization compared to those identifying as middle class. However, the results of our additional social class indicator revealed that respondents with more comfortable living conditions were less likely to be bullied (except in the context of cyberbullying).

Regarding age, individuals aged 15–24 were less likely to report experiencing bullying at work compared to those in the oldest group (aged 25–29). Conversely, respondents in the youngest group (15–19 years old) were more likely to report bullying perpetrated by friends relative to the oldest group (25–29 years old) ( $OR = 1.69, p = .006$ ). Sexual orientation emerged as a significant factor only in the context of school bullying, with heterosexual individuals being at lower risk of victimization ( $OR = 0.62, p = .012$ ). Nationality was also significant in the workplace bullying model, with individuals of Spanish nationality having lower odds of experiencing bullying at work compared to non-Spanish nationals ( $OR = 0.49, p = .011$ ).

In terms of perceived discrimination, reports of race/ethnicity discrimination were related to experiencing workplace bullying ( $OR = 1.96, p = .034$ ) and bullying perpetrated by friends ( $OR = 1.72, p = .041$ ). Similarly, respondents reporting discrimination based on physical appearance were at higher risk of school bullying ( $OR = 2.85, p \leq .001$ ), cyberbullying ( $OR = 1.58, p = .004$ ), and bullying perpetrated by friends ( $OR = 1.46, p = .023$ ). Discrimination due to nationality was also associated with increased odds of reporting bullying perpetrated by friends ( $OR = 1.93, p = .009$ ). Political discrimination emerged as a factor related to cyberbullying ( $OR = 1.97, p \leq .001$ ) and bullying perpetrated by friends ( $OR = 1.56, p = .025$ ), while discrimination based on disability status was associated with an increased likelihood of workplace bullying ( $OR = 2.86, p = .024$ ). Finally, discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation was significant in the model examining school bullying, with individuals who reported such discrimination being at increased risk of victimization ( $OR = 1.94, p = .008$ ).

Table 4 presents the results from the regression models examining the correlates of bullying perpetration and combined perpetration and victimization (bully-victims). In the model dedicated to bullying perpetration, none of the variables were significant.

Regarding the bully-victim model, only self-reported social class and experiencing discrimination for being young were significant. Consistent with the victimization models, respondents identifying as upper class were more likely to engage in both bullying victimization and perpetration compared to those identifying as middle class ( $OR = 1.97, p = .011$ ). Additionally, individuals reporting discrimination based on their youth had greater odds of being bully-victims ( $OR = 1.61, p = .042$ ).

**Table 3**

*Correlates of Bullying Victimization (Logistic Regression Models)*

Variable	School bullying		Cyberbullying		Workplace bullying		Bullying by friends	
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
<b>Gender</b> (Women)	0.90	[0.69 – 1.18]	1.35	[0.98 – 1.87]	1.03	[0.67 – 1.57]	1.33	[0.95 – 1.85]
<b>Age</b> (ref. 25–29 years old)								
15–19 years old	0.87	[0.64 – 1.18]	0.86	[0.59 – 1.24]	0.38***	[0.23 – 0.63]	1.69**	[1.16 – 2.46]
20–24 years old	0.94	[0.69 – 1.27]	0.96	[0.67 – 1.38]	0.47**	[0.29 – 0.75]	1.25	[0.85 – 1.85]
<b>Sexual orientation</b> (Heterosexual)	0.62*	[0.43 – 0.90]	0.68	[0.45 – 1.04]	0.97	[0.54 – 1.74]	0.70	[0.45 – 1.08]
<b>Nationality</b> (Spanish)	0.87	[0.57 – 1.32]	0.99	[0.59 – 1.66]	0.49*	[0.28 – 0.84]	1.09	[0.66 – 1.81]
<b>Social class</b> (ref. Middle class)								
Upper class	1.59**	[1.13 – 2.23]	1.82**	[1.24 – 2.68]	2.33***	[1.43 – 3.82]	1.91**	[1.28 – 2.84]
Low class	1.02	[0.74 – 1.40]	0.95	[0.64 – 1.41]	1.04	[0.63 – 1.72]	1.12	[0.75 – 1.65]
<b>Comfort of living</b> (range 0–8) ( <i>KR20</i> = .73)	0.91**	[0.85 – 0.98]	0.99	[0.92 – 1.08]	0.87**	[0.78 – 0.96]	0.91*	[0.84 – 0.98]
<b>Political orientation</b> (0 Left – 10 Right)	0.99	[0.93 – 1.06]	0.93	[0.86 – 1.00]	0.95	[0.87 – 1.05]	0.96	[0.89 – 1.03]
<b>Perceived discrimination</b>								
Gender discrimination	1.03	[0.72 – 1.47]	0.83	[0.55 – 1.26]	1.59	[0.95 – 2.65]	0.76	[0.49 – 1.17]
Racial discrimination	1.12	[0.69 – 1.81]	0.91	[0.51 – 1.62]	1.96*	[1.05 – 3.64]	1.72*	[1.02 – 2.88]
Appearance discrimination	2.85***	[2.19 – 3.70]	1.58**	[1.16 – 2.17]	0.88	[0.58 – 1.34]	1.46*	[1.05 – 2.01]
Nationality discrimination	1.12	[0.71 – 1.76]	0.98	[0.57 – 1.68]	1.35	[0.74 – 2.45]	1.93**	[1.18 – 3.17]
Political discrimination	1.33	[0.94 – 1.86]	1.97***	[1.36 – 2.86]	0.79	[0.46 – 1.37]	1.56*	[1.06 – 2.30]
Disability discrimination	1.50	[0.69 – 3.27]	1.37	[0.59 – 3.18]	2.86*	[1.15 – 7.14]	1.08	[0.43 – 2.69]
Religious discrimination	1.10	[0.72 – 1.68]	0.92	[0.55 – 1.52]	0.50	[0.24 – 1.04]	1.39	[0.87 – 2.23]
Discrimination for being young	0.94	[0.71 – 1.25]	0.98	[0.70 – 1.37]	1.51	[0.99 – 2.31]	1.22	[0.87 – 1.70]
Sexual orientation discrimination	1.94**	[1.19 – 3.16]	1.65	[0.98 – 1.78]	1.16	[0.57 – 2.35]	1.08	[0.62 – 1.85]
<b>F</b>	6.41		3.63		3.61		3.83	
<b>N</b>	1,146		1,147		1,135		1,124	

*Note:* The outcome variables were used in the imputation model, but not imputed themselves.

OR = Odds Ratio; CI = Confidence Interval

\* $p \leq .05$ , \*\* $p \leq .01$ , \*\*\* $p \leq .001$



**Table 4**

*Correlates of Bullying Perpetration and Bullying Victimization and Perpetration (Logistic Regression Models)*

Variable	Bullying perpetration		Bullying victimization and perpetration	
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
<b>Gender</b> (Women)	0.79	[0.52 – 1.20]	0.84	[0.53 – 1.33]
<b>Age</b> (ref. 25–29 years old)				
15–19 years old	1.16	[0.73 – 1.85]	1.34	[0.80 – 2.25]
20–24 years old	1.01	[0.62 – 1.64]	1.17	[0.68 – 1.99]
<b>Sexual orientation</b> (Heterosexual)	1.12	[0.62 – 2.02]	1.13	[0.59 – 2.17]
<b>Nationality</b> (Spanish)	0.82	[0.43 – 1.56]	0.74	[0.37 – 1.48]
<b>Social class</b> (ref. Middle class)				
Upper class	1.41	[0.87 – 2.28]	1.97*	[1.17 – 3.31]
Low class	0.81	[0.49 – 1.35]	0.97	[0.56 – 1.69]
<b>Comfort of living</b> (range 0–8) ( $KR20 = .73$ )	0.95	[0.86 – 1.04]	0.93	[0.83 – 1.03]
<b>Political orientation</b> (0 Left – 10 Right)	1.06	[0.97 – 1.17]	1.03	[0.93 – 1.14]
<b>Perceived discrimination</b>				
Gender discrimination	1.04	[0.60 – 1.79]	1.11	[0.62 – 1.99]
Racial discrimination	1.07	[0.53 – 2.14]	1.23	[0.59 – 2.55]
Appearance discrimination	1.20	[0.80 – 1.80]	1.20	[0.76 – 1.88]
Nationality discrimination	0.56	[0.26 – 1.18]	0.50	[0.22 – 1.15]
Political discrimination	1.29	[0.78 – 2.12]	1.42	[0.83 – 2.42]
Disability discrimination	2.26	[0.92 – 5.59]	2.25	[0.85 – 5.92]
Religious discrimination	1.25	[0.69 – 2.26]	1.20	[0.63 – 2.29]
Discrimination for being young	1.47	[0.97 – 2.25]	1.61*	[1.02 – 2.54]
Sexual orientation discrimination	1.41	[0.70 – 2.84]	1.44	[0.67 – 3.07]
<b>F</b>	1.20		1.42	
<b>N</b>	1,148		1,133	

*Note:* The outcome variables were used in the imputation model, but not imputed themselves.

OR = Odds Ratio; CI = Confidence Interval

\* $p \leq .05$

## 5. DISCUSSION

The aim of this study was to examine bullying victimization across various social contexts and types of relationships, as well as to explore the perpetration of bullying and the interrelationship among them, using publicly available data from young individuals in Spain. We also explored the associations between individual characteristics and self-perceived discrimination in relation to bullying involvement. This study contributes valuable insights to inform targeted interventions that promote safer and more inclusive environments for young people and other vulnerable groups. To our knowledge, this is one of the first studies to analyze the relationship between bullying occurring in different social contexts and types of relationships, and self-reported discrimination.

Approximately half of the respondents (50.1%) in our sample reported experiencing bullying at some point in their lifetime, underscoring that bullying victimization is a pervasive issue among young people in Spain (RQ<sub>1</sub>). School bullying was the most prevalent form of victimization (42.4%), followed by cyberbullying (20.1%). These findings largely align with previous studies conducted in Spain (Romera et al., 2017; Zych et al., 2016). However, it is important to note that our study used a lifetime timeframe, as opposed to a more specific one (*e.g.*, the past 12 months). Additionally, while previous studies in Spain focused on specific forms of bullying victimization, in the current study we used a general question, which might have affected the endorsement of bullying victimization. Consistent with the literature (Cosma et al., 2020; Jadambaa et al., 2019), our results suggest that cyberbullying is less prevalent than traditional forms of bullying.

Notably, slightly over one in four respondents (27.4%) reported experiencing bullying across multiple social contexts and types of relationships. As Finkelhor et al. (2005) noted, multiple victimization is a common phenomenon, with various forms of bullying victimization often being interconnected. Youth subjected to bullying in one context are more vulnerable to experiencing bullying in other contexts. Our findings, supported by positive correlations among all forms of bullying victimization (RQ<sub>2</sub>), reinforce this interconnectedness. These results are consistent with previous studies (Aizpurua et al., 2021; Lozano-Blasco et al., 2020) and highlight the need for a more nuanced understanding of the personal and environmental factors predisposing individuals to bullying victimization. They also call for the development of longitudinal studies that track diverse forms of victimization across social contexts and relationships, as well as a

variety of risk factors over time. Moreover, these findings underscore the limitations of studies focused solely on bullying within a single context (*e.g.*, school bullying), as it risks overlooking the broader spectrum of victimization.

Our results suggest that bullying victimization varies by age but not by gender, which is consistent with previous research conducted in Spain (Zych & Farrington, 2021). Among both men and women, workplace bullying was more prevalent in the oldest age group (25–29 years old), likely reflecting their increased work experience. Conversely, bullying perpetrated by friends was higher in the youngest age group. This could be attributed to the overlap between friend-perpetrated bullying and school bullying, especially during the school years, when friendships are predominantly formed within educational settings (Berger et al., 2019). The fact that both men and women reported higher rates of bullying victimization between the ages of 20 and 29, compared to the youngest group (15–19 years old), deviates from the literature and might be explained by the recall period used in the survey. Unlike studies using a fixed reference period, which is comparable across respondents, this survey used a lifetime recall approach, giving older respondents a longer timeframe to experience bullying.

In terms of bullying perpetration, no gender-based differences were identified, which contrasts with the existing literature (Cook et al., 2010; Lund & Ross, 2016; Tokunaga, 2010). This discrepancy may stem from the operationalization of bullying perpetration in this study, which did not differentiate between forms of bullying (*i.e.*, physical, verbal, and relational). Our results also show that younger individuals were more likely to recognize engaging in bullying behaviors than their older counterparts (although the confidence intervals overlapped). This aligns with previous research (Lebrun-Harris et al., 2019) and may be partially attributed to younger adolescents displaying less socially desirable behaviors and experiencing less pronounced recall effects than older youth (Vigil-Colet et al., 2013).

Consistent with previous research (Caravaca et al., 2016; Messias et al., 2014), we found notable overlap between bullying victimization and perpetration (RQ<sub>3</sub>). Walters and Espelage (2018) hypothesized that victimization can lead to a cognitive-affective state of hostility, increasing the likelihood that victims engage in bullying behaviors towards others. They also highlighted the role of learning effects, where victims learn to bully as a response to being bullied themselves. While this dynamic is well-documented, our results contribute to the literature by showing that bullying perpetration is correlated with

all the social contexts of bullying examined in this research.

Regarding the last research question (RQ<sub>4</sub>), our findings suggest that perceived discrimination is associated with bullying victimization. This aligns with previous research indicating that being perceived as different is one of the most common reasons victims are targeted (Fluck, 2017). Supporting this, research has shown that characteristics such as differing appearance, national origins, skin color, religious affiliation, or social status are often used by youth to engage in discriminatory bullying behaviors (Rodríguez-Hidalgo et al., 2019). Conversely, our study did not identify individual characteristics as significant predictors of bullying perpetration. This contrasts with existing studies that have linked certain sociodemographic factors and sexual orientation to bullying behaviors (for further information, see Álvarez-García et al., 2015).

## 6. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Despite its contributions, this study has several limitations that should be acknowledged. First, the sample was non-probabilistic and might be subject to selection bias. Additionally, survey weights were not available, limiting our ability to adjust for non-response biases. The reliance on secondary data also meant that certain variables identified as relevant in the literature (*e.g.*, internalizing problems, behavior, or conduct problems) could not be included in our models.

Another limitation is the lack of explicit definitions for the various forms of bullying victimization and perpetration presented to respondents. Using the term “bullying” without providing clear definitions or examples of such behaviors could result in an underestimation of bullying involvement (Daigle et al., 2016; Vigil-Colet et al., 2013). The lack of explicit definitions might have affected how respondents interpreted incidents as bullying, potentially influencing reported prevalence rates and introducing variability linked to personal characteristics and experiences. Future studies should incorporate precise definitions to ensure respondents do not interpret the term “bullying” subjectively, leading to more accurate and comparable estimates.

Additionally, this study did not assess the frequency or severity of bullying behaviors, nor did it account for the power dynamics between bullies and victims. This is particularly relevant as cultural factors, such as individualism-collectivism or hierarchy, can influence the motivations and dynamics of bullying (Smith & Monks, 2008). Future research should

adopt more contextual approaches to better understand bullying across different cultural settings. Furthermore, the use of lifetime prevalence measures might have increased measurement error and reduced the comparability of the findings across age groups. To mitigate this, future research should use a consistent timeframe for measuring prevalence (*e.g.*, the past 12 months), particularly in studies involving the general population and heterogeneous age groups.

The composition of the sample, which included both school children and young working adults, presents another limitation. These two groups experience distinct environments and exhibit different behavioral patterns. Future research should focus on one of these groups or include a comparison between them, examining how their environments (school *versus* workplace), behaviors, routines, social interactions, and use of leisure time might influence differences in bullying behaviors.

Our findings underscore the interconnected nature of bullying across various social contexts and types of relationships. Individuals subjected to bullying in one context are at increased risk of victimization in other contexts and relationships. Therefore, future research should undertake a more comprehensive and systematic examination of the various social contexts of bullying and their interrelationships. This could include identifying groups of individuals through latent class or cluster analysis based on their victimization and perpetration behaviors.

Finally, we recommend that future studies explore the feasibility and effectiveness of interventions designed to reduce marginalization based on personal attributes, to create safer and more inclusive environments.

## 7. CONCLUSION

Bullying is a global health issue that requires comprehensive social and educational interventions for its prevention. Echoing Craig et al. (2009), understanding this phenomenon begins with obtaining precise estimates. In this study, we have provided up-to-date data on both victimization and perpetration, highlighting the widespread prevalence of bullying victimization among youth in Spain. Our findings indicate that bullying across various social contexts and types of relationships is interconnected, suggesting that victims are more likely to encounter negative experiences across multiple social environments.

Additionally, our research underscores that certain groups are at increased risk of bullying, emphasizing the critical need for targeted initiatives to eradicate discrimination. Despite growing evidence linking bullying to discrimination, there remains a gap in national discussions and research on the connections between bullying and discrimination among young people. Although robust measures, such as Law 15/2022 of July 12 (the Comprehensive Law for Equal Treatment and Non-Discrimination), have been established, ongoing efforts are needed to ensure that anti-bullying policies are implemented, and that staff are adequately trained to manage incidents of bullying and discrimination.

National surveys, such as the one used in this study, should incorporate measures of discrimination that capture the complexity illustrated here, considering individual attributes and their intersection with bullying experiences. As Garnett et al. (2014) pointed out, further research is needed to understand the combined effects of bullying and discrimination, and to reflect the intersections of social identities, aligning more closely with the lived experiences of youth. Finally, it is crucial that national-level surveys use precise definitions of bullying to reduce ambiguity and ensure more accurate and comparable estimates across different groups.

## 8. REFERENCES

- Aizpurua, E., Caravaca-Sánchez, F., & Stephenson, A. (2021). Victimization status of female and male college students in Spain: Prevalence and relation to mental distress. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *36*(11-12), 4988–5010. doi: 10.1177/0886260518802848
- Álvarez-García, A., García, T., & Núñez, J. C. (2015). Predictors of school bullying perpetration in adolescence: A systematic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *23*, 126–136. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2015.05.007
- Barzilay, S., Brunstein, A., Apter, A., Carli, V., Wasserman, C., Hadlaczky, G. et al. (2017). Bullying victimization and suicide ideation and behavior among adolescents in Europe: A 10-country study. *Journal of Adolescence Health*, *61*(2), 179–186. doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth .2017.02.002
- Beltrán-Catalán, M., Zych, I., Ortega-Ruiz, R., & Llorent, V. J. (2018). Victimization through bullying and cyberbullying: Emotional intelligence, severity of

- victimisation and technology use in different types of victims. *Psicothema*, 30, 183–188. doi: 10.7334/psicothema2017.313
- Berger, C., Gremmen, M. C., Palacios, D., & Franco, E. (2019). Would you be my friend?": Friendship selection and contagion processes of early adolescents who experience victimization. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 39(9), 1286–1310. doi: 10.1177/0272431618824753
- Bolea, C. (2017). Posiciones de garante frente al acoso escolar. ¿Responden penalmente los padres y docentes que no impiden el acoso? *InDret, Revista de Análisis para el Derecho*, (4). <https://indret.com/posiciones-de-garante-frente-al-acoso-escolar/>
- Bradford, C., & Hedberg, L. (2018). Bullies, the bullied and bullying narratives in contemporary fiction. In M. Flegel & C. Parkes (Eds), *Cruel children in popular texts and cultures. critical approaches to children's literature* (pp. 105–125). Palgrave Macmillan. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-72275-7\_6
- Burkholder, A. R., D'Esterre, A. P., & Killen, M. (2019). Intergroup relationships, context, and prejudice in childhood. In H. E. Fitzgerald, D. J. Johnson, D. B. Qin, F. A. Villarruel & J. Norder (Eds), *Handbook of children and prejudice* (pp. 115–130). Springer. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-12228-7\_6
- Cantera, L. M., Vázquez, M., & Pérez, A. (2019). Bullying situation in Spain: Laws, prevention and care. *Revista OLHARES*, 9(1), 5–20. doi: 10.34024/olhares.2021.v9.10622
- Caravaca, F., Falcón, M., Navarro-Zaragoza, J., Ruiz-Cabello, A. L., Rodrigues, O., & Luna, A. (2016). Prevalence and patterns of traditional bullying victimization and cyber-teasing among the college population in Spain. *BMC Public Health*, 16, 2–10. doi: 10.1186/s12889-016-2857-8
- Chang, V. (2021). Inconsistent definitions of bullying: A need to examine people's judgements and reasoning about bullying and cyberbullying. *Human Development*, 65, 144–159. doi: 10.1159/000516838
- Christensen, L. L., Fraynt, R. J., Neece, C. L., & Baker, B. L. (2012). Bullying adolescents with intellectual disability. *Journal of Mental Health Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, 5(1), 49–65. doi: 10.1080/19315864.2011.637660



- Cook, C. R., Williams, K. R., Guerra, N. G., Kim, T. E., & Sadek, S. (2010). Predictors of bullying and victimization in childhood and adolescence: A meta-analytic investigation. *School Psychology Quarterly, 25*(2), 65–83. doi: 10.1037/a0020149
- Cosma, A., Bjereld, Y., Elgar, F. J., Richardson, C., Bilz, L., Craig, W., Augustine, L., Molcho, M., Malinowska-Cieślik, M., Walsh, S. D. (2022). Gender differences in bullying reflect societal gender inequality: A multilevel study with adolescents in 46 countries. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 71*(5), 601–608. doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2022.05.015
- Cosma, A., Walsh, S.D., Chester, K.L., Callaghan, M., Molcho, M., Craig, W., & Pickett, W. (2020). Bullying victimization: Time trends and the overlap between traditional and cyberbullying across countries in Europe and North America. *International Journal of Public Health, 65*, 75–85. doi: 10.1007/s00038-019-01320-2
- Craig, W., Harel-Fisch, Y., Fogel-Grinvald, H., Dostaler, S., Hetland, J., Simons- Morton, B., et al. (2009). A cross-national profile of bullying and victimization among adolescents in 40 countries. *International Journal of Public Health, 54*, 216–224. doi: 10.1007/s00038-009-5413-9
- Daigle, L. E., Snyder, J. A., & Fisher, B. S. (2016). Measuring victimization: Issues and new directions. In B. M. Huebner & T. S. Bynum (Eds), *The handbook of measurement issues in Criminology and Criminal Justice* (pp. 249–276). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. doi: 10.1002/9781118868799.ch12
- Demmrich, S., & Akgül, S. (2020). Bullying experience among adolescents with a turkish migration background in Germany: Ethnic class composition, integration, and religiosity as protective factors? *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 17*(13), 4776. doi: 10.3390/ijerph17134776.
- Dietrich, L., & Ferguson, R. F. (2020). Why stigmatized adolescents bully more: The role of self-esteem and academic-status insecurity. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth, 25*(1), 305–318. doi: 10.1080/02673843.2019.1622582
- Dupper, D. R., Forrest-Bank, S., & Lowry-Carusillo, A. (2015). Experiences of religious minorities in public school settings: Findings from focus groups involving

Muslim, Jewish, Catholic, and Unitarian Universalist youths. *Children & Schools*, 37(1), 37–45. doi: 10.1093/cs/cdu029

- Farooqui, J. F., & Kaushik, A. (2021). Understanding Islamophobia through the eyes of American Muslim children: Religious bullying and school social work interventions. *Child & Family Social Work*, 26(3), 454–466. doi: 10.1111/cfs.12828
- Finkelhor, D., Ormrod, R. K., Turner, H. A., & Hamby, S. L. (2005). The victimization of children and youth: A comprehensive, national survey. *Child Maltreatment*, 10, 5–25. doi: 10.1177/1077559504271287
- Fluck, J. (2017). Why do students bully? An analysis of motives behind violence in schools. *Youth & Society*, 49, 567–587. doi: 10.1177/0044118X14547876
- Galán, C. A., Stokes, L. R., Szoko, N., Abebe, K. Z., & Culyba, A. J. (2021). Exploration of experiences and perpetration of identity-based bullying among adolescents by race/ethnicity and other marginalized identities. *JAMA Network Open*, 4(7): e2116364. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.16364
- Garaigordobil, M., & Larrain, E. (2020). Bullying and cyberbullying in LGBT adolescents: Prevalence and effects on mental health. *Comunicar*, 62, 79–90. doi: 10.3916/C62-2020-07
- García-Fernández, C. M., Romera, E. M., Monks, C. P., & Ortega-Ruiz, R. (2023). Peer aggression and victimisation: Social behaviour strategies in early childhood in Spain. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 51, 837–849. doi: 10.1007/s10643-022-01348-9
- Garnett, B. R., Masyn, K. E., Austing, S. B., Miller, M., Williams, D. R., & Viswanath, K. (2014). The intersectionality of discrimination attributes and bullying among youth: An applied latent class analysis. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 43(8), 1225–1239. doi:10.1007/s10964-013-0073-8
- Hamm, M. P., Newton, A. S., Chisholm, A., Shulhan, J., Milne, A., Sundar, P., et al. (2015). Prevalence and effect of cyberbullying on children and young people: A scoping review of social media studies. *JAMA Pediatrics*. 169(8), 770–777. doi: 10.1001/jamapediatrics.2015.0944

- Heerde, J. A., & Hemphill, S. A. (2018). Are bullying perpetration and victimization associated with adolescent deliberate self-harm? A meta-analysis. *Archives of Suicide Research, 23*(3), 353–381. doi: 10.1080/13811118.2018.147269
- Hinduja, S., & Patching, J. W. (2022). *Cyberbullying: Identification, prevention, and response*. Cyberbullying Research Center. <https://cyberbullying.org/Cyberbullying-Identification-Prevention-Response-2022.pdf>
- Hong, J. S., Peguero, A. A., & Espelage, D. L. (2018). Experiences in bullying and/or peer victimization of vulnerable, marginalized, and oppressed children and adolescents: An introduction to the special issue. *The American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 88*(4), 399–401. doi: 10.1037/ort0000330
- Islam, M. I., Khanam, R., & Kabir, E. (2022). Depression and anxiety have a larger impact on bullied girls than on boys to experience self-harm and suicidality: A mediation analysis. *Journal of Affective Disorders, 297*, 250–258. Doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2021.10.061
- Jadambaa, A., Thomas, H. J., Scott, J. G., Graves, N., Brain, D., & Pacella, R. (2019) Prevalence of traditional bullying and cyberbullying among children and adolescents in Australia: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry, 53*(9), 878–888. doi: 10.1177/0004867419846393
- Lebrun-Harris, L. A., Sherman, L. J., Limber, S. P., Miller, B. D., Edgerton, E. A. (2019). Bullying victimization and perpetration among U.S. children and adolescents: 2016 National Survey of Children’s Health. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 28*, 2543–2557. doi: 10.1007/s10826-018-1170-9
- Llorent, V. J., Ortega-Ruiz, R., & Zych, I. (2016). Bullying and cyberbullying in minorities: Are they more vulnerable than the majority group? *Frontiers in Psychology, 7*:1507. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01507
- Lozano-Blasco, R., Cortés-Pascual, A., & Latorre-Martínez, M. P. (2020). Being a cybervictim and a cyberbully – The duality of cyberbullying: A meta-analysis. *Computers in Human Behavior, 111*. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2020.106444

- Lund, E. M., & Ross, S. W. (2016). Bullying perpetration, victimization, and demographic differences in college students: A review of the literature. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 18*(3), 248–360. doi: 10.1177/1524838015620818
- Messias, E., Kindrick, K., & Castro, J. (2014). School bullying, cyberbullying, or both: Correlates of teen suicidality in the 2011 CDC youth risk behavior survey. *Comprehensive Psychiatry, 55*(5), 1063–1068. doi: 10.1016/j.comppsy.2014.02.005
- Monks, C. P., & Coyne, I. (2011). A history of research into bullying. In C. P. Monks & I. Coyne (Eds), *Bullying in different contexts* (pp. 1-11). Cambridge University Press. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511921018
- Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do*. Blackwell.
- Organic Law 3/2020, of December 29, which amends Organic Law 2/2006, of May 3, on Education. Official State Gazette, No. 340, December 30, 2020, pages 122868 to 122953.
- Pichel, R., Feijóo, S., Isorna, M., Varela, J., & Rial, A. (2022). Analysis of the relationship between school bullying, cyberbullying, and substance use. *Children and Youth Services Review, 134*, 106369. doi: 10.1016/j.childyouth.2022.106369
- Puhl, R. M., & Latner, J. D. (2007). Stigma, obesity, and the health of the nation's children. *Psychological Bulletin, 133*, 557–580. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.133.4.557
- Rodríguez-Hidalgo, A. J., Calmaestra, J., Casas, J. A., & Ortega-Ruiz, R. (2019). Ethnic-cultural bullying versus personal bullying: specificity and measurement of discriminatory aggression and victimization among adolescents. *Frontiers in Psychology, 10*. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00046
- Rodríguez-Hidalgo, A. J., Ortega-Ruiz, R., & Zych, I. (2014). Peer victimization and ethnic-cultural peer victimization: Self-esteem and school relations between different cultural groups of students in Andalusia, Spain. *Revista de Psicodidáctica, 19*(1), 191–210. doi: 10.1387/RevPsicodidact.7909
- Romera, E. M., Ortega-Ruiz, R., del Rey, R., Casas, J. A., Viejo, C., Gómez, O., Córdoba, F., Zych, I., García-Fernández, C. M., & Luque, R. (2017). *Bullying, cyberbullying y dating violence. Estudio de la gestión de la vida social en*

- estudiantes de primaria y secundaria de Andalucía*. Centro de Estudios Andaluces. Consejería de la Presidencia y Administración Local. <https://www.centrodeestudiosandaluces.es/datos/publicaciones/Actualidad75.pdf>
- Sánchez, C. (2023). *Tratamiento jurídico-penal del acoso en España*. Boletín Oficial del Estado. [https://www.boe.es/biblioteca\\_juridica/abrir\\_pdf.php?id=PUB-DP-2023-293](https://www.boe.es/biblioteca_juridica/abrir_pdf.php?id=PUB-DP-2023-293)
- Sapouna, M., de Amicis, L., & Vezzali, L. (2023). Bullying Victimization due to racial, ethnic, citizenship and/or religious status: A systematic review. *Adolescent Research Review*, 8, 261–296. doi: 10.1007/s40894-022-00197-2
- Scheithauer, H., Hayer, T., Petermann, F., & Jugert, G. (2006). Physical, verbal, and relational forms of bullying among German students: Age trends, gender differences, and correlates. *Aggressive Behavior*, 32, 261–275. doi: 10.1002/ab.20128
- Smith, P. K., & Monks, C. P. (2008). Concepts of bullying: Developmental and cultural aspects. *International Journal of Adolescent Medicine and Health*, 20(2), 101–112. doi: 10.1515/IJAMH.2008.20.2.101
- Tokunaga, R. S. (2010). Following you home from school: A critical review and synthesis of research on cyberbullying victimization. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26(3), 277–287. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2009.11.014
- Ttofi, M. M., Farrington, D. P., Lösel, F., Crago, R. V., & Theodorakis, N. (2016). School bullying and drug use later in life: A meta-analytic investigation. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 31(1), 8–27. doi: 10.1037/spq0000120
- Vigil-Colet, A., Morales-Vives, F., & Lorenzo-Seva, U. (2013). How social desirability and acquiescence affect the age-personality relationship. *Psicothema*, 25(3), 342–348. doi: 10.7334/psicothema2012.297
- Walters, G. D. (2020). Mediating the victim-offender overlap with delinquent peer associations: A preliminary test of the person proximity hypothesis. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 33(4), 297–315. doi: 10.1080/1478601x.2020.1711752

- Walters, G. D. (2021). School-age bullying victimization and perpetration: A meta-analysis of prospective studies and research. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 22*(5), 1129–1139. doi: 10.1177/1524838020906513
- Walters, G. D., & Espelage, D. L. (2018). From victim to victimizer: Hostility, anger, and depression as mediators of the bullying victimization–bullying perpetration association. *Journal of School Psychology, 68*, 73–83. doi: 10.1016/j.jsp.2017.12.003
- Wolke, D., & Lereya, S. T. (2015). Long-term effects of bullying. *Archives of Disease in Childhood, 100*, 879–885. doi: 10.1136/archdischild-2014-306667
- Zych, I., & Farrington, D. P. (2021). Stability and change in bullying and cyberbullying throughout the school years. In P. K. Smith & J. O. Norman (Eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell Handbook of Bullying: A Comprehensive and International Review of Research and Intervention* (pp. 20–36). John Wiley & Sons Ltd. doi: 10.1002/9781118482650.ch36
- Zych, I., & Llorent, V. J. (2023). Bias-Based cyberbullying in Spanish adolescents and its relation to social and emotional competencies and technology abuse. *The Journal of Early Adolescence, 43*(1), 37–58. doi: 10.1177/02724316211020365
- Zych, I., Ortega Ruiz, R., & Marín López, I. (2016). Cyberbullying: A systematic review of research, its prevalence and assessment issues in Spanish studies. *Psicología Educativa, 22*, 5–18. doi: 10.1016/j.pse.2016.03.002

## 1. ENDNOTES

- [1] Information about the ESOMAR panel is available at <https://es.cint.com/esomar28>
- [2] The microdata for the 2021 Youth and Gender Barometer is available at <https://www.centroreinasofia.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/Barometro-Genero-2021-Microdatos.zip>
- The questionnaire for the 2021 Youth and Gender Barometer can be accessed at <https://www.centroreinasofia.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/Barometro-Genero-2021-Cuestionario.pdf>
- [3] This indicator was computed by counting the number of positive responses to the eight items that composed the scale. Social class was associated with the comfort scale ( $F = 43.15$ ,  $df = 2$ ,  $1,170$ ,  $p < .001$ ), with individuals who identified themselves as low social

class scoring significantly lower ( $M = 4.81$ ) than those in the middle- and upper-class groups ( $M = 6.00$  and  $M = 6.08$ , respectively), with no differences between these two groups.

## 9. SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

**Table A1**

*Missing Data*

<b>Variable</b>	<b>% (n)</b>
<b><i>Bullying victimization</i></b>	
School bullying	4.6% (55)
Cyberbullying	4.5% (54)
Workplace bullying	5.5% (66)
Bullying perpetrated by friends	6.4% (77)
<b><i>Bullying perpetration</i></b>	
	4.4% (53)
<b><i>Individual characteristics</i></b>	
Gender	0.4% (5)
Nationality	0.2% (2)
Self-reported social class	2.3% (28)
Political orientation	13.1% (157)
Sexual orientation	2.6% (31)

*Note:* The variables “age”, “perceived discrimination”, and “comfort of living” had no missing data and are excluded from this table.