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INTRODUCTION

School violence is just one of the forms in which human violence manifests in society. Recently, school violence has alarmingly spread both in Romanian schools and abroad. School is an educational institution and thus school violence must become a problem of the entire society. This present study starts from the idea that the problem of violence is extremely serious for the entire educational system in Romania and other countries of the world. The questions that require prompt answers for ensuring a favourable climate in school and for controlling the school violence phenomenon are related to the following aspects: the identification of the forms in which violent behaviour becomes manifest in school, the identification of the factors which cause such behaviour, which cause some students to behave violently towards their schoolmates and teachers, etc. Research into the school violence phenomenon used to focus on the study of “traditional” forms of violence (fighting, swearing, sexual violence, etc.), but the development of new communication technologies (the Internet and mobile phones) gave rise to new forms of aggression, namely cyberbullying. The idea of the present study emerged from the desire to answer the need of identifying “traditional” forms of in-school violent behaviour, the places in which it occurs, its authors, and the most important and the original aspect of the research, the new forms in which violent behaviour manifests (cyberbullying). In Romania, no research has been conducted, up to the present moment, into school cyberbullying. Early identification of “traditional” forms of school violence, as well as of its new forms is extremely important for developing prevention and
intervention strategies, in a timely manner, and which are efficient in the struggle to combat this phenomenon.

The doctoral thesis titled “Determinant Factors of Current Forms of Manifestation of School Violence. Prevention and Intervention Strategies,” written by candidate Lia Bologa, under the supervision of Professor Preda Vasile, PhD is divided into two parts, structured on 5 chapters, and contains a general conclusion section, appendixes and a bibliography. The thesis contains 507 pages of which: the theoretical part represents 31.8% of the entire paper and contains 146 pages; the practical part represents 68.2 % of the entire paper, namely 313 pages; the general conclusions, 8 pages; the appendixes, 19 pages; the bibliography, 17 pages.

PART I - THE THEORETICAL STUDY

The purpose of developing the theoretical study was to bring together information in the current literature on the school violence phenomenon in order to lay a solid ground for the actual research.

CHAPTER I - SCHOOL VIOLENCE - A CURRENT PHENOMENON is an approach to issues such as: violence versus aggressiveness, violent social behaviour, school violence, school violence in Romania, school violence in Europe, violence effects.

CHAPTER II - THE ETIOLOGY OF VIOLENT ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOUR refers to explicative models of the development of antisocial violent behaviour, as well as violent behaviour risk and protective factors.

CHAPTER III - FORMS OF MANIFESTATION OF SCHOOL VIOLENCE approaches the typology of school violence, the “traditional” forms of school violence and the new forms violent behaviour takes today (cyberbullying).

CHAPTER IV - PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION STRATEGIES IN SCHOOL VIOLENCE approaches the main difficulties implied by the attempt to reduce school violence, aspects of school-violence prevention and intervention strategies, prevention and intervention programmes and models, prevention and intervention strategies based on the violence ecological model and school-cyberbullying prevention and intervention strategies.
PART II – OWN RESEARCH

CHAPTER V – RESEARCH METHODOLOGY consists of three subchapters and contains three studies. The research methodology was designed so as to enable the researcher to: 1) identify the “traditional forms of in school violent behaviour. These objectives were achieved in the first study; 2) identify the new forms of in-school violent behaviour (cyberbullying), these objectives being achieved in the second study; 3) identify risk factors and contexts in which in-school violent behaviour occurs.

1. STUDY I - SCHOOL VIOLENT BEHAVIOUR ASSESSMENT

The aspects this study investigates are the following: the forms of violence occurring in the educational environment; places and times of the day when violent behaviour occurs; the authors of this type of behaviour; reactions of the aggrieved victims; the climate in school.

1.1. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

1.1.1. OBJECTIVES OF STUDY I

- Investigating the opinion of students between 11 and 19 years of age on the frequency of different types of violent behaviour in lower secondary and higher secondary education
- Investigating the opinion of students between 11 and 19 years of age on the frequency of violent behaviours occurring in the school environment by gender
Investigating the opinion of students between 11 and 19 years of age on the places in which violent behaviours occur in the school environment

Investigating the opinion of students between 11 and 19 years of age on the times of the day when violent behaviours take place

Investigating the opinion of students between 11 and 19 years of age on the authors of violent behaviours within the school environment

Investigating the opinion of students between 11 and 19 years of age on the extent to which teachers manage to prevent and control violent behaviours within the school environment and the methods they use

1.2.2. HYPOTHESES OF STUDY I

There will be no significant differences regarding the frequency of in-school violent behaviours between lower-secondary female students and higher-secondary female students.

There will be no significant differences regarding the frequency of in-school violent behaviours between lower-secondary male students and higher-secondary male students.

There will be no significant differences regarding the places in the school environment in which violent behaviours take place between lower-secondary female students and higher-secondary female students.

There will be no significant differences regarding the places in the school environment in which violent behaviours take place between lower-secondary male students and higher-secondary male students.

There will be no significant differences regarding the methods which teachers use in order to prevent in-school violent behaviours between lower-secondary female students and higher-secondary female students.

There will be no significant differences regarding the methods which teachers use in order to prevent in-school violent behaviours between lower-secondary female students and higher-secondary female students.

1.2.3. PROCEDURE

For this study, we selected students from 6 lower-secondary forms and 7 higher-secondary forms to whom we applied several questionnaires on violent behaviours in the
school environment, places in which violent behaviours occur, their authors, as well as the methods which teachers use in order to prevent and control violent behaviours in the school environment.

1.2.4. TOOLS

In order to identify violent behaviours in the school environment, of the places in which these behaviours occur, of the authors of violent behaviours, as well as of the methods which teachers use in order to prevent and control violent behaviours in the school environment we have used the questionnaire “Questionnaire for the assessment of violent behaviours in the school environment.”

Table no. 1

The internal consistency index for the entire questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
<th>N of cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.77</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2.5. PARTICIPANT DISTRIBUTION

Table no. 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no. 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-secondary</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher-secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For study I, I included 457 students selected according to the nominal cycle variable (lower-secondary and higher-secondary). The group of lower-secondary participants in the study consisted of 226 students and the group of higher-secondary participants consisted of 231 students.

### Participant distribution by form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject’s form</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The participants in the study are 5-12th form students, as follows: 1) 5th form: 60 students, representing a 13.1% of the entire group of participants; 2) 6th form: 60 students, representing a 13.1% of the entire group of participants; 3) 7th form: 52 students, representing a 11.4% of the entire group of participants; 4) 8th form: 54 students, representing a 11.8% of the entire group of participants; 5) 9th form: 55 students, representing a 12.0% of the entire group of participants; 6) 10th form: 60 students, representing a 13.1% of the entire group of participants; 7) 11th form: 62 students, representing a 13.6% of the entire group of participants; 8) 12th form: 54 students, representing a 11.8% of the entire group of participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percentiles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>457</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participant distribution by gender

Table no. 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid F</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid M</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no. 6

Figure no. 3
Participants in the study are 225 female students, representing 49.2% of the entire group, and 232 male students, representing 50.8% of the entire group.

**Participant distribution by age**

**Table no. 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>98.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure no. 4*

Participant distribution by age: 1) 11 year-olds: 57 students, representing 12.5% of the entire group of participants; 2) 12 year-olds: 64 students, representing a 14.0% of the entire group of participants; 3) 13 year-olds: 54 students, representing a 11.8% of the entire group of participants; 4) 14 year-olds: 55 students, representing 12.0% of the entire group of participants; 5) 15 year-olds: 52 students, representing a 11.4% of the entire group of participants.
participants; 6) 16 year-olds: 58 students, representing 12.7% of the entire group of participants; 7) 17 year-olds: 608 students, representing 13.1% of the entire group of participants; 8) 18 year-olds: 51 students, representing 11.2% of the entire group of participants; 9) 19 year-olds: 6 students, representing a 1.3% of the entire group of participants.

1.2.6. ASSESSMENT OF VIOLENT BEHAVIOURS IN ALL PARTICIPANTS IN THE STUDY

Table no. 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violent Behaviours in the School Environment</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>1-2 times</th>
<th>More than 2 times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hit someone deliberately</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hit someone deliberately with obvious intent to injure</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession of firearms on school grounds</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of a blunt object with intent to injure</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical care provided after altercations</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>89.9%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of personal belongings</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession of knives by students</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats from other students</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knife threats from other students</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profanities from other students</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insults from other students</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>567%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats from a group of students in the school</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjected to blackmail, involving money or any other valuable objects, by another student</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insults from school staff</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hit by school staff</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexually harassed by school staff</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexually harassed by another student</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>96.1%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession of blunt objects on school property</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>88.4%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An analysis of the indicators regarding the opinion of participants in the study on the presence of violent behaviours in the school environment at the level of the entire group of higher-secondary and lower-secondary students indicates, in a decreasing order, the following percentages:

1) Profanities from other students – 78.6%
2) Insults from other students – 43.3%
3) Theft of personal belongings – 32.2%
4) Hit deliberately – 30.7%
5) Insults from school staff – 28.6%
6) Hit someone deliberately with obvious intent to injure – 22.4%
7) Possession of knives by students – 19.9%
8) Subjected to blackmail, involving money or any other valuable objects – 11.8%
9) Threats from other students in the school – 17.1%
10) Threats from other students – 11.8%
11) Possession of white weapons (knife, pocket-knife etc.) – 11.6%
12) Use of a blunt object with intent to injure – 10.7%
13) Medical care provided after altercations – 10.1%
14) Hit by school staff – 9.6%
15) Sexually harassed by another student – 4%
16) Threatened with a knife by other student – 2.8%
17) Sexually harassed by school staff – 1.5%
18) Possession of firearms (grenade, air pistols etc.) – 0%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Places in the school environment where violent behaviours occur</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At the snack stall, during breaks or at the store in proximity to the school</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the teaching staff room</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the locker-room</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the gymnasium</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the classroom</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside school grounds</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the schoolyard or on the playground | 279 | 178
%    | 61.1% | 38.9%
On school corridors | 327 | 130
%    | 71.6% | 28.4%
On the way to school | 325 | 132
%    | 71.1% | 28.9%
Somewhere else | 357 | 100
%    | 78.1% | 21.9%

The analysis of the places in the school environment where violent behaviours occur emphasises the following hierarchy:

1) In the classroom – 53%
2) In the schoolyard or on the playground – 38.9%
3) Outside school grounds – 32.4%
4) On the way to school – 28.9%
5) On school corridors – 28.4%
6) Somewhere else – 21.9%
7) At the snack stall, during breaks or at the store in proximity to the school – 21%
8) In the teaching staff room – 17.7%
9) In the gymnasium – 11.2%
10) In the locker-room – 8.3%

Table no. 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of the day when violent behaviour occurs</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During classes</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
%                                           | 76.8% | 23.2%|
| Immediately after classes                  | 224 | 233|
%                                           | 49.0% | 51.0%|
| In other times of the day                  | 230 | 227|
%                                           | 50.3% | 49.7%|
| Before classes                             | 312 | 145|
%                                           | 68.3% | 31.7%|
| During breaks                              | 219 | 238|
%                                           | 47.9% | 52.1%|

1) During breaks – 52.1%
2) Immediately after classes – 51%
3) In other times of the day – 49.7%
4) Before classes – 31.7%
5) During classes – 23.2%
Table no. 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors of violent behaviours</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students from upper forms</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students from other schools</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A student from a lower form</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A classmate</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A student from the same form but different class</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A group of classmates</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>98.2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A group of students from several classes</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A group of students from other schools</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A group of students from upper forms</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A group of students from the same form but different class</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A group of students from a lower form</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) A student from the same form but different class – 32.6%
2) Students from upper forms – 26%
3) A classmate – 17.7%
4) A student from a lower form – 17.3%
5) A group of students from upper forms – 15.3%
6) A group of students from the same form but different class – 13.6%
8) Students from other schools – 13.1%
9) A group of students from other schools – 12.3%
10) A group of students from several classes – 8.5%
11) A group of students from a lower form – 7.7%
12) A group of classmates – 1.8%

Table no. 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsecured places in the school</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there certain places in the school building where you do not feel safe?</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. No – 65.4%
2. Yes – 34.6%
Table no. 13

Types of help requested by students facing violent behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Help from another student</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>321</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reaction</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help from school staff</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help from family members</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Ask family members for help – 44%;
2) Ask school staff for help – 33.3%;
3) Ask another student from help – 29.8%;
4) No reaction – 14.4%.

Table no. 14

Problems teachers have to face and ways in which they manage to prevent and control in-school violent behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>1-2 times</th>
<th>More than 2 times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vandalisation of classrooms and other places in the school</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swearing addressed to teachers by students</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of alcoholic beverages</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of narcotic drugs</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>97.4%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of safety in the school</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ rate of success in controlling students’ violent behaviours</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ interest in preventing violent behaviours</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures taken by teachers for the reduction of violent behaviours</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ rate of success in reducing violent behaviours</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Measures taken by teachers for the reduction of violent behaviours - 98.5%
2) Teachers’ interest in preventing violent behaviours – 98.2%
3) Teachers’ rate of success in reducing violent behaviours - 98%
4) Students’ perception of safety in the school – 98%
5) Teachers’ rate of success in controlling students’ violent behaviours – 94.1%
6) Vandalising, devastating classrooms and other places in the school by students - 24.8%
7) Swearing addressed to teachers by students – 23.7%
8) Consumption of alcoholic beverages by students in the school – 16%
9) Consumption of narcotic drugs by students in the school – 2.6%

As a result of the statistic analysis (the Chi-square test) of differences by gender between lower-secondary and higher secondary students concerning violent behaviours in the school environment, of the times of the day when these occur, of the authors of such behaviours, and the teachers’ rate of success in reducing and controlling violent behaviours in the school environment, the hypotheses of study I are partially confirmed because several significant differences were discovered at the level of the following variables:

A) Female students

1. Violent behaviours
   - Hit someone deliberately
   - Hit someone deliberately with obvious intent to injure
   - Use of a blunt object with intent to injure
   - Medical care provided after altercations
   - Profanities from other students
   - Sexually harassed by school staff
   - Attempted sexual harassment by another student

2. Places in which violent behaviours occur
   - In the schoolyard or on the playground
   - On school corridors
   - On the way to school

3. Problems teachers have to face
   - Vandalisation of classrooms and other places in the school
   - Consumption of narcotic drugs in the school
B) Male students

In the case of male students differences have been discovered only at the level of the problems which teachers have to face, namely:

- Consumption of narcotic drugs in the school

2. STUDY II - CYBERBULLYING AT SCHOOL

2.1. OBJECTIVES

The objectives Study II focus on the following:

- Investigating the opinion of students between 15 and 18 years of age on the frequency of cyberbullying in higher secondary and vocational education
- Investigating the opinion of students between 15 and 18 years of age on the frequency of cyberbullying in the school environment by gender
- Investigating the opinion of students between 15 and 18 years of age on the frequency of mobile phone related aggressions in the school environment
- Investigating the opinion of students between 15 and 18 years of age on the frequency of Internet related aggressions in the school environment
- Investigating the opinion of students between 15 and 18 years of age on the effects of cyberbullying on its victims

2.2. HYPOTHESES

Hypotheses focus on the following aspects:

- There will be no significant differences concerning mobile-phone related aggressions between higher-secondary female students and vocational education female students
- There will be no significant differences concerning mobile-phone related aggressions between higher-secondary male students and vocational education male students
- There will be no significant differences concerning Internet related aggressions between higher-secondary female students and vocational education female students
There will be significant differences concerning Internet related aggressions between higher-secondary male students and vocational education male students.

There will be no significant differences concerning the effects of cyberbullying on the victims between higher-secondary female students and vocational education female students.

There will be no significant differences concerning the effects of cyberbullying on the victims between higher-secondary male students and vocational education male students.

### 2.3. PROCEDURE

6 classes of higher-secondary students and 6 classes of vocational education students were selected, several questionnaires were applied to students between 15 and 18 years of age on the cyberbullying behaviour, the electronic media it uses, its effects on its victims, as well as the usefulness of taking certain measures for its prevention in school.

### 2.4. TOOLS

In order to identify cyberbullying in school, the electronic media it uses, its effects on its victims, as well as its prevention methods, the questionnaire “Cyberbullying in the school environment” was applied.

**The internal consistency index for the entire questionnaire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach's Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no. 15

### 2.5. PARTICIPANT DISTRIBUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no. 16
For study II, I included 376 students selected according to the nominal cycle variable (higher-secondary and vocational education). The group of higher-secondary participants in the study consisted of 184 students (51.1%), and the group of vocational education participants, from schools of arts and crafts, consisted of 192 students (48.9%).

Participant distribution by age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Percentiles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>376</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentiles</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no. 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high school</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vocational school</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure no. 5

EDUCATION

Table no. 18
Table no. 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure no. 6

AGE

Participant distribution by age: 1) 15 year-olds: 68 students, representing 18.1% of the entire group of participants; 2) 16 year-olds: 121 students, representing a 32.2% of the entire group of participants; 3) 17 year-olds: 106 students, representing a 28.2% of the entire group of participants; 4) 18 year-olds: 81 students, representing a 21.5% of the entire group of participants.

Participant distribution by gender

Table no. 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Percentiles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>Percentiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>376</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The group of participants in the study consists of: 192 female students, representing 51.1% of the entire group of participants and 184 male students, representing 48.9% of the entire group of participants.
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Table no. 23

SMS aggression-victim during the past three months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SMS aggression</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>1-2 times</th>
<th>2-3 times a month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMS aggression at school</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMS aggression outside school grounds</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) SMS aggression at school – 2.1%
2) SMS aggression outside school grounds – 5.9%

Table no. 24

Authors of SMS aggression at school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors of SMS aggression</th>
<th>I was not aggressed</th>
<th>I do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) I do not know – 2.1%
2) I was not aggressed – 97.9%

Table no. 25

The SMS aggression was reported to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The SMS aggression was reported to</th>
<th>I was not aggressed</th>
<th>Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) I was not aggressed – 97.9%
2) Parents – 2.1%

Table no. 22

SMS aggressions during the past three months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SMS aggressions during the past three months</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) No – 83%
2) Yes – 16.2%

Aggression through Pictures or/and Videos

Table no. 26

Victim of aggression through pictures or/and videos during the past three months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggression through pictures or/and videos at school %</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>1-2 times</th>
<th>2-3 times a month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>326</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression through pictures or/and videos outside school %</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) Victim of aggression through pictures or/and videos at school – 13.3%
2) Victim of aggression through pictures or/and videos outside school – 5.9%

| Table no. 27 |
| Authors of aggression through pictures or/and videos at school |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors of aggression through pictures or/and videos</th>
<th>I was not aggressed</th>
<th>A classmate</th>
<th>A student from the same form but different class</th>
<th>A student from an upper form</th>
<th>I do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) I was not aggressed – 86.7%
2) A student from the same form but different class – 5.9%
3) I do not know – 5.3%
4) A student from an upper form – 1.9%
5) A classmate – 0.2%

| Table no. 28 |
| The person whom the aggression through pictures or/and videos was reported to |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The aggression through pictures or/and videos was reported to</th>
<th>I was not aggressed</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Friends</th>
<th>Class teacher</th>
<th>No one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) I was not aggressed – 86.7%
2) I did not report to anyone – 9.3%
3) Parents – 1.9%
4) Friends – 1.2%
5) Class teacher – 0.9%

| Table no. 29 |
| Occurrence of aggression through pictures or/and videos during the past three months at school |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occurrence of aggression through pictures or/and videos during the past three months at school</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) No – 79.2%
2) Yes – 20.8%

**Aggression through mobile phone calls**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victim of aggression through mobile phone calls</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>1-2 times</th>
<th>2-3 times a month</th>
<th>once a week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggression through mobile phone calls at school</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression through mobile phone calls outside school grounds</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Victim of aggression through mobile phone calls outside school grounds – 22.1%

2) Victim of aggression through mobile phone calls at school – 0.5%

**Table no. 31**

**Authors of aggressions through mobile phone calls at school**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors of aggressions through mobile phone calls</th>
<th>I was not aggressed</th>
<th>I do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors of aggressions through mobile phone calls</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) I was not aggressed – 99.5%

2) I do not know – 0.5%

**Table no. 32**

**The person whom the aggression through mobile phone calls was reported to**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The person whom the aggression through mobile phone calls was reported to</th>
<th>I was not aggressed</th>
<th>No one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) I was not aggressed – 99.5%

2) I did not report to anyone – 0.5%

**Table no. 33**

**Occurrence of aggression through mobile phone calls at school during the past three months**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occurrence of aggression through mobile phone calls at school during the past three months</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) No – 86.4%
2) Yes – 13.6%

**Email aggression**

Table no. 34

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victim of Email aggression</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>1-2 times</th>
<th>Several times a week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email aggression at school %</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email aggression outside school grounds %</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Email aggression outside school grounds – 22.6%
2) Victim of Email aggression at school – 0%

Table no. 35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors of Email aggression at school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authors of Email aggressions %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) I was not aggressed – 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because of the fact that there were no Email aggressions at school, there were no authors of aggressions.

Table no. 36

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The person whom the Email aggression was reported to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Email aggression was reported to %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) I was not aggressed – 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because of the fact that there were no Email aggressions at school, there were no persons whom the aggressions were reported to.

Table no. 37

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occurrence of Email aggressions at school during the past three months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occurrence of Email aggressions at school during the past three months %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) No – 94.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Yes – 5.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chat aggression

#### Table no. 38

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victim of chat aggression</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>1-2 times</th>
<th>2-3 times a month</th>
<th>Once a week</th>
<th>I am not a chat user</th>
<th>Several times a week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chat aggression at school %</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chat aggression outside school grounds %</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Victim of chat aggression outside school grounds – 14.1%
2) Victim of chat aggression at school – 0%

#### Table no. 39

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors of chat aggressions at school</th>
<th>I was not aggressed</th>
<th>I am not a chat user</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authors of chat aggressions %</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) I was not aggressed – 66%
2) I am not a chat user – 34%

Because of the fact that there were no chat aggressions at school, there were no authors of aggressions.

#### Table no. 40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The person whom the chat aggression was reported to</th>
<th>I was not aggressed</th>
<th>I am not a chat user</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The person whom the chat aggression was reported to %</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) I was not aggressed – 66%
2) I am not a chat user – 34%

Because of the fact that there were no chat aggressions at school, there were no authors of aggressions.

#### Table no. 41

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occurrence of chat aggressions at school during the past three months</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occurrence of chat aggressions at school during the past three months %</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) No – 96.6%
2) Yes – 3.4%

**IM aggression**

**Victim of IM aggression during the past three months**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>I am not an IM user</th>
<th>1-2 times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IM aggression at school</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM aggression outside school grounds</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Victim of IM aggression outside school grounds – 12.5%
2) Victim of IM aggression at school – 0%

**Authors of IM aggressions at school**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors of IM aggressions</th>
<th>I was not aggressed</th>
<th>I am not an IM user</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) I was not aggressed – 96.6%
2) I am not an IM user – 3.4%
Because of the fact that there were no IM aggressions at school, there were no authors of aggressions.

**The person whom the IM aggression was reported to**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The person whom the IM aggression was reported to</th>
<th>I was not aggressed</th>
<th>I am not an IM user</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) I was not aggressed – 96.6%
2) I am not an IM user – 3.4%
Because of the fact that there were no IM aggressions at school, there were no persons whom the aggression was reported to.

**Occurrence of IM aggressions at school during the past three months**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occurrence of IM aggressions at school during the past three months</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) No – 93.1%
2) Yes – 6.9%

**Aggression through Internet sites**

**Table no. 46**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victim of aggressions through Internet sites</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>1-2 times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggression through Internet sites at school %</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression through Internet sites outside school grounds %</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Victim of aggressions through Internet sites at school – 0%
2) Victim of aggressions through Internet sites outside school grounds – 6.7%

**Table no. 47**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors of aggressions through Internet sites at school %</th>
<th>I was not aggressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authors of aggressions through Internet sites</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) I was not aggressed – 100%

Because of the fact that there were no aggressions through Internet sites at school, there were no authors of aggressions.

**Table no. 48**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The person whom the aggression through Internet sites was reported to %</th>
<th>I was not aggressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The person whom the IM aggression was reported to</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) I was not aggressed – 100%

Because of the fact that there were no aggressions through Internet sites at school, there were no persons whom aggressions were reported to.

**Table no. 49**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occurrence of aggressions through Internet sites at school during the past three months %</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occurrence of IM aggressions at school during the past three months</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) No – 100%
2) Yes - 0%

Table no. 50
Effects of cyberbullying on its victims as compared to “traditional, conventional” violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you think that cyberbullying, as compared to “traditional, conventional” violence...</th>
<th>It has a less significant effect upon its victim</th>
<th>It has the same effect upon its victim</th>
<th>It has a more significant effect upon its victim</th>
<th>I do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) I do not know – 42.3%
2) It has a less significant effect upon its victim – 24.7%
3) It has the same effect upon its victim – 20.5%
4) It has a more significant effect upon its victim – 12.5%

Table no. 51
The importance of forbidding the use of mobile phones at school to prevent cyberbullying

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you think it is useful to forbid mobile phones in school to prevent cyberbullying?</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>I do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) No – 50.8%
2) Yes – 27.4%
3) I do not know – 21.8%

Table no. 52
The use of blocking private Internet access at school to prevent cyberbullying

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you think it is useful to block private Internet access at school to prevent cyberbullying?</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>I do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) No – 54%
2) I do not know – 26.9%
3) Yes – 19.1%
As a result of the statistic analysis (the Chi-square test) of the difference between higher-secondary and vocational education by gender with reference to: a) victims of aggressions through mobile phone calls; b) authors of aggressions through mobile phone calls; c) the persons to whom mobile phone aggressions are reported to; d) the Occurrence of mobile phone aggressions at school; e) victims of Internet aggressions; f) authors of Internet aggressions; g) the persons to whom Internet aggressions are reported to; h) the Occurrence of Internet aggressions at school, hypotheses of Study II are partially confirmed because several significant differences were identified at the level of the following variables:

A) In the case of female students:
- Aggression through pictures or/and videos
- Occurrence of aggression through pictures or/and videos
- Occurrence of IM aggression
- Authors of IM aggressions

B) In the case of male students there were no significant differences.

3. STUDY III - CASE STUDIES

The case studies were aimed at highlighting risk factors in the contexts in which violent behaviours occur in the school environment, and not at developing a psychological profile of the student who manifests a violent behaviour. These case studies were based on individual interviews with: a) violent students. The interview developed for violent students focused on the following aspects: the type of violent behaviour, individual characteristics, extracurricular activities, relationship with their classmates and teachers, as well as their family life; b) violent students’ parents (tutors). The interview developed for violent students’ parents (tutors) focused on the following aspects: family’s reaction to student’s violent behaviour, punishment inflicted upon the violent student at home, the family-school relationship, the characteristics of the family environment, as well as family’s perception of the use of education; c) class teachers. The interview developed for violent students’ class teachers focused on the following aspects: the ways in which violent behaviour manifests, the
reaction of the violent student’s family in school-violence related situations, the students’ academic record, as well as family-school collaboration. In order to identify the risk factors of violent behaviours, the following typology was used: individual, familial, educational, and social factors.

These case studies were developed according to the following structure: a) personal information of the investigated subject (name, ethnic group, age, form, school, environment of origin, address); b) what is to be investigated (violent behaviours at school); c) form in which violent behaviours manifest; d) investigation methods and procedures (semi-structured and free interview, collection and analysis of academic records); e) the investigation period; f) data collection and recording; g) data analysis and development of hypotheses; h) the development of a violent-behaviour changing programme in three stages, namely: setting objectives, intervention methods and strategies and the administration of the behaviour-change programme; i) assessment of the violent behaviour changing programme, consisting of: assessment and recommendations.

The forms of violence encountered in students subjected to the investigation are: verbal and physical violence against classmates and teachers. The risk factors we identified are: a) on an individual level: the low level of aspiration, aggressiveness, impulsiveness, victim of violence, lack of interest in education, tendency towards addictive behaviour (consumption of alcohol and tobacco); b) on a familial level: familial violence, disorganised family, lack of communication within the family, deficient parenting styles, lack of male authority, low level of parents’ education, as well as lack of family-school collaboration; c) on an educational level: teacher-student conflicts, violent students’ low level of group integration and teachers’ subjective evaluation of their students; d) economic and social problems, lack of places for spare-time activities, negative influence of the entourage, proximity violence and the violence in mass-media.

Our research aimed at investigating the school violence phenomenon from two perspectives, namely: a) a theoretical perspective (Chapter I: School Violence - A Current Phenomenon; Chapter II The Etiology of Violent Antisocial Behaviour; Chapter III: Forms of

CONCLUZII GENERALE
The purpose of developing the theoretical study was to bring together information in the current literature on the school violence phenomenon in order to lay a solid ground for the actual research. In order to achieve this objective, in the first chapter I dealt with a general approach to in-school violence, the second chapter was dedicated to the explanatory models of antisocial violent behaviour development; the third chapter was dedicated to the typology of in-school violence and its new forms of manifestation, and in the last chapter we focused on prevention and intervention strategies with reference to both in-school “traditional” violence and cyberbullying.

After analysing the literature, we have come to the following conclusions:

- it is difficult to compare the level of in-school violence at an international scale for several reasons: a) many countries do not collect data on violent incidents in schools; b) the cultural differences between countries make data and violent behaviours comparison difficult; c) there are different definitions of school violence; d) violent-incident reporting methods are different from country to country; e) many countries are reluctant to report violent incidents; f) group (classmates, friends, etc.) pressure may intimidate students and prevent them from reporting aggressions they witnessed or had to deal with etc.

- none of the explanatory models of antisocial violent behaviour development is able to provide a satisfactory answer on its own with regard to the development of violent behaviour; only a combination of all these models may help us obtain a real perspective on the genesis of violent behaviour;

- risk factors (individual, familial, social, educational) are not statistical, and their effect upon people depends on the ontogenetic period in which they are produced, on the context in which they appear as well as on the circumstances. The presence of risk factors perpetuate the violence cycle, but their absence, along with the presence of protective factors, help with interrupting this cycle.

- the identification and understanding of risk and protective factors is necessary for the development of prevention and intervention strategies

- numerous research studies indicate the fact that there are no significant differences between genders regarding the period in which violent behaviours emerge, which provides the possibility of a unitary intervention, without gender-related differences.
the international literature synthesizes some of the current trends of in-school violent behaviours, namely: a) the transition to physical, direct violence, visible in subtler forms, disguised in a form of symbolic violence; b) the multiplication of violence focused on teachers; c) the increase in unlawful serious violent phenomena in schools; d) the diffusion of violent phenomena from outside school grounds or from areas in close proximity to schools; e) the proliferation in schools of violent behaviours related to ethnic, religious, social or gender differences

the prevalence of cyberbullying at school is difficult to estimate because: a) there is no national and international body engaged in collecting data related to Internet abuse; b) the aggressors are, in most cases, not available for research; c) the Internet provides its users with multiple connectivity options, and very few possibilities of identifying information sources; d) many of the activities performed on the Internet are not illegal, and thus they are not frequently reported, etc.

the family-school-community collaboration is the only efficient way to approach in-school violence, and efficient prevention programmes must be developed for a long period of time, they must include several components and focus on students, in general, but also on those who are likely to adopt violent behaviours

The research methodology was designed so as to enable the researcher to: 1) identify the “traditional forms of in school violent behaviour. These objectives were achieved in the first study; 2) identify the new forms of in-school violent behaviour (cyberbullying), these objectives being achieved in the second study; 3) identify risk factors and contexts in which in-school violent behaviour occurs, the objectives being accomplished in the third study.

The first study investigates, in an extended and heterogeneous manner, the following aspects of school violence: the forms of violence occurring in the educational environment; places and times of the day when violent behaviour occurs; the authors of this type of behaviour; the presence or absence of unsafe places in the school; reactions of the aggressed victims; the climate in the school. Students’ violent behaviours are of a physical or psychological nature, but in most cases, they are both physical and psychological. An analysis of violent behaviours in students across Europe (Vettenburg, 2002) shows that the most prevalent form of violence is verbal violence, 90% of the students admitting that they had previously aggressed verbally other students. Most studies conclude that male students are more violent than female students (Felix & McMahon, 2007; Balica et al., 2004). This is true especially for physical violence; in the case of verbal violence, the difference is smaller but
still prominent. In relation to these aspects, the present study led us to the following conclusions: verbal violence (verbal, pen-knife, knife threats, profanities, insults, taunts etc.) is one of the most frequent forms of violence in lower-secondary students, with no significant gender-related differences; physical violence (crushing, deliberate pushing, hitting etc.) is a form of violence identified in both female and male students. I have learned that lower-secondary female students are more frequently victims of physical violence, as compared to higher-secondary female students.

One of the most serious forms of school violence, fatal in most cases, is firearm aggression. The survey conducted in the United States of America in 2003 showed that between 1991 and 2003 61% of lower-secondary students brought weapons to school (knives, pen-knives, firearms, etc.) (Brener et al., 2005). In Europe, only a minority of students admitted to have been in possession of a firearm and to have aggressed their mates (Vettenburg, 2002). Regarding these forms of violent behaviours in schools, I have found the following: there were no students who brought firearms to school; higher-secondary female students were more frequently victims of aggressions involving the use of blunt objects, as compared to lower-secondary female students; female students did not bring “white” weapons (knives, sticks, pen-knives, etc.) to school, unlike male students who did bring such objects to school.

There are not many statistics about sexual violence between students. In spite of this, sexual harassment or abuse among students is a major concern in many countries (Jones et al., 2008; Blaya & Debarbieux, 2008). As shown by various studies, sexual violence mainly affects pubescent or adolescent people (Krug et al., 2002). Although female students are more exposed to sexual violence, male students are also exposed to such violence (Jones et al., 2008). Our research study led to the following conclusions: none of the examined female lower-secondary students reported attempts of sexual harassment by another student; female higher-secondary students were subjected to attempts of sexual harassment; none of the male students were victims of sexual harassment by another student in their school.

Violent behaviour of teachers or other staff in schools is a reality in many countries. This type of behaviour includes physical punishment and psychological violence. A serious form of teacher violent behaviour is sexual harassment and/or abuse against students; this is occurs frequently in many countries (Blaya, 2003). With regard to verbal violence school staff uses against students, the present study describes it as more frequent than physical violence.
Sexual violence was reported only in the case of higher-secondary female student victims, whilst no male students were aggressed in such way.

In order to develop effective school-violence prevention and intervention programmes one must identify the places in which violent behaviours occur, the times of the day when they occur as well as their authors. I have found that the places in which violent behaviours occur most frequently are: the classroom, the schoolyard, the playground, outside the school grounds, and on school corridors. The times of the day in which these behaviours are most frequent, as reported by the participants in this study, are: during breaks and immediately after classes. There are several types of authors of aggressions in schools: students from the same form but different class, students in higher forms, and classmates. With regard to the school climate, several aspects were mentioned: teachers take measures to reduce the number of violent acts in schools, they are interested in preventing violent behaviours, and manage to prevent and oppose students’ violent behaviours, students feeling safe at school. The consumption of narcotic drugs at school was mentioned only by male and female higher-secondary students. The consumption of alcoholic beverages at school was mentioned by both lower- and higher-secondary students, but this phenomenon is more frequent in the case of the latter group.

After analysing the data, I have noticed the following: the presence of firearms on school grounds was not mentioned, verbal violence occurs in the case of preadolescent, adolescent students but also in that of the teaching staff; sexual harassment by students and teachers manifests, with a low frequency, against female adolescent students; victims of physical violence are both lower- and higher-secondary students.

Cyberbullying is a form of aggression which becomes more and more frequent being induced by the use of modern communication technology by young people. Previous research (National Children’s Home, 2002; Oliver & Candappa, 2003; Balding, 2005) focused on the prevalence of cyberbullying, in general, or just on one of its categories (for instance, aggressive text messages). In the present study, we focused on identifying new forms of violent behaviour (cyberbullying) in schools, but also outside school grounds, of their authors, of the persons whom aggressions are reported to, and on identifying the presence of such forms in the school environment. Today, there are few studies which investigate these aspects. This may be explained, on the one hand, by the fact that people are not aware of the presence of such a phenomenon and, on the other hand, many languages lack an equivalent for “cyberbullying”.
For the identification of the new forms of school violence, I have used the typology developed by Smith et al. (2006), namely: 1) text messages (sending offensive SMSs); 2) sending pictures or/and video files recorded with mobile phone cameras and shared via mobile phones or/and uploaded to the Internet (happy slapping); 3) receiving offensive phone calls; 4) Email cyberbullying; 5) chat cyberbullying; 6) IM (for instance, MSN Messenger, Yahoo Messenger), sending injurious and/or intimidating messages; 7) websites aimed at offending other people or groups. The study conducted by Smith et al. (2006) indicated the fact that 22% of students had faced cyberbullying, but only 6.6% reported long-term aggression. In a research study conducted in the United States of America, Burgess-Proctor et al. (2006) indicated the fact that 38.3% of the people who were interviewed admitted that they had been victims of cyberbullying. According to another study, 55% of the preadolescent and 30% of the adolescent Americans reported that they had been victims of cyberbullying, and 44% of the preadolescent and 70% of the adolescent Americans were victims of this phenomenon outside school grounds (Opinion Research Corporation, 2006). After analysing the data obtained in study II, I have come to the conclusion that cyberbullying is more frequent outside rather than inside school grounds.

With regard to aggressions related to the use of mobile phones, the study conducted by Li (2005) led to the following conclusions: 21% of the surveyed students had been aggressed through mobile phones, and 69% of those knew someone who had faced such aggression. Another study indicated the fact that 4.5% of the male students surveyed and 2.2% of the female students surveyed had aggressed some of their classmates by taking photos of them without asking for their permission (Auestad & Roland, 2005, qtd by Ortega et al., 2007). In the study conducted by Smith et al. (2006), 6.5% of the surveyed students declared that they had been victims of films recorded with mobile phone cameras. Based on the data obtained from our research study, we could conclude the following aspects: most of the victims were aggressed through pictures or/and videos (happy slapping), which confirms the fact that this form of aggression is the most widely known and used by students; the fewest victims were aggressed through mobile phone calls; the greatest number of victims did not report the aggression; the persons to whom the aggression was reported were: parents, friends, and members of the teaching staff. This should be an alarm signal to teachers who must take measures to encourage students to report such aggressions.

In the case of Internet aggressions, recent studies have concluded that approximately one out of four students is victim of online aggressions (Wolak et al., 2006). With regard to
using the Internet for aggressing other people, the data obtained during our research led to the following conclusions: there were no victims of email, chat, IM, website aggressions at school. With regard to the presence of such aggressions on school grounds, but whose victims were not among the students participating in our survey, we have come to the following conclusions: 1) the most frequent aggressions were those through IM services; 2) there were no website aggressions. The general conclusion of study II is the following: mobile-phone aggressions are more frequent than Internet aggressions. This fact must be considered during the development of cyberbullying prevention programmes.

It is essential to emphasise the fact that the differences between the forms of “traditional, conventional” violence and cyberbullying require that they be analysed separately, and the development of prevention and intervention strategies be done individually, taking into account their specific aspects.

The case studies based on the individual interviews with violent students, their parents, and their class teachers, were meant to identify the risk factors associated to the violent behaviour at school. One must also note that the case studies conducted as part of our research were not an attempt to generalise the risk factors identified in all violent students, or those predisposed to violence at school, or to develop a psychological profile of those students. The initial idea was our conviction that becoming aware of the multifactor etiology of preadolescent and adolescent violent behaviour is of crucial importance to the development of strategies for the prevention and intervention of violence in schools. The risk factors may be identified on an individual, family, school, and social level, exercising multiple effects upon individuals, on different stages in their development. These factors do not act in isolation, but depending on their number and significance there is a possibility that the preadolescent and adolescent people might adopt a violent behaviour. The risk-factor typology used in the case studies was developed by Resnick et al. (2004), namely: the individual, family, educational, and social factors.

Among the individual factors identified in the case studies we could mention: the low level of aspiration, victim of violence, lack of interest in education, tendency to addictive behaviour (consumption of alcohol and tobacco). Individual risk factors must be studied within their interaction with external risk factors (family, community, school).

Family factors identified during the case-study analysis were: family violence, disorganized family, lack of communication within the family, deficient parenting styles, lack of male authority within the family, parents’ low level of education, the lack of family-school
collaboration. In the families with a low level of education there could be a tendency to undervalue education, the presence of a reserved attitude towards school and a negative representation of its role and importance to education (Jigău, 2002). Research (Scott et al., 2001; Păun, 1999; Neamțu, 2003; Sprague & Walker, 2005) demonstrates that, the school environment included, may supply numerous resources for the development of violent behaviour in students, and this aspect should be considered when designing prevention and intervention programmes focused on violence in schools. Among school factors identified in the case studies, we noted: teacher-student conflicts, violent students’ low level of group integration and teachers’ subjective evaluation of their students.

Social factors are those related to: the community, entourage (”peer group”) and mass-media. Access to weapons, proximity violence, lack of places for spare-time activities are all violence risk factors (Loeber & Farrington, 2000). According to Flannery (1997), in the communities in which there is a great number of residents, disorganized families or single-parent families, in which children are not being attentively supervised, there is a high risk of violent behaviours. The meta-analysis performed by Bushman & Andreson (2001), based on 202 studies published between 1956 and 2000 on violence in mass-media and its consequences reveals a significantly positive correlation between violence presented by the mass-media and aggressive behaviour. The social factors identified in our case studies are the following: economic problems, the lack of places for spare-time activities, the negative influence of the entourage, proximity violence and the violence presented by the mass-media.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This study was developed as a solution to a long list of aspects related to violence in schools, but, as any other study, it has its own limitations. Given the absence of an information system dedicated to monitoring violence in schools, of a unified definition of violence in education and a single typology accepted on a national level, this present study was merely an exploratory endeavour, and managed to accomplish only a global assessment of the phenomenon. Because of the fact that the presence of violence in a certain school may exert a negative effect upon its image, some of the participants’ answers might be misleading.

The conclusions resulted from data processing raise additional problems which could be analysed in a further research study. In the future, we could include in study I an additional
research method involving: 1) questionnaires addressed to teachers. These should be focused on: the school’s level of safety; forms of violence in the school; cases of violence in areas situated in close proximity to the school; the relationship between the school and violent students’ parents; the causes of students’ but also school staff’s violent behaviours; 2) questionnaires addressed to school counsellors, aimed at identifying: the factors which cause violence in schools; forms of violence and prevention and intervention methods.

Regarding the investigation of the various forms of cyberbullying, in a future study, we could focus on: a) finding a larger focus group including more age categories for a profound analysis of age-related differences in adopting cyberbullying; b) a larger group of participants in order to investigate the differences by gender between the victims of cyberbullying; c) a longitudinal approach to cyberbullying in order to assess the shifts in people’s attitude towards this type of aggression as well as to identify the variation of cyberbullying occurrences in schools.

A society, whose students learn, from a young age, how to adopt a non-violent attitude towards those around them and treat people with empathy and tolerance, will be a healthy society. The strength, the cultural and moral values of a society is appraised also in relation to its reactions to acts of violence.

*The message we intended to convey in this research is the following: if we all become aware of the fact that we live in a multicultural society, and we admit and understand the various differences between us, we will be able to co-exist with the others, in mutual respect, and to fight against violence.*
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