

Research article Ερευνητική εργασία

Bullying victimization: Associated contextual factors in a Greek sample of children and adolescents

P. Pervanidou, G. Makris, I. Bouzios, G. Chrousos,
E. Roma, G. Chouliaras

*First Department of Pediatrics, School of Medicine, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens,
"Aghia Sophia" Children's Hospital, Athens, Greece*

Psychiatriki 2019, 30:216–225

School bullying is increasingly recognized as an important factor affecting both individual's well-being and social functioning. Several studies provide evidence for the potential role of contextual factors that relate to bullying victimization such as the socioeconomic status of the parents/family, the quality of family and home environment, the school climate, structure and ethos, and also various community characteristics. The objectives of this school-based, cross-sectional study were to report the prevalence of the perception of being bullied in a sample of Greek children and adolescents from 6 to 17 years of age and to investigate the relations among the subjective impression of bullying victimization and several sociodemographic and socioeconomic factors. We hypothesized that influences external to individual children and adolescents play a decisive role to their perception of being victimized. Bullying victimization was measured through a simple "yes/no" question, which confirmed or rejected respectively the fact that the child or adolescent has been at some time victimized in the school environment. Also, demographic and socioeconomic data about the families of children and adolescents were collected. A total of 1,588 children (51.8% females, mean age \pm SD: 12.9 \pm 2.8 years) were assessed. The overall prevalence of victimization was 10.4%. Multiple logistic regression analysis on the probability of being victimized identified that living at a main urban center (Odds Ratio[OR]: 2.63, CI: 1.78–3.87, $p < 0.001$), presence of a person with a chronic illness at home (OR: 1.90, CI: 1.12–3.20, $p = 0.016$), poor family economic status (OR: 1.83, CI: 1.05–3.20, $p = 0.032$), and increased number of adults at home (OR: 2.00, CI: 1.00–3.77, $p = 0.041$) had a positive correlation with the prevalence of reported bullying victimization. Moreover, higher parental educational level related to lower probability of victimization (OR: 0.88, CI: 0.78–0.99, $p = 0.05$). These findings demonstrate that several demographic and socioeconomic factors play a potential role in bullying victimization among schoolchildren. Our results also highlight the need to consider the influence of contextual factors in the design of targeting efforts countering and/or preventing bullying victimization.

Key words: School bullying, victimization, demographic factors, socioeconomic status, contextual factors.

Introduction

School bullying is increasingly recognized as an important factor affecting both individual's well-being and social functioning.¹ Bullying is defined as a specific type of aggressive behavior which encompasses three elements: (1) The behavior is intended to harm or disturb, (2) The behavior occurs repeatedly over time, and (3) There is an imbalance of power, with a person or group of persons regarded of higher status than or of greater strength than the victim.² The individuals involved in the social phenomenon of school bullying may be bullies (perpetrators of bullying behavior), victims (targets of bullying behavior), or bullies/victims.³

Studies show worldwide prevalence rates for the overall phenomenon of bullying that vary from 8% in Germany to 29.9% in the United States and 30% in Italy.^{1,4,5} In a study on prevalence rates of 11– to 16– year-old children involved in bullying across 25 countries, on average, 10% of children admitted bullying others, 11% reported being the victims of bullying and 6% reported being both bullies and victims.⁶ Although boys appear to be more often perpetrators than girls, the rates of victimization do not differ between the two sexes.^{7,8}

Bullying victimization has been associated by epidemiologic evidence with physical and psychological health outcomes for children and adolescents.^{9,10} This evidence casts light on bullying victimization as a problem of public health proportions and underlies the importance of investigation for predictive factors associated with the phenomenon. There are at least two levels of predictors for bullying victimization: individual characteristics and contextual characteristics of the setting.¹¹ Individual characteristics, including conduct problems, social problems, prior victimization and internalizing behaviors, have been identified as predictors of victimization.¹² Also, special health care needs, poor physical or mental health status, poor academic achievement and sexual orientation are risk factors for child and adolescent victimization.^{1,13–16} In a large representative sample of children and adolescents from 11 European countries, the factors most strongly associated with the perception of being bullied were younger age, being overweight/obese, having psy-

chological/mental problems, lacking social support and having a low level of parental education.³

In regard to contextual factors that relate to bullying victimization, several studies provide evidence for the potential role of the socioeconomic status (SES) of the parents/family.¹⁷ Specifically, the risk of being a bullying victim has been higher among children and adolescents with parents from lower socioeconomic positions expressed as poor parental education, low parental occupation or low affluence.^{18–20} Other contextual factors that have been associated with bullying victimization at school are family and home environment, school climate, structure and ethos, community factors, peer status and peer influence.¹¹ More precisely, at the family level, child abuse, overprotectiveness for the boys and threats of rejection for the girls have been associated with victimization.²¹ Also, an authoritarian parental style and the experience or witnessing of violence at home through conflicts between parents are major risk factors for manifestation of bullying behaviors at school.²² Finally, at the peer group-level the most robust predictors of bullying victimization are the high peer rejection and the low peer acceptance.²¹

This study focuses on the subjective perception of bullying victimization without differentiating the group of victims from the group of bully-victims. The objectives of this study were to report the prevalence of the perception of being bullied in a sample of Greek children and adolescents from 6 to 17 years of age and to investigate the relations among the subjective impression of bullying victimization and several sociodemographic and socioeconomic factors.

Material and method

Participants

The present school-based, cross-sectional study was conducted during a 6-month period (January 2014–June 2014), following approval by the Ministry of Education of Greece. The study was conducted in the context of a broader epidemiological research protocol investigating psychosocial factors related to functional gastrointestinal disorders in children.²³ All children participated in the study with their legal representatives' written informed consent. All procedures were in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and approved by both the Scientific and the Ethics

Committee of the Children's Hospital. The target population was children attending primary (6–11 years of age), intermediate ("gymnasium") (12–14 years of age) and high school ("lyceum") (15–17 years of age).

Study design

Schools were selected from different regions of Greece, but no specific sampling procedure was applied; therefore, this cannot be regarded as a nationwide representative study. Nevertheless, all efforts were made to include schools from different geographic regions and socioeconomic backgrounds to incorporate as much information, related to those factors, as possible. Specifically, nine primary schools (all in Athens), 12 gymnasiums (5 in Athens, and 1 each in Thessaloniki, Pylos, Kalamata, Volos, Heraklion, Zakynthos and Lefkada) and 12 lyceums (5 in Athens, and 1 each in Thessaloniki, Pylos, Kalamata, Volos, Heraklion, Zakynthos and Lefkada) were selected in terms of accessibility by the participating researchers. All were public schools except for two private gymnasiums and lyceums.

At the next step, questionnaires along with a letter (including a blank informed consent form) inviting the parents to participate in the study were distributed to the pupils of selected gymnasiums and lyceums or given directly to the parents of children attending primary schools. Consent was verified by telephone contact between the two school visits. For children aged 6–11 years, the questionnaires were filled-in by their parents. Older children filled-in the questionnaires on their own, during the second visit at school. During the second visit, a few days after the first, the signed informed consent forms and the questionnaires were collected either directly from the children (in gymnasiums and lyceums) or from their parents (primary schools). Anonymity was retained at all stages of the analysis.

Assessments

Bullying victimization

Being a bullying victim was assessed by using a simple "yes or no" question, asking if the child has ever reported that he/she was a bullying victim at school. For children between 6–11 years of age the answer was given by their parents or caregivers. For older children, from 11 to 17 years of age, the answer was given by children themselves.

Other measurements

Collected Demographic and Socioeconomic data included: (i) Geographic data: urban/rural, continental areas/islands, main urban centers/elsewhere, (ii) Gender, (iii) Age, (iv) Parental origin: Both parents Greeks, one parent Greek and both parents non-Greeks, (v) Paternal and maternal educational level: primary school, gymnasium, lyceum, higher degree, (vi) Family's economic status (subjective view): poor, average, good, (vii) Number of adults at home, (viii) Number of children at home, (ix) Family size (persons at home): 2–3 persons, 4–5 persons, 6–8 persons, (x) Parental presence at home: single-parent families or not, (xi) TV-exposure (hours per day): ≤ 1 hour per day, 1–3 hours per day, > 3 hours per day, (xii) Presence of at least one person with a severe health problem at home: yes/no, (xiii) Level of physical exercise (days per week): none, 1–3 days per week, 4–7 days per week.

To reduce the number of assessed covariates, paternal and maternal educational level (primary school=0, gymnasium=1, lyceum=2, higher degree=3) were combined (by summing) to form a new parameter (0–6 scale), the combined parental educational level, which was treated as a continuous variable.

Statistical analyses

Continuous variables are described by mean \pm standard deviation (SD) or median and interquartile range in case of skewing. Comparisons were assessed by the Student t-test or the Mann-Whitney U test, respectively. Categorical data were described as absolute (n) and relative (%) frequencies and compared by the Fisher's exact test. Initially, bivariate analyses were used to identify parameters related to the probability of bullying. Subsequently, a stepwise backward multiple regression analysis was performed to establish a multivariate model. In the bivariate analyses, the significance level was set to 0.05. In the stepwise backward multiple regression analysis, the probability for entering a factor in the model was set to 0.05, whereas the probability for removing it was set to 0.051. The results of the logistic regression are presented as odds ratios (OR) along with 95% confidence intervals (ci). All analyses were performed using the Stata 11.0 MP statistical software (Stata Corp, TX, USA).

Results

Descriptive statistics and bivariate analyses

A total of 1,588 children and adolescents (51.9% females, aged 12.9 ± 2.8 years) were included in the analysis. Bullying was reported in 165 children corresponding to a prevalence of 10.4% in our population. Correlations between bullying and demographic and socioeconomic factors are illustrated in table 1.

Multivariate analyses

The final model that resulted after the stepwise regression analysis is presented in table 2. All the parameters that were significantly related to bullying in the bivariate analyses were retained in the final equation, with the exception of school group (primary school versus high school), where the observed effect in the bivariate analyses was absorbed

Table 1. Demographic and socioeconomic characteristics and their relation to the probability of victimization (1a. Categorical parameters, 1b. Continuous parameters).

	Probability of victimization	pi
Group, n (%)		0.001
Primary school (6–12 yrs), 416 (26.2%)	14.9%	
High school (Gymnasium & Lyceum, 12–18 yrs), 1172 (73.8%)	8.8%	
Gender, n (%)		0.8
Females, 825 (51.9%)	10.2%	
Males, 763 (48.1%)	10.6%	
Urban vs rural, n (%)		0.01
Urban, 1088 (68.5%)	11.7%	
Rural, 500 (31.5%)	7.4%	
Islands vs continental areas, n (%)		0.27
Islands, 268 (16.8%)	8.2%	
Continental areas, 1320 (83.2%)	10.8%	
Main urban centers, n (%)		<0.001
Athens & Thessaloniki, 876 (55.2%)	13.4%	
Elsewhere, 712 (44.8%)	6.6%	
Parental origin, n (%)		0.065
Both parents Greeks, 710 (44.7%)	11.7%	
One parent Greek, 98 (6.2%)	14.3%	
Both parents non-Greeks, 780 (49.1%)	8.7%	
Paternal educational level, n (%)		0.43
Primary school, 78 (4.9%)	15.4%	
Gymnasium, 232 (14.6%)	9.5%	
Lyceum, 630 (39.7%)	10.8%	
University, 647 (40.8%)	9.7%	
Maternal educational level, n (%)		0.038
Primary school, 78 (4.9%)	19.2%	
Gymnasium, 126 (7.9%)	8.7%	
Lyceum, 647 (40.8%)	8.8%	
University, 737 (46.4%)	11.1%	

Continues

Table 1. Demographic and socioeconomic characteristics and their relation to the probability of victimization (1a. Categorical parameters, 1b. Continuous parameters) (*Continued*).

1a. Categorical parameters		Probability of victimization	pⁱ	
Family's economic status, n (%)			0.002	
Good, 601 (37.8%)		8.0%		
Average, 890 (56.1%)		11.1%		
Poor, 97 (6.1%)		19.6%		
Number of adults at home, n (%)			0.055	
One, 111 (7.0%)		12.6%		
Two, 1282 (80.7%)		9.5%		
Three, 126 (7.9%)		12.7%		
Four, 65 (4.1%)		18.8%		
Family size (persons at home), n (%)			0.26	
2–3 persons, 269 (17.0%)		13.0%		
4–5 persons, 1124 (70.8%)		9.7%		
6–8 persons, 194 (12.2%)		10.8%		
Parental presence at home, n (%)			0.3	
Single parent, 139 (8.8%)		13.0%		
Both parents, 1449 (91.2%)		10.1%		
Days of physical exercise per week, n (%)			0.9	
None, 270 (17.0%)		10.4%		
1–3 days, 885 (55.8%)		10.3%		
4–7 days, 432 (27.2%)		10.7%		
Television exposure (hours per day), n (%)			0.19	
1 hour or less, 575, (36.2%)		11.3%		
1–3 hours, 923 (58.1%)		9.4%		
More than 3 hours, 90 (5.7%)		14.4%		
Person at home with a severe health problem, n (%)			0.004	
No, 1470 (92.6%)		9.7%		
Yes, 118 (7.4%)		18.6%		
1b. Continuous Parameters				
	Overallⁱⁱⁱ	Bullyingⁱⁱ	No bullyingⁱⁱ	p
Age (years)	12.9±2.8 13.3 (11.9–14.5)	12.3±3.1 13.0 (9.6–14.3)	12.9±2.7 13.3 (12.0–14.5)	0.011 ⁱⁱⁱ
Number of children at home	2.23±0.89 2 (2–3)	2.17±1.00 2 (2–3)	2.23±0.88 2 (2–3)	0.093 ^{iv}
Parental combined educational level	4.4±1.5 5 (4–6)	4.4±1.6 5 (4–6)	4.5±1.5 5 (4–6)	0.73 ^{iv}

Note: $p < 0.05$ was considered as statistically significant; Parental combined educational level is a 0–6 scale resulting from summing the maternal and paternal educational level: primary school: 0, gymnasium: 1, lyceum: 2, higher degree: 3

(i) Fisher's exact test, (ii) mean \pm standard deviation, median (interquartile range), (iii) Student's t-test, (iv) Mann-Whitney U-test

Table 2. Logistic regression analysis on the probability of victimization.

Parameter	Odds Ratio	95% CI	p
Main urban centers or not Athens/Thessaloniki vs Elsewhere	2.63	1.78–3.87	<0.001
Person with a chronic health problem at home Yes vs No	1.90	1.12–3.20	0.016
Family's economic status Poor vs Good	1.83	1.05–3.20	0.032
Parental combined educational level	0.88	0.78–0.99	0.05
Number of adults at home Four vs Two	2.00	1.00–3.77	0.041

Note: Stepwise backward multiple logistic regression was conducted; $p < 0.05$ was considered as statistically significant; Combined parental educational level is a 0-6 scale resulting from summing the maternal and paternal educational level: primary school: 0, gymnasium: 1, lyceum: 2, higher degree: 3. It was treated as continuous variable; CI=Confidence interval

by the other covariates in the final model. In detail, living at a main urban center (2.6 times higher probability of bullying), the presence of a person with a chronic illness at home (1.9-fold increased probability), reporting poor financial status compared to good (1.8 times increased risk) and increased number of adults at home (4 vs. 2.2-fold higher probability) had a positive correlation with the prevalence of reported bullying victimization. The parental educational level had an inverse mode of association, with an estimated decrease of 12% in the risk of bullying per one unit higher educational level in our 0-6 scale (table 2).

Discussion

We investigated the prevalence of the perception of being bullied in a large school-based sample of Greek children and adolescents from 6 to 17 years of age and explored the relations among the subjective impression of bullying victimization and several sociodemographic, socioeconomic, physical, and psychosocial factors.

Overall, 10.4% of our school-based sample reported being bullied. In a representative sample of Greek late adolescents, the prevalence of pupils involved in bullying-related behaviors at least once monthly either as victims, perpetrators or both was 26.4%, while the prevalence of victims only and victims-perpetrators was 12.8%.²⁴ Bullying at school takes place in almost all countries although its prevalence

is highly variable.^{1,9} The cross-cultural variations of the prevalence of bullying may reflect the different culture-specific risk factors among countries or may be the result of differences in study design, the nature of the sample, the definition of bullying used and the target population (perpetrators, victims or both).^{3,24}

The multivariate analysis pointed out that living at a main urban center, the presence of a person with a chronic illness at home, poor financial status, increased number of adults at home and low parental educational level are associated with a perception of being bullied.

Age and gender

In our sample, percentages of children being bullied were higher in the younger age group as indicated by the school grade. In addition, the group of children reporting victimization was significantly younger than children and adolescents who did not report victimization. Also, there was no significant difference in the prevalence of reported victimization between the two sexes. These findings are in line with previous studies assuming that a factor strongly associated with victimization is younger age, while sex has not been observed to have an impact on the frequency of being bullied reports.^{1,9,25} However, age per se did not modify any of the associations and was not a significant predictor of victimization in the multivariate model.

Geographic data

Bullying is by definition a phenomenon that occurs within a social context. The factor most strongly associated with the perception of being a bullying victim was the residency in main urban centers. This finding needs to be considered in the context of previous research on the association of school and/or neighborhood factors with the prevalence of bullying victimization. More precisely, it has been previously reported that school overcrowding and larger school size are key factors in the likelihood of becoming a bullying victim.^{26,27} Also, hostile interactions in the neighborhood level, which are more common in main urban centers, may lead to reproduction of such bullying behaviors in the school context.²⁸ Moreover, this finding may reflect to a certain extent the low degree of social cohesion that characterizes the large urban centers in comparison to rural areas and small cities, where children's friendships and close peer networks function as protective factors for bullying victimization.²⁹ Finally, a possible alternative explanation of the higher probability of victimization in urban centers may reside in factors including heightened awareness and less fear or shame from the part of the children or/and their parents respecting the declaration of the bullying victimization incident.

Socioeconomic status (SES)

Our approach to measuring SES comprised as indicators the paternal education, the maternal education, the combined parental educational level and the economic status of the family. The multivariate analysis showed that both lower educational level of parents and lower economic status of the family are independently associated with a higher risk of children being bullying victims. The findings concerning the parental educational level are in line with previous studies indicating that poor parental education is associated with a significant increased risk of victimization.^{3,18,30} A possible explanation of this pattern is that high level of parental education is accompanied by greater access to intellectual resources and positive family environment, which are both related to children's development of adequate social skills, positive self-related cognitions and problem-solving skills.^{11,18} Furthermore, our

study has pointed out a positive relation between the lower economic status of the family and the reported victimization. In accordance with our findings, there is a broad agreement to date suggesting that victimization is positively related to low SES.^{17,31} An explanation of this finding may reside in the fact that being different from the peer group is a main motivator for victimization.³² In addition, low parental SES has appeared to be associated with more adverse home environments.¹⁷ The positive association between low self-reported parental affluence and bullying victimization in our sample may reflect the degree of socioeconomic disparities within the Greek society. In addition, it could be argued that except from the SES as an absolute value, the focus of interest should be on the degree of socioeconomic inequality among children in the school as a factor of higher risk of victimization.

Family context

The presence of a person with a chronic illness at home and increased number of adults at home correlated positively with the prevalence of those perceiving themselves to be victims of bullying. Although it would be premature to make a hypothesis about these associations until future studies are conducted, explanation for these relations should be considered. Most studies on the impact of disease on family members have shown that a wide variety of aspects of family quality of life can be affected in multiple ways across all medical specialties.³³ Several impact areas have been identified, including familial psychological and emotional functioning, financial resources, family interpersonal relationships, education and work, leisure time, and social activities.^{34,35} As a consequence, parents' emotional distress may disrupt both parenting and the interactions between parent and child leading to poor outcomes of children's physical and emotional health and their cognitive and social functioning.³⁶ Negative family environment, emotional instability, internalizing problems, low self-esteem and lack of adequate social problem-solving skills are significant predictors and have been consistently associated with bullying victimization.^{3,11} We have no clear explanation for the positive influence of the number of adults at home to the perception of being victimized. In previous studies it was suggested

that having a calm and well-structured home environment characterized by warm relationships within the family is important for positive development in all children.³⁷ This may reduce overall stress levels in victimized children and increase the potential of achieving positive social adaptation.³⁷ We suppose that the presence of more than two adults in the household potentially increases the amount of adult time available to a child but may lead to role confusion and complicate the difficulties inherent in parenting.³⁶

Strengths and limitations of the study

The major strengths of the study are the large epidemiological sample of 1,588 children from a wide range of ages, as well as the geographical distribution of the sample, including urban and rural areas all over the country. However, our findings should be interpreted cautiously in the light of several limitations. First and foremost, the cross-sectional design of the study does not allow determining the directionality of the associations. In addition, parents and adolescents were called to answer in a simple “yes or no” question assessing the subjective perception of being victimized. Thus, a potential confounding factor is the personal differences in understand-

ing of the term of bullying victimization.³⁸ Another limitation may stem from the fact that all variables were self-reported and not based on objective data. Also, although the list of variables was extensive, it was not exhaustive given that individual factors, which have been shown to be predictors of victimization, were not included. Finally, for the precise interpretation of our results it should be taken into account that the group of victims and the group of bully-victims are treated as a single group and also, the different types of bullying (i.e. direct/indirect, verbal/physical etc.) were not assessed.

Conclusions

Our findings demonstrate the extent to which influences external to individual children and adolescents play a decisive role to their perception of being victimized. Thus, our results highlight the need to also consider the influence of contextual factors in the design of targeting efforts countering and/or preventing bullying victimization. Finally, while this study may add to our knowledge of the prevalence and potential risk factors of bullying victimization among Greek children and adolescents, further research with prospective studies is needed.

Σχολικός εκφοβισμός: Σχετιζόμενοι παράγοντες πλαισίου σε ελληνικό δείγμα παιδιών και εφήβων

**Π. Περβανίδου, Γ. Μακρής, Η. Μπούζιος, Γ. Χρούσος,
Ε. Ρώμα, Γ. Χουλιάρας**

*Α' Παιδιατρική Κλινική, Ιατρική Σχολή, Εθνικό και Καποδιστριακό Πανεπιστήμιο Αθηνών,
Νοσοκομείο Παίδων «Η Αγία Σοφία», Αθήνα*

Ψυχιατρική 2019, 30:216–225

Το φαινόμενο του σχολικού εκφοβισμού αποτελεί σημαντικό παράγοντα αρνητικής επίδρασης στη σωματική και ψυχική υγεία του ατόμου καθώς και στην ευρύτερη κοινωνική λειτουργία. Μελέτες παρέχουν δεδομένα για τη σχέση παραγόντων πλαισίου με τη θυματοποίηση στο πλαίσιο σχολικού εκφοβισμού. Στους παράγοντες πλαισίου περιλαμβάνονται ανάμεσα σε άλλους το κοινωνικοοικονομικό επίπεδο των γονέων/της οικογένειας, η ποιότητα του οικογενειακού περιβάλλοντος, γενικά και ειδικά χαρακτηριστικά του σχολικού πλαισίου, όπως το μέγεθος του σχολείου

και η δομή του καθώς επίσης και ποικίλα χαρακτηριστικά της κοινότητας. Η παρούσα αναδρομική μελέτη εστιάζει στη σχέση ορισμένων δημογραφικών και κοινωνικοοικονομικών παραγόντων με την υποκειμενική αντίληψη θυματοποίησης στο πλαίσιο σχολικού εκφοβισμού σε δείγμα από τον ελληνικό πληθυσμό παιδιών και εφήβων 6–17 ετών. Υποθέσαμε ότι επιδράσεις εξωτερικές των μεμονωμένων ατόμων διαδραματίζουν αποφασιστικό ρόλο στην υποκειμενική αντίληψη θυματοποίησής τους στο σχολικό περιβάλλον. Η αξιολόγηση της θυματοποίησης έγινε μέσω ερώτησης τύπου «ναι/όχι», η οποία επιβεβαίωνε ή απέρριπτε αντίστοιχα το γεγονός ότι το παιδί ή ο έφηβος έχει υπάρξει κάποια στιγμή θύμα εκφοβισμού στο σχολικό περιβάλλον. Συγχρόνως, συλλέχθηκαν από τους γονείς πληροφορίες σχετικά με δημογραφικά και κοινωνικοοικονομικά στοιχεία των οικογενειών των παιδιών και των εφήβων. Συνολικά συμπεριλήφθηκαν στη μελέτη 1.588 παιδιά και έφηβοι (51,8% κορίτσια, μέση ηλικία: 12,9±2,8 έτη). Ο επιπολασμός της υποκειμενικής εντύπωσης θυματοποίησης στο σύνολο του δείγματος ήταν 10,4%. Ανάλυση πολλαπλής λογιστικής παλινδρόμησης έδειξε θετική συσχέτιση της πιθανότητας θυματοποίησης με την κατοικία σε κύρια αστική περιοχή (Odds Ratio [OR]: 2,63, CI: 1,78–3,87, $p < 0,001$), την παρουσία στο σπίτι ενός ατόμου με χρόνια νόσο (OR: 1,90, CI: 1,12–3,20, $p = 0,016$), το χαμηλό οικογενειακό οικονομικό επίπεδο (OR: 1,83, CI: 1,05–3,20, $p = 0,032$) και τον αυξημένο αριθμό ενηλίκων στο σπίτι (OR: 2,00, CI: 1,00–3,77, $p = 0,041$). Επίσης, το υψηλότερο μορφωτικό επίπεδο των γονέων συσχετίστηκε με χαμηλότερη πιθανότητα σχολικού εκφοβισμού (OR: 0,88, CI: 0,78–0,99, $p = 0,05$). Τα ευρήματα της παρούσας μελέτης καταδεικνύουν ότι δημογραφικοί και κοινωνικοοικονομικοί παράγοντες διαδραματίζουν σημαντικό ρόλο στην υποκειμενική αντίληψη θυματοποίησης από σχολικό εκφοβισμό μεταξύ παιδιών και εφήβων. Επομένως, υπογραμμίζεται η ανάγκη να συμπεριλαμβάνονται στον σχεδιασμό παρεμβάσεων πρόληψης ή/και αντιμετώπισης του σχολικού εκφοβισμού παράγοντες που αφορούν στο ευρύτερο δημογραφικό και κοινωνικοοικονομικό πλαίσιο.

Λέξεις ευρητηρίου: Σχολικός εκφοβισμός, θυματοποίηση, δημογραφικοί παράγοντες, κοινωνικοοικονομική κατάσταση, παράγοντες πλαισίου.

References

1. Nansel TR, Overpeck M, Pilla RS, Ruan JW, Simons-Morton B, Scheidt P. Bullying Behaviors Among US Youth: Prevalence and Association With Psychosocial Adjustment. *JAMA* 2001, 285: 2094–2100, doi: 10.1001/jama.285.16.2094
2. Arseneault L, Bowes L, Shakoor S. Bullying victimization in youths and mental health problems: "Much ado about nothing"? *Psychol Med* 2010, 40:717–729, doi: 10.1017/S0033291709991383
3. Analitis F, Velderman MK, Ravens-Sieberer U, Detmar S, Erhart M, Herdman M et al. Being Bullied: Associated Factors in Children and Adolescents 8 to 18 Years Old in 11 European Countries. *Pediatrics* 2009, 132: 569–577, doi: 10.1542/peds.2008-0323
4. Wolke D, Woods S, Stanford K, Schulz H. Bullying and victimization of primary school children in England and Germany: prevalence and school factors. *Br J Psychol* 2001, 92:673–696, doi: 10.1348/000712601162419
5. Baldry AC, Farrington DP. Brief report: types of bullying among Italian school children. *J Adolesc* 1999, 22:423–426, doi: 10.1006/jado.1999.0234
6. Nansel TR, Craig W, Overpeck MD, Saluja G, Ruan WJ. Health Behaviour in School-aged Children Bullying Analyses Working Group. Cross-national consistency in the relationship between bullying behaviors and psychosocial adjustment. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med* 2004, 158:730–736, doi: 10.1001/archpedi.158.8.730
7. Craig W, Harel-Fisch Y, Fogel-Grinvald H, Dostaler S, Hetland J, Simons-Morton B et al. A cross-national profile of bullying and victimization among adolescents in 40 countries. *Int J Public Health* 2009, 54:216–224, doi: 10.1007/s00038-009-5413-9
8. Whitney I, Smith PK. A survey of the nature and extent of bullying in junior/middle and secondary schools. *Educ Res* 1993, 35:3–25, doi: 10.1080/0013188930350101
9. Due P, Holstein BE. Bullying victimization among 13 to 15 year old school children: Results from two comparative studies in 66 countries and regions. *Int J Adolesc Med Health* 2008, 20: 209–221, doi: 10.1515/IJAMH.2008.20.2.209
10. Chester KL, Spencer NH, Whiting L, Brooks FM. Association Between Experiencing Relational Bullying and Adolescent Health-Related Quality of Life. *J Sch Health* 2017, 87:865–872, doi: 10.1111/josh.12558
11. Cook C, Williams K, Guerra N, Kim T, Sadek S. Predictors of Bullying and Victimization in Childhood and Adolescence: A Meta-analytic Investigation. *Sch Psychol Q* 2010, 25:65–83, doi: 10.1037/a0020149
12. Kljakovic M, Hunt C. A meta-analysis of predictors of bullying and victimisation in adolescence. *J Adolesc* 2016, 49:134–145, doi: 10.1016/j.adolescence.2016.03.002

13. Van Cleave J, Davis M. Bullying and peer victimization among children with special health care needs. *Pediatrics* 2006, 118: 1212–1219, doi: 10.1542/peds.2005-3034
14. Fekkes M, Pijpers F, Fredriks A, Vogels T, Verloove-Vanhorick S. Do bullied children get ill, or do ill children get bullied? A prospective cohort study on the relationship between bullying and health-related symptoms. *Pediatrics* 2006, 117:1568–1574, doi: 10.1542/peds.2005-0187
15. Kumpulainen K, Rasanen E, Henttonen I. Children involved in bullying: psychological disturbance and the persistence of the involvement. *Child Abuse Negl* 1999, 23:1253–1262, doi: 10.1016/S0145-2134(99)00098-8
16. Bontempo D, D'Augelli A. Effects of at-school victimization and sexual orientation on lesbian, gay, or bisexual youths' health risk behavior. *J Adolesc Health* 2002, 30:364–374, doi:10.1016/S1054-139X(01)00415-3
17. Tippett N, Wolke D. Socioeconomic Status and Bullying: A Meta-Analysis. *Am J Publ Health* 2014, 104:48–59, doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2014.301960
18. Jansen PW, Verlinden M, Dommisse-van Berkel A, Mieloo C, Ende J, Veenstra R et al. Prevalence of bullying and victimization among children in early elementary school: do family and school neighbourhood socioeconomic status matter? *BMC Publ Health* 2012, 12:494–504, doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-12-494
19. Lemstra M, Nielsen G, Rogers M, Thompson A, Moraros J. Risk indicators and outcomes associated with bullying in youth aged 9–15 years. *Can J Publ Health* 2012, 103:9–13, doi: 10.17269/cjph.103.2404
20. Lumeng J, Forrest P, Appugliese D, Kaciroti N, Corwyn R, Bradley R. Weight status as a predictor of being bullied in third through sixth grades. *Pediatrics* 2010, 125:1301–1307, doi: 10.1542/peds.2009-0774
21. Card NA, Hodges EVE. Peer Victimization Among Schoolchildren: Correlations, Causes, Consequences, and Considerations in Assessment and Intervention. *Sch Psychol Q* 2008, 23:451–461, doi: 10.1037/a0012769
22. Espelage DL, De la Rue L. School bullying: its nature and ecology. *Int J Adolesc Med Health* 2012, 24:3–10, doi: 10.1515/ijamh.2012.002
23. Bouzios I, Chouliaras G, Chrousos GP, Rome E, Gemou-Engesaeth V. Functional gastrointestinal disorders in Greek Children based on ROME III criteria: identifying the child at risk. *Neurogastroenterol Motil* 2016, 29:1–8, doi: 10.1111/nmo.12951
24. Magklara K, Skapinakis P, Gkatsa T, Bellos S, Araya R, Stylianidis S et al. Bullying behaviour in schools, socioeconomic position and psychiatric morbidity: a cross-sectional study in late adolescents in Greece. *Child Adolesc Psychiatry Ment Health* 2012, 6:1–13, doi: 10.1186/1753-2000-6-8
25. Dao T, Kerbs J, Rollin S et al. The association between bullying dynamics and psychological distress. *J Adolesc Health* 2006, 39: 277–282, doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2005.11.001
26. Nolin MJ, Davies E, Chandler K. Student victimization at school. *J Sch Health* 1996, 66:216–222, doi: 10.1111/j.1746-1561.1996.tb08289.x
27. Barnes J, Belsky J, Broomfield KA, Melhuish E, the National Evaluation of Sure Start (NESS) Research Team. Neighbourhood deprivation, school disorder and academic achievement in primary schools in deprived communities in England. *Int J Behav Dev* 2006, 30:127–136, doi: 10.1177/0165025406063585
28. Bowes L, Arseneault L, Maughan B, Taylor A, Caspi A, Moffitt TE. School, Neighborhood, and Family Factors Are Associated With Children's Bullying Involvement: A Nationally Representative Longitudinal Study. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 2009, 48:547–553, doi: 10.1097/CHI.0b013e31819cb017
29. Karna A, Voeten M, Poskiparta E, Salmivalli C. Vulnerable Children in Varying Classroom Contexts: Bystanders' Behaviors Moderate the Effects of Risk Factors on Victimization. *Merrill-Palmer Q* 2010, 56:261–282, doi: 10.1353/mpq.0.0052.
30. Nordhagen R, Nielsen A, Stigum H, Kohler L. Parental reported bullying among Nordic children: a population based study. *Child Care Health Dev* 2005, 31:693–701, doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2214.2005.00559.x
31. Due P, Merlo J, Harel-Fisch Y, Damsgaard MT, Soc MS, Holstein BE et al. Socioeconomic Inequality in Exposure to Bullying During Adolescence: A Comparative, Cross-Sectional, Multilevel Study in 35 Countries. *Am J Publ Health* 2009, 99: 907–914, doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2008.139303
32. Thornberg R. Schoolchildren's social representations on bullying causes. *Psychol Sch* 2010, 47:311–327, doi: 10.1002/pits.20472
33. Golics CJ, Basra MK, Salek MS, Finlay AY. The impact of patients' chronic disease on family quality of life: an experience from 26 specialties. *Int J Gen Med* 2013, 6:787–798, doi: 10.2147/IJGM.S45156
34. Golics CJ, Basra MK, Finlay AY, Salek S. The impact of disease on family members: a critical aspect of medical care. *J R Soc Med* 2013, 106:399–407, doi: 10.1177/0141076812472616
35. Holmes AM, Deb P. The effect of chronic illness on the psychological health of family members. *J Ment Health Policy Econ* 2003, 6:13–22, PMID: 14578544
36. Schor EL, American Academy of Pediatrics Task Force on the Family. Family Pediatrics: Report of the Task Force on the Family. *Pediatrics* 2003, 111: 1541–1571, PMID: 12777595
37. Bowes L, Maughan B, Caspi A, Moffitt TE, Arseneault L. Families promote emotional and behavioural resilience to bullying: evidence of an environmental effect. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry* 2010, 51:809–817, doi: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.2010.02216.x
38. Monks CP, Smith PK. Definitions of bullying: Age differences in understanding of the term, and the role of experience. *Br J Dev Psychol* 2006, 24:801–821, doi: 10.1348/026151005X82352

Corresponding author: G. Makris, First Department of Pediatrics, School of Medicine, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, "Aghia Sophia" Children's Hospital, Thivon & Levadias street, 115 27 Goudi, Athens, Greece, Tel: (+30) 6939-750 609, Fax: 213-20 1 3 457
e-mail: makrisgi@med.uoa.gr