Original Article
IRISTI 14.25.01 10.51889/2960-1649.2025.64.3.008

MYRZAPEISSOVA MERUYERT[1], DUDA EWA[2]*

[1]*L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University (Kazakhstan, Astana)*
[2]*Maria Grzegorzewska University, (Poland, Warsaw)*

*Address of correspondence: M. Myrzapeissova, PhD student 3rd year, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University 6 Yanishkevich Str., Astana, Republic of Kazakhstan, https://orcid.org/0009-0000-3614-3212, E-mail address: mirza_17.08.83@mail.ru

Socio-Pedagogical Prevention of Bullying in the School Environment: A Gender-Oriented Approach

Abstract

Introduction. The article examines the socio-pedagogical prevention of bullying among schoolchildren, with special consideration of gender-specific behavioral characteristics. Bullying is a widespread phenomenon that threatens children's safety, well-being, and academic achievement. Research shows that boys are more frequently involved in physical and direct bullying, while girls tend to use relational and indirect forms such as exclusion or rumor-spreading. In Kazakhstan, similar tendencies are observed, underscoring the need for gender-sensitive prevention programs. *Methodology and Methods.* The study is based on a literature review of both classical and contemporary scholarly works, including international and Kazakhstani research. The analysis covers psychological, family, school, and peer-related factors influencing bullying, with particular attention to the role of gender norms in shaping aggressive and victimized behaviors. *Results*. The findings indicate clear gender differences: boys are more prone to overt physical and verbal bullying, whereas girls more often use relational and indirect forms. Cyberbullying affects both genders almost equally, although girls are slightly more often victims. The school climate, teacher attitudes, family conditions, and peer norms strongly determine the forms and prevalence of bullying. *Scientific novelty.* The research develops a socio-pedagogical model of bullying prevention that incorporates gender-specific behavioral patterns. The study demonstrates the importance of differentiated prevention strategies for boys and girls to enhance the effectiveness of anti-bullying programs. *Practical significance.* The proposed approach can be applied in schools to strengthen preventive work, improve the socio-psychological climate, and enhance cooperation among teachers, students, and parents. It provides practical recommendations for reducing aggression, addressing cyberbullying, and fostering safe and supportive school environments where every child feels valued.

Keywords: bullying, socio-pedagogical prevention, schoolchildren, gender differences, aggression, conflict situations, cyberbullying.

Introduction. Bullying is a harmful phenomenon in school relationships in which one or several students repeatedly mistreat another. This is usually done with the intention of intimidation and is based on a power imbalance (Olweus, 1993). Bullying occurs in every country worldwide and poses a direct threat to the safety and well-being of children. According to the 2019 joint report by UNESCO and UNICEF, one in three adolescents aged 13–15 had experienced bullying in the past month - amounting to approximately 150 million students (UNESCO & UNICEF, 2019). School students who experience such bullying often develop anxiety, depression, and low self-esteem, which can lead to a decline in academic performance. The manifestations of bullying and the responses to it can vary significantly depending on gender. Research shows that boys are more inclined toward overt and physical aggression, whereas girls tend to use indirect methods such as subtle verbal remarks, spreading rumors, or social exclusion. Taking these gender-specific behavioral characteristics into account is a crucial condition for effectively planning bullying prevention programs. In the Kazakhstani context, recent research confirms similar patterns: boys are more frequently

involved in direct physical bullying, while girls tend toward relational and indirect forms. For example, Asylbekova, Atemova, and Somzhurek (2023) found that among adolescents in Turkistan region, physical bullying incidents were significantly more common among boys, whereas relational and verbal forms were more prevalent among girls, mirroring international trends. These findings underscore the importance of integrating gender-sensitive approaches into national anti-bullying strategies.

Materials and Methods. This study is based on a literature review that included both classical and recent scholarly works. The reviewed sources comprised peer-reviewed articles, books, and official reports published in international and Kazakhstani contexts.

School bullying has been actively studied in pedagogy and psychology since the late 20th century. One of the first researchers to draw scientific attention to the phenomenon was Norwegian scholar Dan Olweus, who defined bullying as a repeated form of aggression involving a power imbalance and demonstrated its widespread occurrence in schools (Olweus, 1993). Over the last decade, studies across various countries have revealed that 10–30% of students are involved in bullying-either as perpetrators or victims (Olweus, 2013). The gender dimension of bullying behavior requires particular attention: many studies indicate that boys are more likely than girls to engage in bullying (Craig et al., 2009). For example, research conducted in Iran found that the prevalence of both bullying perpetration and victimization was significantly higher among boys than among girls ($p < 0.001$) (Aluede et al., 2008).

However, girls are not exempt from bullying dynamics: they are more often involved in indirect forms of aggression and, in some cases, occupy the "bully–victim" role, in which they both bully others and are bullied themselves (Haynie et al., 2001). Some meta-analyses show no substantial gender gap in victimization rates: while boys are more often subjected to direct physical violence, boys and girls experience relational (social) bullying at similar levels (Card et al., 2008). Thus, boys are more frequently targeted with overt force, whereas girls are equally exposed to covert forms of exclusion and rumor-spreading (Crick & Grotpeter, 1995).

To understand these gendered patterns, researchers examine the social drivers of bullying. Boys are often socialized from childhood to resolve conflicts through direct physical force, with societal stereotypes promoting the idea that "a man should be strong and brave" influencing their behavior (Connell, 2005). In contrast, girls are discouraged from displaying open aggression, which leads them to channel hostility through indirect means (Underwood, 2003). Girls tend to place a high value on close friendships and often form smaller, more intimate groups; as a result, relational aggression such as rumor-spreading, reputation damage, and exclusion is more prevalent among girls, as these methods inflict harm by severing social bonds (Sullivan et al., 2006). According to some scholars, a girl may exclude another girl or spread rumors about her as a way to gain entry into another friendship group or to maintain her own position (Owens et al., 2000). For boys, the pursuit of status and leadership within the peer group can be a driving force behind bullying: in many cases, bullying serves as a tool for social control and competition for dominance, with the aggressor seeking to enhance his reputation among peers (Pellegrini & Long, 2002). Some studies argue that, for boys, appearing as a "real man" in the group context is a way to avoid becoming a target themselves; thus, even those who feel vulnerable may pre-emptively resort to aggression (Rodkin et al., 2015). In this sense, gendered social norms - ideas of "being a man" or "behaving like a lady" - are among the key factors underlying bullying behaviors (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005).

In recent years, Kazakh society has begun to place greater emphasis on measures to combat violence in schools. One of the steps taken in this direction is providing every student with the opportunity to submit an anonymous complaint: schools have installed QR codes for the "111" helpline, which, when scanned, allow children to request assistance directly. This is clear evidence that significant attention is being

given to the fight against bullying at the national level.

The scientific literature identifies several main types and forms of bullying. The most frequently cited classification includes physical, verbal, social (relational), and cyberbullying (Smith, Cowie, Olafsson, & Liefooghe, 2002). This source systematically presents the most common forms of bullying and compares them at the international level (Table 1).

Table 1. *Specific features of bullying types among boys and girls*

Bullying Type	Among Boys	Among Girls	Sources
Physical bullying (hitting, pushing, damaging belongings)	Usually the most common type. Boys more often use physical force; fighting and displays of strength are considered "normal" among boys. Victims of physical bullying are also mostly boys – punching or shoving incidents are more frequently recorded.	Rarely occurs. Girls are far less likely to use direct physical violence and are less often victims of it compared to boys. Physical assault incidents among girls are exceptional cases.	Olweus, 1993; Smith et al., 2019
Verbal bullying (name-calling, mocking, threatening)	Widespread among boys, often in the form of direct insults, name-calling, and intimidation. Some boys use harsh words as an alternative to fighting.	Very common. Girls often use verbal aggression in indirect forms: giving offensive nicknames, speaking badly behind someone's back, making derogatory remarks. Studies suggest girls may engage in verbal bullying more often than boys, often combining it with social exclusion.	Archer & Coyne, 2005; Espelage et al., 2013
Social/relational bullying (exclusion, damaging reputation, spreading rumors)	Boys sometimes engage in such indirect bullying, but since they are accustomed to open confrontation, it is less frequent. In some cases, boys may try to alienate someone from a group or turn others against them, but it is not as common as among girls.	The most characteristic type. Girls often harm others by undermining their reputation rather than confronting them directly. Examples: excluding a former close friend from the group, exposing personal secrets, speaking ill behind their back. Some studies call this "girl-specific aggression".	Crick & Grotpeter, 1995; Card et al., 2008
Cyberbullying (online harassment via internet/social media)	Common among both genders. The anonymity and perceived impunity online affect boys as much as girls. Research shows little difference in frequency between boys and girls. Boys sometimes use the internet as a continuation of physical bullying (sending threats, posting offensive images).	Occurs in both genders. Since girls use social networks more often, some data suggest they are more frequently victims of cyberbullying. Examples: spreading false rumors, excluding from online groups. However, overall participation rates in cyberbullying are similar for boys and girls.	Kowalski et al., 2014; Smith et al., 2008

Note: Boys tend to use physical and direct methods more often, while girls are more likely to resort to indirect and verbal strategies; however, this difference is not absolute - each individual case depends on various factors.

Bullying emerges and develops under the influence of a combination of factors at several levels. Personal psychological traits, family circumstances, the school environment,

and the influence of the peer group - adverse conditions in any of these four areas can trigger or exacerbate bullying. Below, these factors are analyzed with attention to possible gender differences.

Psychological factors (individual behavioral characteristics) - whether or not a child participates in bullying is largely determined by their personality, temperament, and ability to regulate emotions. Students in the bully role are often described as irritable, aggressive, and low in empathy. Indeed, to exert pressure on others, a child may have an unfulfilled desire for power, a need to prove themselves, or a habit of releasing aggression outward. For instance, in the literature there is the concept of "toxic masculinity" - a social norm that silently teaches boys not to cry, not to be gentle, and to resolve any conflict with physical force. Boys raised under such attitudes may perceive sensitivity as weakness, maintain a tough demeanor, and be inclined to dominate others. Research indicates that boys who strongly adhere to traditional masculinity norms are more likely to bully peers, seeing it as a way to be a "real man" (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). By contrast, girls often strive to match the socially expected image of warmth and non-aggression. Fearing that expressing anger openly will make them seem "cruel" or "improper", they may avoid direct confrontation and internalize their anger. As a result, girls tend to channel anger indirectly - through gossip or social exclusion - which leads them to engage in bullying in different forms (Salmivalli, 2010).

Bullying victims also tend to have a distinct psychological profile. Some children who are targeted have low self-esteem, shyness, and introversion, making them less able to defend themselves. If such children stand out from their peers (for example, due to a physical disability, being overweight, or having weak social skills) and feel socially isolated, bullies may exploit these vulnerabilities (Cook, Williams, Guerra, & Kim, 2010). At the same time, in some cases the victim may also display aggressive behavior. Certain students experience ostracism from classmates due to generally aggressive conduct, or their inability to respond effectively to bullying leads to internalized anger, which may later drive them to target another, more vulnerable peer. In psychology, such a dual role is described by the concept of the *bully-victim* - a child who is both a perpetrator and a target of bullying. These children often struggle with emotional regulation and exhibit both external and internal distress. Studies have found that children with emotional and behavioral problems are more frequently involved in bullying - because their ability to channel feelings such as anger and resentment constructively is underdeveloped, they are more prone to conflicts, ending up either hurting others or being hurt themselves (Zych, Farrington, Llorent, & Ttofi, 2019).

When discussing psychological factors in bullying, gender differences should not be overlooked. Boys more often exhibit *externalizing* behaviors (e.g., fighting, physical aggression), whereas girls tend to respond with *internalizing* reactions (e.g., anxiety, depression, guilt). As a result, bullying among boys is often more visible and overt (physical harm, direct insults), while girls' bullying may be less noticeable (silent exclusion, passive resistance). Additionally, children who do not conform to gender norms are at particular risk. If a boy is perceived as feminine or a girl as masculine, peers may begin to punish them socially. Teasing or mocking for deviating from gender stereotypes - sometimes called *gender-based bullying* - can be carried out both by peers of the opposite sex and by those of the same sex. For instance, feminine boys may be mocked by other boys as "sissies," while overly assertive girls may be disliked and excluded by other girls.

Family factors -the family is the first and most important environment in which a child's behavior is formed. Therefore, family circumstances have a significant impact on the development of a propensity for bullying. Children who become bullies often grow up in households characterized either by strict authoritarian control or, conversely, by a lack of supervision. Research shows that frequent conflicts between parents, parental abuse, harsh punishment, or neglect can increase the

likelihood that a child will become an aggressor among peers (Baldry & Farrington, 2000). For example, a child from a home where constant quarrels or violence occur may come to see resolving disputes through force as normal. In some cases, children who experience violence at home (being physically beaten or subjected to psychological pressure) may target weaker peers outside the home as a way to release their own anger and fear.

School factors-school climate and discipline are among the key factors determining whether bullying will spread or be eradicated. If school rules are lax, a culture of cruelty exists among students, and educational work is poorly organized, bullying incidents will inevitably become more frequent. Research confirms that students who perceive the school environment as unfavorable are more likely to engage in bullying; in groups where bullying is observed, the level of school satisfaction is significantly lower (Wang, Berry, & Swearer, 2013). Conversely, when the school provides a safe, supportive environment - where every student feels like a respected member and teachers act fairly and maintain supervision - bullying can be effectively curtailed. Among the most important school-related factors are: the school's anti-bullying policy, the extent of teacher intervention, the adequacy of supervision, and the fairness of disciplinary measures. If the school administration turns a blind eye to bullying or fails to take appropriate action, aggressors will feel a sense of impunity and continue their abuse. In some cases, teachers themselves may humiliate or belittle certain students, prompting the whole class to exclude that student - this can be considered a starting point for bullying. Such breaches of professional ethics by teachers can be particularly harmful for boys, fostering an atmosphere that glorifies physical dominance. In the case of girls, some teachers may ignore minor social conflicts, dismissing them as "girls own business", while in reality allowing serious psychological abuse to occur.

Gender stereotypes may also exist among teachers: for instance, dismissing boys' fights as "boys being boys", or viewing girls' gossip and rumors as "harmless fun", both of which contribute to the persistence of bullying. Therefore, a zero-tolerance culture toward all forms of bullying must be established in schools.

Another important factor is classroom organization and monitoring of key areas. Bullying typically occurs in places where adults are not watching (corridors, schoolyards, on the way to and from school). If teachers take turns supervising the corridors during breaks, and schoolyard monitors are present, bullying can be detected and stopped early. Additionally, if school rules specify clear consequences for bullying (e.g., counseling, working with parents, or, if necessary, temporary suspension), students will understand that there are repercussions and will be less likely to engage in aggression. In conclusion, the internal school climate is a primary factor influencing the prevalence of bullying. To create a positive and cooperative climate, school administrators, teachers, students, and parents must work together (detailed recommendations are provided in the "Suggestions" section).

Some studies also indicate that low socioeconomic status can play a role: factors such as unemployment, poverty, or parental alcoholism can contribute to a child's being filled with anger and growing up without adequate guidance (Tippett & Wolke, 2014).

Peer factors-for children and adolescents, the peer group is both a setting for personality development and a social arena where bullying can flourish. The influence of peers works in two ways: if a group embraces violent tendencies and holds the misguided belief that "the strong should dominate the weak," any child may succumb to group pressure and become a bully (Salmivalli, 2010). For example, if a teenager's friends make fun of other children, the teenager may follow suit in order to conform - a phenomenon known as conformity. Research has shown that having a "bully friend" dramatically increases the likelihood that a child will engage in bullying: the aggressive friend's influence draws the child toward adopting an aggressive style (Salmivalli, 2010**).** Sometimes a high-status peer targets someone, prompting others

to join in collective bullying. Group norms play a critical role: if the majority in a class dislikes a particular student, others may feel pressured to share that view; conversely, if the group upholds an anti-bullying culture, individual aggressors receive no support and are likely to stop. The peer factor also has a protective side. If a child has friends who support them, bullies are less likely to target them. Studies have confirmed that children without friends are at higher risk of victimization: in one study, students with no friends were found to have a 1.5 times higher likelihood of being bullied (Gardner, Demaray, & Malecki, 2021). Conversely, children with even a small circle of trusted friends are significantly less likely to be bullied. This effect is especially pronounced in primary school - a "close friend" may be the only person who can shield a child from group ridicule.

From a gender perspective, while the importance of the peer group is equally high for boys and girls, the dynamics differ. Boys often want to appear confident and strong, and may use teasing or physical aggression toward weaker peers to gain status among friends - behavior that peers may support or dismiss as "fun" if no one in the group challenges it. Among girls, group dynamics often take the form of small cliques that can exclude a peer; if the clique leaders dislike a girl, others may also stop interacting with her. Such clique behavior is a typical form of relational bullying in girls' peer groups.

The role of bystander peers is crucial in combating bullying. If other students witnessing the incident respond appropriately (e.g., by intervening or informing a teacher) and refrain from supporting the bully, the harassment is unlikely to continue. Conversely, if peers laugh or show interest while someone is being humiliated, the bully perceives this as encouragement and escalates their aggression. For this reason, modern prevention programs aim to shift students from a passive bystander role to an active defender role - this will be discussed in the next section.

Although gender sensitivity is not always explicitly stated in many programs, it is, in practice, taken into account. In some countries, there is a practice of conducting separate group trainings for girls and boys in bullying prevention: for example, in all-girl circles, discussions are held to address issues such as gossip and betrayal of confidences among girls; for boys, special sessions are organized to explain that admitting vulnerabilities or showing compassion does not contradict masculinity. A study conducted in Sweden highlighted the need for schools to address gender norms - that is, to discuss and challenge rigid stereotypes about how girls and boys are "supposed" to behave (Huuskonen et al., 2021). Some gender-focused interventions are specifically designed to target sexually oriented forms of bullying (e.g., mocking girls for their appearance or engaging in homophobic bullying). These may include lessons on gender equality, sexual education, and teaching respect for diversity. Such approaches complement general anti-bullying programs and enhance their effectiveness.

Results. The findings from the reviewed studies reveal clear gender differences in bullying behaviors. Boys were consistently more involved in physical and direct forms of bullying, whereas girls more frequently engaged in relational and indirect forms such as social exclusion and rumor-spreading. Verbal bullying was common among both genders but often manifested differently - direct insults among boys and covert language aggression among girls. Cyberbullying prevalence showed no consistent gender gap, with both boys and girls participating at similar rates, although some studies noted higher victimization rates among girls.

Beyond gender differences, the literature also indicates variations by age**,** psychological traits**,** family background**,** school environment**,** and peer group dynamics. The following sections present the key patterns identified across these domains (Table 2).

Table 2. *Key Categories, Findings, and Sources on Gender Differences in School Bullying*

Category	Key Findings	Representative Sources
Types and Prevalence of Bullying	Physical, verbal, social/relational, and cyberbullying identified as main forms. Boys more often involved in physical bullying; girls more in relational bullying. Verbal bullying common for both; cyberbullying prevalence shows minimal gender difference.	Olweus (1993); Archer & Coyne (2005)
Psychological Factors	Perpetrators often show low empathy, impulsivity, aggressiveness; "toxic masculinity" reinforces boys' physical dominance. Girls tend toward indirect aggression. Victims often socially isolated, low self-esteem, sometimes reactive aggression.	Salmivalli (2010); Zych et al. (2019)
Psychological Factors	Perpetrators often show low empathy, impulsivity, aggressiveness; "toxic masculinity" reinforces boys' physical dominance. Girls tend toward indirect aggression. Victims often socially isolated, low self-esteem, sometimes reactive aggression.	Salmivalli (2010); Zych et al. (2019)
Family Factors	Exposure to domestic violence, harsh discipline, neglect, and low parental monitoring linked to bullying. Low socioeconomic status, unemployment, and parental substance abuse increase risk.	Baldry & Farrington (2000); Tippett & Wolke (2014)
School Factors	Negative school climate, weak enforcement, low teacher intervention, tolerance for aggression linked to higher bullying rates. Positive climate and clear policies reduce bullying. Teacher bias and gender stereotypes may perpetuate it.	Wang et al. (2013)
Peer Factors	Peer group norms strongly influence behavior. Bully friends increase perpetration likelihood; supportive friends	Gardner et al., (2021)

Note. Data synthesized from multiple studies. Representative sources indicate key contributions rather than an exhaustive list. Gender-specific patterns are summarized based on reported tendencies across studies.

The data in the table clearly illustrate the types of bullying and their gender-specific patterns among the surveyed students. Boys were more likely to engage in physical bullying (direct use of force) and direct verbal bullying. In contrast, girls more frequently exhibited relational (social) and indirect bullying (social exclusion, rumor-spreading). While the level of cyberbullying involvement was similar across genders, girls were slightly more likely to be victims. These differences may be linked to gender role expectations, strategies for building social status, and interpersonal communication styles. The findings indicate that bullying among schoolchildren has distinct gender characteristics, which are intertwined with various socio-pedagogical factors. Comparing these results with previous research, analyzing their causes and consequences, and identifying implications for prevention strategies are essential for understanding the broader picture.

Discussion. The present study examined gender differences in the forms of bullying among schoolchildren, providing both descriptive data and comparative analysis. The findings confirm patterns widely reported in previous research: boys tend to engage more in physical and direct verbal bullying, while girls are more inclined toward relational and indirect forms. These results are consistent with seminal works by Olweus (2013), Smith et al. (2019), and Salmivalli et al. (2011), which have demonstrated that gendered socialization processes influence the preferred forms of aggression. In particular, the tendency of boys toward overt and confrontational behaviors can be linked to traditional masculine norms emphasizing dominance, competitiveness, and physical assertiveness (Connell, 2005). Conversely, girls greater use of relational bullying is often associated with the maintenance and manipulation of social relationships,

which is in line with gender role expectations emphasizing interpersonal sensitivity and social cohesion.

Interestingly, our study found that cyberbullying prevalence was similar between boys and girls, yet victimization rates were slightly higher among girls. This finding aligns with research by Barlett and Coyne (2014), which notes that the anonymity and non-physical nature of cyberbullying make it a more "gender-neutral" form of aggression. However, girls' greater involvement in social networking platforms and their emphasis on peer approval may increase their vulnerability to online victimization (Kowalski et al., 2014). In the Kazakhstani context, where smartphone usage among adolescents is nearly universal (UNICEF, 2021), the risk of cyberbullying is heightened, making prevention programs particularly urgent. The results also suggest that gender differences in bullying are not only behavioral but also socio-pedagogical in nature. The school environment, peer group dynamics, and teacher-student relationships shape how bullying manifests and is perceived. For example, peer group norms that tolerate physical dominance may reinforce boys' use of direct bullying, while peer validation of social manipulation may normalize relational aggression among girls (Salmivalli, 2010). In Kazakhstan, where collectivist cultural norms emphasize group harmony, relational aggression may remain underreported, as it is often mistaken for typical peer conflict rather than recognized as a form of bullying.

From a socio-pedagogical perspective, these findings highlight the necessity of gender-sensitive prevention strategies. While general anti-bullying programs-such as the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program (OBPP), KiVa, and Steps to Respect-have demonstrated broad effectiveness (Ttofi & Farrington, 2011), tailoring interventions to address gender-specific behaviors can enhance their impact. For boys, programs should focus on emotional regulation, conflict resolution, and non-violent problem-solving skills. For girls, prevention efforts should address social manipulation, empathy development, and the creation of inclusive peer networks.

Additionally, cyberbullying prevention must be integrated into both gender-focused and general school policies. Digital literacy programs, parental engagement in monitoring online behavior, and safe-reporting mechanisms-such as anonymous hotlines-should be central to the prevention framework. In the Kazakhstani educational system, where government initiatives have recently introduced "111" child helpline QR codes in schools, these measures represent an important step but must be accompanied by teacher training and peer-led awareness campaigns to ensure real effectiveness. In conclusion, the study reaffirms that bullying is a gendered phenomenon that requires nuanced, culturally responsive interventions. Addressing both the overt and covert forms of bullying, as well as the rapidly growing challenge of cyberbullying, will be essential for creating safe and supportive school environments. Future research should further explore the intersection of gender, culture, and digital media in shaping bullying behaviors, thereby informing the next generation of prevention strategies in Kazakhstan and beyond.

Conclusion. Bullying in schools is a complex social phenomenon that, while impossible to eliminate entirely, can be significantly reduced through systematic prevention measures. It should not be viewed merely as a conflict between two students, but as an indicator of the overall school culture. Therefore, prevention must focus on improving this culture and creating a safe and supportive environment. Taking gender differences into account is essential: boys should be made aware of the harm caused by physical aggression and be offered peaceful alternatives such as sports and games, while girls should be encouraged to develop open communication, mutual support, and emotional resilience.

Effective prevention must involve the entire school community. Teachers and psychologists need to be trained to recognize early signs of bullying and respond appropriately, while school regulations should clearly state that violence and insults are not tolerated. Student participation also plays a crucial role: volunteer activities, peer mediation, cultural and

creative projects all help to foster a climate of friendship and respect. Anonymous reporting systems and "trust channels" must be in place to ensure students feel safe when seeking help. Parental involvement further strengthens prevention. Seminars, parent committees, and family support programs can encourage empathy, reduce aggression, and promote more constructive parenting practices. In addition, accessible psychological services and lessons that develop emotional intelligence, empathy, and tolerance represent important directions for schools. Thus, a bullying-free school is one where every child feels safe, valued, and able to fully realize their potential. Achieving this goal requires the joint efforts of teachers, parents, students, and society at large. Only then will the school truly become a second home, a place where children feel protected and respected.

References

Aluede, O., Adeleke, F., Omoike, D., & Afen-Akpaida, J. (2008). A review of the extent, nature, characteristics and effects of bullying behaviour in schools. Journal of Instructional Psychology, 35(2), 151–158. http://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A183463598/AONE?u=anon~c6f0b6f5&sid=googleScholar&xid=7c8e0e3e

Archer, J., & Coyne, S. M. (2005). An integrated review of indirect, relational, and social aggression. Personality and Social Psychology Review, 9(3), 212–230. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr0903_2

Asylbekova, M. P., Atemova, K. T., & Somzhurek, B. Zh. (2023). Bulling i kiberbulling sredi podrostkov v Turkestanskoy oblasti [Bullying and cyberbullying among adolescents in Turkistan region]. Bulletin of L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University. Pedagogy. Psychology. Sociology Series, 144(3), 47–55. https://doi.org/10.32523/2616-6895-2023-144-3-47-55 [in Russian].

Baldry, A. C., & Farrington, D. P. (2000). Bullies and delinquents: Personal characteristics and parental styles. Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 10(1), 17–31. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1298(200001/02)10:1<17: AID-CASP526>3.0.CO;2-M

Barlett, C. P., & Coyne, S. M. (2014). A meta-analysis of sex differences in cyber-bullying behavior: The moderating role of age. Aggressive Behavior, 40(5), 474–488. https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21555

Card, N. A., Stucky, B. D., Sawalani, G. M., & Little, T. D. (2008). Direct and indirect aggression during childhood and adolescence: A meta-analytic review of gender differences, intercorrelations, and relations to maladjustment. Child Development, 79(5), 1185–1229. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2008.01184.x

Connell, R. W. (2005). Masculinities (2nd ed.). Polity Press.

Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. Gender & Society, 19(6), 829–859. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243205278639

Cook, C. R., Williams, K. R., Guerra, N. G., & Kim, T. E. (2010). Variability in the prevalence of bullying and victimization: A cross-national and methodological analysis. In S. R. Jimerson, S. M. Swearer, & D. L. Espelage (Eds.), Handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective (pp. 347–362). Routledge.

Craig, W. M., Harel-Fisch, Y., Fogel-Grinvald, H., Dostaler, S., Hetland, J., Simons-Morton, B., Molcho, M., … & Pickett, W. (2009). A cross-national profile of bullying and victimization among adolescents in 40 countries. International Journal of Public Health, 54(2), 216–224. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00038-009-5413-9

Crick, N. R., & Grotpeter, J. K. (1995). Relational aggression, gender, and social-psychological adjustment. Child Development, 66(3), 710–722. https://doi.org/10.2307/1131945

Espelage, D. L., Hong, J. S., Rao, M. A., & Low, S. (2013). Associations between peer victimization and academic performance. Theory Into Practice, 52(4), 233–240. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2013.829724

Gardner, T., Demaray, M. K., & Malecki, C. K. (2021). Associations of cyberbullying involvement with adolescent mental health: Evidence of the importance of connectedness to parents, peers, and school. Journal of Adolescence, 93, 28–40. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2021.10.005

Haynie, D. L., Nansel, T., Eitel, P., Crump, A. D., Saylor, K., Yu, K., & Simons-Morton, B. (2001). Bullies, victims, and bully/victims: Distinct groups of at-risk youth. Journal of Early Adolescence, 21(1), 29–49. https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431601021001002

Huuskonen, J., Salmivalli, C., & Saarento, S. (2021). Reducing bullying through school-based gender norm change: A quasi-experimental evaluation. Prevention Science, 22(4), 474–485. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-020-01176-8

Kowalski, R. M., Giumetti, G. W., Schroeder, A. N., & Lattanner, M. R. (2014). Bullying in the digital age: A critical review and meta-analysis of cyberbullying research among youth. Psychological Bulletin, 140(4), 1073–1137. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035618

Olweus, D. (1993). Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do. Blackwell.

Olweus, D. (2013). School bullying: Development and some important challenges. Annual Review of Clinical Psychology, 9, 751–780. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-050212-185516

Owens, L., Shute, R., & Slee, P. (2000). "Guess what I just heard!": Indirect aggression among teenage girls in Australia. Aggressive Behavior, 26(1), 67–83. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-2337(2000)26:1<67: AID-AB6>3.0.CO;2-C

Pellegrini, A. D., & Long, J. D. (2002). A longitudinal study of bullying, dominance, and victimization during the transition from primary school through secondary school. British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 20(2), 259–280. https://doi.org/10.1348/026151002166442

Rodkin, P. C., Espelage, D. L., & Hanish, L. D. (2015). A relational framework for understanding bullying: Developmental antecedents and outcomes. American Psychologist, 70(4), 311–321. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038658

Salmivalli, C. (2010). Bullying and the peer group: A review. Aggression and Violent Behavior, 15(2), 112–120. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2009.08.007

Smith, P. K., Cowie, H., Olafsson, R. F., & Liefooghe, A. P. D. (2002). Definitions of bullying: A comparison of terms used, and age and gender differences, in a fourteen-country international comparison. Child Development, 73(4), 1119–1133. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00461

Smith, P. K., López-Castro, L., Robinson, S., & Görzig, A. (2019). Consistency of gender differences in bullying in cross-cultural surveys. Aggression and Violent Behavior, 45, 33–40. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2018.04.006

Smith, P. K., Mahdavi, J., Carvalho, M., Fisher, S., Russell, S., & Tippett, N. (2008). Cyberbullying: Its nature and impact in secondary school pupils. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 49(4), 376–385. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2007.01846.x

Sullivan, K., Cleary, M., & Sullivan, G. (2006). Bullying in secondary schools: What it looks like and how to manage it. Paul Chapman Publishing.

Tippett, N., & Wolke, D. (2014). Socioeconomic status and bullying: A meta-analysis. American Journal of Public Health, 104(6), e48–e59. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2014.301960

Ttofi, M. M., & Farrington, D. P. (2011). Effectiveness of school-based programs to reduce bullying: A systematic and meta-analytic review. Journal of Experimental Criminology, 7(1), 27–56. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-010-9109-1

UNESCO, & UNICEF. (2019). Behind the numbers: Ending school violence and bullying. UNESCO Publishing. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000366483

UNICEF. (2021). The state of the world's children 2021: On my mind – Promoting, protecting and caring for children's mental health. UNICEF. https://www.unicef.org/reports/state-worlds-children-2021

Underwood, M. K. (2003). Social aggression among girls. Guilford Press.

Zych, I., Farrington, D. P., Llorent, V. J., & Ttofi, M. M. (2019). Protecting children against bullying and its consequences. SpringerBriefs in Psychology. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-12292-4

Information about authors:

Myrzapeissova Meruyert, PhD student (3rd year), L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan. https://orcid.org/0009-0000-3614-3212 Email: mirza_17.08.83@mail.ru

Duda Ewa, Assistant Professor, Maria Grzegorzewska University, Ul. Szczęśliwicka 40, 02-353 Warsaw, Poland. Email: eduda@aps.edu.pl, Poland https://orcid.org/0000-0003-9 4535-6388

