

## **Bullying Defined in Pakistani School Context: An Urdu Translation of Olweus Bully Victim Questionnaire**

**Rabia Khawar, PhD**

Department of Applied Psychology, GC University, Faisalabad

**Farah Malik, PhD**

Institute of Applied Psychology, University of the Punjab, Lahore

The present study intended to develop an Urdu version of the Olweus Bully Victim Questionnaire (OBVQ; Olweus, 1996) for Pakistani school children. The translation process mainly followed forward/backward translation, cognitive debriefing and expert review, this also included brief qualitative investigation to explore the most suitable 'contextual framework' of 'bullying' in Urdu. A preliminary testing of OBVQ Urdu version with a bilingual sample ( $n = 36$ ) yielded a significant correlation in scores of English and Urdu versions. The instrument's bi-factor structure (bullying and victimization) was evaluated using Exploratory Factor Analysis ( $n = 122$ ). The convergent and divergent validity of OBVQ Urdu version was examined through Aggressive Behavior and Anxious/Depressed subscale of Child Behavior Checklist. The results provided a robust two-factor solution (Victimization and Bullying) with good internal reliability ( $\alpha = .91$ ) and adequate support to the construct validity of the Urdu version of OBVQ. In conclusion, Urdu version of the OBVQ is valid and reliable instrument for assessing elementary children's involvement in bullying/victimization. The study also triggers an argument on using the appropriate Urdu word for bullying.

*Keywords.* Bullying, OBVQ, Olweus bully victims, school children, Pakistan

Bullying is a habitual and repeated behavior that is meant to impose domination over the weaker individual. Bullying behavior primarily revolves around coercion and intimidation by using a range of both direct and indirect forms of aggression. Direct forms of aggression may include physical (e.g., slapping, shoving, pushing, beating, snatching and damaging victim's property) and verbal (e.g., name-calling, shouting, abusing and insulting) acts of violence. Indirect forms involve gossiping, rumor spreading and socially rejecting the target (Beran & Lupart, 2009).

---

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Rabia Khawar, PhD, Associate Professor/Chairperson, Department of Applied Psychology, Government College University, Faisalabad, Pakistan. Email: khawarthisend@gmail.com

Farah Malik, PhD, Professor/ Director, Institute of Applied Psychology, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan. Email: drfarahmalik@gmail.com

Most widely accepted definition of bullying had been offered by Olweus (1993) who initiated the empirical investigation of the phenomenon (Olweus, 1978). He described bullying as an intentional, recurring exposure to negative actions, performed by an individual or a group, perceived to be more powerful and stronger than the victim. In addition to the conventional features (harm, intentionality, repetition and power imbalance), Rigby added that bullying is also characterized by “Enjoyment by the aggressor and generally a sense of being oppressed on the part of the victim” (Rigby, 2002, p. 51).

Recently, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDCP) has described bullying as an undesirable and repetitive act of aggression that involves actual or perceived power imbalance. They further distinguished bullying from sibling and dating partner violence and also explained the nature of inflicted harm as physical, psychological, social and educational (Gladden, Vivolo-Kantor, Hamburger, & Lumpkin, 2014).

Accurate assessment of bullying behavior is the basic step for a well-structured, synchronized and the systematic bullying prevention program in schools. There are multiple methods and instruments available for assessment of bullying at schools including structured and unstructured observational methods, peer ratings, teacher nominations and ratings and self-report measures (Cornell & Cole, 2012; Hamburger, Basile, & Vivolo, 2011). Self-report measurement of bullying is considered efficient, economical and less sensitive to change (Frey, Hirschstein, Edstrom, & Snell, 2009). Self-report measures are either based on behavioral descriptions of bullying or include an operational definition of bullying that youth has to consider while responding to the statements (Furlong, Sharkey, Felix, Tanigawa, & Green, 2010). Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire (Olweus, 1996), Multidimensional Peer Victimization Scale (Mynard & Joseph, 2000), Revised Bully Surveys by Swearer (2001) and the School Climate Bullying Survey (SCBS; Cornell & Sheras, 2003) are some of the most commonly used self-reports that incorporate definition of bullying.

Revised version of Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire (OBVQ; Olweus, 1996) is the most extensively used comprehensive self-report instrument for primary, middle and high school students (Green, Felix, Sharkey, Furlong & Kras, 2013; Olweus, 2006). Unlike most of the self-reported measures of bullying/ victimization, Olweus questionnaire has shown sound cross-cultural psychometric evidence (Vessey et al., 2014). OBVQ pays close attention to the dynamic nature of bullying process. Besides estimating the prevalence of school bullying and victimization,

OBVQ investigates the students' friendships; location, duration and reporting of being bullied; feelings, attitudes and reaction towards bullying, and general satisfaction with school. It introduces the concept of bullying by providing a standardized definition to be read aloud to the participants (Olweus & Solberg, 2003). Words such as bullying, bullied and being bullied have been used several times in the questionnaire statements. It is therefore, very important to reflect on the meaning and perception of the term '*bullying*' within the specific cultural framework, for which OBVQ is being translated.

Different age groups may comprehend the word bullying differently. Researchers have used recall and recognition tasks for investigating how different groups of people (children, parents and teachers) understand and define bullying (Smith, Cowie, Olafsson & Liefoghi, 2002; Smith, Talamelli, Cowie, Naylor & Chuahan, 2004). Recall tasks require participants to define bullying in terms of reporting whatever comes to their mind while thinking about it and provide examples for further explanation. Possible limitation of such approach is that children tend to describe physical and verbal behaviors in bullying; they are less likely to perceive or report indirect abuse (Naylor, Cowie, Cossin, Bettencourt, & Lemme, 2006). Recognition tasks include scenarios (such as vignettes or cartoons eliciting social situations) presented to participants who are probed for their understanding of bullying (Smith et al., 2002). A number of studies have demonstrated that until around 8 or 9 years of age, school students tend to use term *bullying* quite broadly, which seems to cover all nasty kinds of behavior even when no imbalance of power is involved (Smith & Levan, 1995; Smith, Madsen & Moody, 1999). Experts have emphasized the cautious use of words referring to the bullying experiences since it is difficult to decide where teasing or fighting ends and bullying begins (Green et al., 2013; Hellstrom, Persson, & Hagquist, 2015; Smith et al., 2002).

Cross-cultural differences have been found in reporting bullying and victimization (Due et al., 2005). These differences may be attributed to the variety of conceptual frameworks of bullying across countries. With reference to translating the term bullying into other languages, Smith and Monks (2008) highlighted difficulties and controversies in finding equivalent word that encompasses the actual sense of '*bullying*'. Cross-national discrepancies in description of school bullying is contingent on numerous factors such as behavioral inconsistencies, societal dissimilarities (e.g., individualistic vs. collectivistic society), organizational

structure of schools, and suitable contextual meaning in target language words from vocabulary (Smith, 2016).

When translated into a certain language, a word that denotes bullying may refer to the nature and range of bullying behaviors that actually occur in a particular culture, *Ijime*, for example, as the Japanese term for bullying emphasizes more on psychological and collective nature of the attack (Morita, Soeda, Soeda, & Taki, 1999). Similarly, the construct of bullying named as '*Wang ta*' in Korea was found to be less physical in nature (Koo, Kwak, & Smith, 2008). So, it is important to take the indigenous perspective into account and conceptualize '*bullying*' accordingly.

Research on bullying is sparse in Pakistan. In a study Shujja and Atta (2011) translated Illinois Bullying Questionnaire into Urdu, however, it did not include the term bullying. Behavior based measures are criticized for overestimating the prevalence rates of bullying (Sawyer, Bradshaw, & O'Brennan, 2008). In another study Akram and Munawar (2016) translated the Multidimensional Peer Victimization Scale (MPVS; Mynard & Joseph, 2000) into Urdu, yet they had not provided any evidence of the psychometric properties. Moreover, MPVS is restricted to reporting of victimization only and provides no information with regard to perpetration of bullying. More accurate and thorough assessment of bullying perpetration and victimization is required to initiate school wide bullying prevention programs in Pakistan.

### **Objectives**

- To translate Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire (Olweus, 1996) into Urdu for elementary grade students
- To acquire a wider comprehension of '*bullying*' by taking children's' understanding of the phenomenon into account.
- To establish initial psychometric properties of OBVQ Urdu version.

### **Method**

Translation and adaptation of the Olweus Bully Victim Questionnaire has been carried out in three phases.

Phase I: The translation process

Phase II: Preliminary testing with bilingual sample

Phase III: Initial psychometric properties of OBVQ

### **Revised Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire (OBVQ; Olweus, 1996)**

Olweus bully/victim questionnaire consists of 39 items. Most of the items provide both temporal (in the past couple of months) and spatial reference (at school). Two global questions about involvement in victimization (being bullied; item 4) and bullying (bullying others; item 24) along with 8 types each (verbal, physical, relational, racial and sexual victimization & bullying) can be answered on a 5 point scale with “I haven’t been bullied/bullied other students at school in the past couple of months,” coded as 1 and “several times a week” coded as 5. “2 or 3 times a month” (coded as 3) is considered the standard cutoff (Olweus & Solberg, 2003). OBVQ distinctly classifies students into four bullying roles: bullies, victims, bully/victims and uninvolved, and also provides an initial estimate of cyber bullying (items 12a & 32a). According to Olweus and Solberg (2003), OBVQ revised version (Olweus, 1996) yielded high reliability coefficients (Cronbach’s  $\alpha = .80$  to  $.90$ ) and could be administered in a group setting. Moreover, it can produce clear factors for items assessing bullying (25 to 32) and victimization (5 to 12) (Bendixen & Olweus, 1999; Woods & Wolke, 2004).

#### **Phase I: The Translation Process**

Translation process usually involves forward and backward translation, committee review, cognitive debriefing and pilot testing of the target language version of the scale (Beaton, Bombardier, Guillemin & Ferraz, 2000; ITC, 2010; MAPI, 2012; Sousa & Rojjanasrirat, 2010). The present study considered the above mentioned guidelines and used forward, backward translation followed by cognitive debriefing and expert review. Permission to translate the questionnaire was sought from the author.

**Forward translation.** We recruited two bilingual judges. They were PhD scholars in child and educational psychology and they had an adequate fluency in Urdu (target) and English (source) languages. They translated the OBVQ into Urdu. Both translations were then evaluated by a committee comprising of three experts in the field of psychological assessment. They critically evaluated each item of scale and then came up with a synthesized version. However, there was disagreement in appropriate contextual translation of word ‘bullying’ in Urdu (target language).

The committee agreed to further investigate this empirically on the target population. Qualitative investigation is one of the numerous variations in translation procedure suggested by the researchers for

certain type of complex and controversial concepts, phrases or words (Chávez & Canino, 2005). So, in order to find the suitable alternate for 'bullying' we conducted a brief qualitative investigation using recall method.

### Brief Qualitative Investigation of Bullying Phenomenon

**Step 1.** Sixty students (30 boys and 30 girls) between 9 to 12 years of age ( $M = 10.63$ ,  $SD = 1.05$ ) studying in three private tuition centers were included in this investigation. Researcher enlisted all the behaviors and actions corresponding bullying according to the Olweus Questionnaire and asked the participants to name the phenomenon. They were also asked to write down the term they used to describe the person who is involved in such kind of behaviors as a perpetrator and victim.

School boys identified perpetrators of bullying as 'ghunda / غنڈہ' (gangster, delinquent), 'fasaadi / فسادی', 'badmash / بدمعاش' (black guard, culprit), 'bhae log / بھائی لوگ' (native term used for gangster etc), 'dhansoo / دھانسو' (powerful and dominant in negative connotation), 'akroo / اکڑو' (arrogant) and a few related terminologies to villainous characters of movies. Girls described them as 'mirchi / مرچی' (termagant), 'fasaadi / فسادی' (rowdy), 'ziddi / ضدی' (obstinate, stubborn) and 'laraka / لڑاکا' (quarrelsome). The victims of bullying were commonly recognized with weaker psychological attributes such as 'bechara, bechari / بیچارہ, بیچاری' (miserable), 'machu / ماچو' (weak), 'miskeen / مسکین' (miserable), 'buzdil / بزدل' (coward) and 'shareef / شریف' (good). A few students also mentioned the physical characteristics while describing terms for victims such as 'kaloo / کالو' (tanned complexion), 'motoo / موٹو' (obese), 'thigna / تھگنا' (short heighted).

A total of 10 terms of bullying were identified, among these six terms with higher frequencies were presented to the expert committee for discussion. Two of the identified terms 'badmashi and gunda gardi' (بدمعاشی اور غنڈہ گردی, hooligan) were excluded to these being colloquial and redundant in Urdu, and the experts were of the opinion that these terms are inappropriate and sensitive, and thus not to be used with young children. Remaining four terms 'Bohat tang karna (بہت تنگ کرنا)', 'Sataana (ساتانا)', 'Roab dalna (رعب ڈالنا)' and 'Dhouns jamana (دھونس جمانا)' were considered for further empirical evaluation to arrive at final decision.

Table 1

*Frequency of Words, Representing "Bullying" by Gender and Grade  
(N=120)*

Words		Gender			Grade			total
Urdu	English	Boys (n=30)	Girls (n=30)	Total 1	4 <sup>th</sup> (n=20)	5 <sup>th</sup> (n=20)	6 <sup>th</sup> (n=20)	
بد معاشی	Blackguardism	16	4	20	4	5	11	20
بہت تنگ کرنا	Teasing too much	9	10	19	8	6	5	19
غنڈہ گردی	Hooliganism	14	4	18	2	6	10	18
ستانا	Pestering	6	11	17	6	7	4	17
رعب جھاڑنا	To impress with an awe	5	7	12	2	6	4	12
دھونس جمانا	To Oppress/ intimidate	3	6	9	0	2	0	6
لڑائی جھگڑا	Quarrel/Fight	1	5	6	4	2	0	6
ظلم کرنا	Tyrannize/ Cruelty	3	3	6	3	2	1	6
فساد	Fracas/ Agitation	2	3	5	0	2	3	5
دہشت گردی	Terrorism	3	0	3	0	1	2	3

**Step 2.** To further investigate the meaning of these 4 terms identified through above mentioned procedure, recall method was employed. Another sample of 20 students (10 boys and 10 girls) ( $M = 10.45$ ,  $SD = 1.09$ ) was drawn from a private tuition centre. They were presented with the list of six identified terms representing bullying, and were asked to express them each in detail by recalling their experiences at school. They were instructed to describe behaviors relevant to the listed terms one by one. They were encouraged to report whatever comes to their mind after reading each term. Following behaviors were identified. Table 2 shows the frequency of behaviors described for each of the four terms.

Table 2  
Behavioral Descriptions of the Terms Corresponding the Word  
'Bullying'

Components of Definition	Behaviors	حد سے زیادہ گھمنا کرنا (teasing/vexing) (beyond limits)	دعوت جھڑنا (impressing) with an (awe	سستا (pestering)	دعوتس برسانا (oppressing) and (intimidating)	Total
<b>Inflicting Harm through Abuse</b>	<p>مار کھانا (beating)، پھینکانا (smacking)،            تھپڑ مارنا (slapping)، دھکے دینا (pushing)،            پکڑنے کے گھیننا (dragging)، پھوست            لگانا (hitting)، بال نوچنا،            کپڑوں کو کھینچنا یا            کپڑوں (clothes) سے مسیں بہتر کر            دینا (indoors locking)، باہر دینا (tying            (up</p>	18	13	15	12	58
<b>Intimidation</b>	<p>ڈرانا (scaring/terrifying)، دھمکیاں            دینا (ingreatenth)، بلیک میل            کرنا (blackmailing)</p>	16	20	15	20	71
<b>Verbal abuse</b>	<p>گالی دینا (abusing)، آوازیں            کھینچنا (hooting)، اسٹانا نام لینا (name            calling)، مذاق اڑانا (mocking)، چیخنا            (becoming) (yelling)، فحش دیکھنا            (enraged)، کسی کے گھسروالوں کو برا بھلا            کہنا (badmouthing someone's family)</p>	20	17	18	19	74

Table Continued



Table 2  
Behavioral Descriptions of the Terms Corresponding the Word  
'Bullying'

Components of Definition	Behaviors	صدے زیادہ ٹھمک کرنا teasing/vexing ) (beyond limits	رعب محسوسنا (impressing ) with an (awe	دعوتس برسانا (oppressing ) and (intimidating	Total	
Ham to Property	چسب زریں چوری کرنا، چھین لینا، توڑ دینا یا بھنگنا۔ دینا (stealing,snatching,breaking) and throwing things away) گلوٹا کر دینا اور اس کا مزہ لینا (wasting someone's lunch eating or)	17	11	17	14	59
Social exploitation	ساتھ نہ کھیلانا (excluding from ) (play)، جھوٹی شکایت لگانا (false)، complaints)، عیب لگانا (blaming)، جھٹیلی کرنا (backbiting)، کسی کو پھانسنے کے لیے عیب لگانا (belittling)، اور ڈر بچوں کے عیب لگانا یا شعلیں بھنکانا (sketching grim pictures of other's on writing board) کرتا یا دہنام کرنے کی کوشش کرنا، دوسروں کی تصویریں مسینا کرنا (distorting someone's image and reputation and defaming ) and others	12	9	14	12	47

Table Continued

Table 2  
Behavioral Descriptions of the Terms Corresponding the Word  
'Bullying'

Components of Definition	Behaviors	حد سے زیادہ تنگ کرنا teasing/vexing beyond limits	رعب جھاننا impressing with an awe	ستانا pestering	دھونس جھاننا oppressing and atingintimid	Total
Psychological abuse	تکلیف دینا، سخت دیکھ بچھانا، بار بار دہرا کرنا (afflicting pain/hurting) repeatedly) دوسروں کی تکلیف پہنچانا لینا (schadenfreude)، بلاوجہ پریشان کرنا (annoying)، سکون سے نہ رہنے دینا (disturbing) اپنی طاقت کی نمائش showing off/exhibiting کرنا (power دوسروں کو حقیر سمجھانا (others, disdaining) خود کو سپرو considering) سمجھنا (yourself as hero زور زبردستی کرنا (coercing)، ہر بار اپنی طاقت کا ناجائز استعمال دھانسنا (use of unauthORIZED) power everytime	16	10	14	13	53
Power & Coercion	سمجھنا (considering) خود کو سپرو (yourself as hero زور زبردستی کرنا (coercing)، ہر بار اپنی طاقت کا ناجائز استعمال دھانسنا (use of unauthORIZED) power everytime	10	12	9	14	45

Table Continued

Table 2  
Behavioral Descriptions of the Terms Corresponding the Word  
'Bullying'

Components of Definition	Behaviors	حد سے زیادہ تنگ کرنا teasing/vexing beyond limits	رعب جمنا impressing with an awe	ستانا pestering	دھونس جمانا oppressing and intimidating	Total
Sexual abuse	زبردستی کپڑے کھینچنا pulling (other's) (dress forcefully talking) گندی باتیں کرنا (obscene (obscene ہر بار اپنی طاقت کا حساب از نو مندرہ اٹھانا	1	0	2	2	5
Repetition	unauthorized use of (power) (everytime repeatedly) بار بار دکھانا (hurting	7	3	3	9	22
Others	ناک مس میں دم کر دینا (embittering)	3	0	2	0	5
Total	Behaviors reported under one category	120	95	109	115	431

**Step 3.** The results were analyzed by the expert committee and two most comprehensive and suitable words were chosen and incorporated in the Urdu version of OBVQ (i.e. "حد سے زیادہ تنگ کرنا" and "دھونس جمانا").

**Backward translation.** Two bilingual experts, with cross-cultural background and experience/exposure (of at least 8 years) independently translated the Urdu version of the questionnaire back into English. The expert committee again reviewed both translations and came up with a converged version of reverse translation that was further compared to the original version and was found identical and acceptable in terms of semantic equivalence.

**Cognitive debriefing and expert review.** Few sentences were modified in the light of findings from cognitive debriefing as OBVQ Urdu version was administered to 8 students from the target population. This step provides insight to the suitability of alternative wording in translation/adaptation, enhances understandability and cultural significance. This semi-structured interview allows an examination of the construct, method, and item bias (Wild et al., 2005). Experts then reviewed the results of cognitive debriefing. For example, the term sexual typically translated as '*jinsi* (جنسی)' was replaced with '*gandi batein* (گندی باتیں)' (obscene and vulgar remarks). Thus a pre-final Urdu version was produced.

## **Phase II: Preliminary Testing with Bilingual Sample**

The purpose of this pilot study was to empirically evaluate the OBVQ Urdu version for a sample of students studying in 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> grades. Another aim was to determine the concurrent validity of the OBVQ-Urdu version and to serve this purpose; response from the original English OBVQ version were compared with those from the translated Urdu version using bilingual respondents.

**Sample I.** Three English medium schools were contacted and informed about the purpose of study for obtaining a sample of bilingual students. Only one school agreed to participate. Finally, a sample of 36 students (50% girls), studying in 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> grades was drawn with the age ranging between 9 to 12 years ( $M = 10.53$ ,  $SD = 1.1$ ).

**Assessment measures.** Both the original Olweus Bully Victim Questionnaire in English and the pre-final Urdu version were used.

**Procedure.** Permission for data collection was sought from an English medium school. Initially 45 students were identified as fluent in both Urdu and English but finally 36 agreed to participate in the study. The participants were informed about the confidentiality of data and their right to withdraw during the study, despite their previous consent. The participants first completed the Urdu version of OBVQ during 40 minutes session of regular school hours. The definition of bullying was read aloud to them and they were asked to complete the instrument by keeping this definition in mind. One week later, the same participants completed the English version of the instrument. The items in both versions were presented in a different order.

### **Phase III: Exploratory Factor Analysis and Psychometrics Properties**

This part of the study includes exploratory factor analysis and the initial psychometric evaluation of OBVQ Urdu version such as internal consistency, scale-item characteristics and convergent/divergent validity. These psychometric properties were established on a separate sample (sample II).

**Sample II.** The sample for the empirical evaluation of psychometric properties of the measures included 122 students ( $M_{age} = 11.13$ ,  $SD = 1.1$ ) studying in 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> grades. Girls ( $n = 70$ ) and boys ( $n = 52$ ) were drawn from two private schools of Lahore. Their mothers were also approached with the help of school administration, who rated their children on anxious/depressed and aggressive behavior subscales of Child Behavior Checklist (Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001). There are several guidelines about the sample size for Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and Principle Component Analysis (PCA) including both absolute sample size and subject to item ratio. Several researchers have recommended a minimum subject to item ratio of at least 5:1 in EFA. In terms of overall size, sample should not be less than hundred (Gorsuch, 1983; Hatcher, 1994).

**Assessment measures.** Following measures were used in this stage:

***Olweus Bully Victim Questionnaire Urdu Version.*** First three questions and two set of items measuring victimization (item 4-12a) and bullying (24-32a) were used in the current investigation.

*Aggressive Behavior and Anxious/Depressed Subscale of CBCL.* Child Behavior Checklist (Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001) measures severity of various behavior problems in children and adolescents. The present study assessed the Anxious/Depressed Domain and Aggressive Behavior Domain for establishing the construct validity of the OBVQ. The measure has already been translated into Urdu. The translated version has been used in several investigations which have reported adequate psychometric properties (Anjum & Malik, 2010).

### **Procedure**

Permission was sought out from schools and an informed consent was obtained from the parents. Mothers were also requested to fill the enclosed questionnaire. It included questions pertaining to anxious/depressed and aggressive behavior domains of CBCL. Out of 140 requests, 18 were turned down thus the final sample constituted of 122 students and their mothers. All the students voluntarily participated in the study. They were also informed about the right to withdraw from their participation at any point of time. Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire was administered to the students in their regular class rooms. After instructing the students about filling the questionnaire, they were asked to answer the first two questions. The definition included in the questionnaire was read aloud to them. They were asked to mention any difficulty while answering the questions. It took only 15 minutes to complete this brief version of OBVQ. Students reported no difficulty in comprehending the questions. The questionnaire was filled anonymously and the information provided by mothers was matched to the student data by code numbers mentioned on both of the measures.

### **Results**

#### **Comparison of English and Urdu Version Administration of OBVQ**

First of all inter-item correlation was computed between English and Urdu versions of the OBVQ. There was a gap of one week between the administrations of both versions. Results are presented in table 3.

Table 3

*Inter-Item Correlation between English and the Urdu Versions of OBVQ*

<i>Items</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>Items</i>	<i>R</i>
Item 1	.79***	Item 21	.85***
Item 2	.1***	Item 22	.79***
Item 3	.84***	Item 23	.71***
Item 4	.82***	Item 24	.90***
Item 5	.80***	Item 25	.89***
Item 6	.87***	Item 26	.81***
Item 7	.91***	Item 27	.86***
Item 8	.83***	Item 28	.85***
Item 9	.82***	Item 29	.96***
Item 10	.91***	Item 30	.78***
Item 11	.89***	Item 31	.83***
Item 12	.78***	Item 32	.85***
Item 12a	.90***	Item 32a	.84***
Item 13	.79***	Item 33	.67***
Item 14	.78***	Item 34	.89***
Item 15	.88***	Item 35	.91***
Item 16	.81***	Item 36	.84***
Item 17	.89***	Item 37	.89***
Item 18	.66***	Item 38	.93***
Item 19	.78***	Item 39	.85***
Item 20	.89***		

\*\*\* $p < .001$

Strong correlation coefficients, ranged from .67 to .96 were found between the items of English and Urdu versions of OBVQ.

Moreover, Urdu and English versions yielded good internal consistency with Cronbach alpha of .84 and .83 respectively.

### **Exploratory Factor Analysis**

The present study was conducted to see if the set of items in OBVQ measuring bullying and victimization represent two distinct behavior patterns that could further distinguish the students into different bullying roles. Principal Component Analysis (PCA) with varimax method of rotation was used for current data set. KMO was found to be .86 that exceeds the minimum value of .50 suggested by Field (2005) and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity yielded highly significant findings,  $\chi^2(190) = 1733.3, p < .001$ , which showed the appropriateness of the data for factor

analysis. We chose minimum of .35 as loading standard for an item that is recommended by Stevens (as cited in Field, 2005).

Table 4

*Summary of Principal Component Analysis with Varimax Rotation for OBVQ Urdu Version (N = 122)*

Items	Factor 1 (V)	Factor 2 (B)	Factor 3 (CBV)
OBVQ item 6	.84		
OBVQ item 5	.83		
OBVQ item 4	.83		
OBVQ item 8	.83		
OBVQ item 11	.83		
OBVQ item 12	.83		
OBVQ item 9	.82		
OBVQ item 10	.82		
OBVQ item 7	.78		
OBVQ item 26		.85	
OBVQ item 31		.84	
OBVQ item 25		.81	
OBVQ item 27		.80	
OBVQ item 29		.78	
OBVQ item 28		.76	
OBVQ item 24		.76	
OBVQ item 30		.70	
OBVQ item 32		.68	
OBVQ item 32a			.83
OBVQ item 12a			.78
Eigen values	7.51	4.42	1.51
% of Variance	37.53	22.10	7.55
Cumulative %	37.53	59.63	67.17

*Loadings > .40*

Table 4 shows the factor loadings of 20 items from OBVQ Urdu version. These items measure the bullying and victimization status of the students by asking about general and specific behaviors that are often linked to bullying. The results showed high communalities for all the items. A principal component analysis with varimax rotation resulted in factor solution that converged in 3 iterations and high loadings ranging from .68 to .84. The three factor solution showed Eigen values greater



than 1 and the extraction was confirmed by scree plots. The items indicating the global question about being bullied (item 4) and different types of traditional bullying experienced (5-12) by students made the first factor named Victimization (V). It had the highest Eigen value (7.51) explaining the largest part (37.53%) of the total variance. Similarly, set of items asking general question about bullying others (item 24) and related types of traditional perpetration of bullying (items 25-32) resulted in the second factor that is called Bullying (B). Factor II showed Eigen value of 4.42 which explained 22.09 % of variance. This was an expected depiction except for two items that accounted for the third factor (item 32 and 12a) having an Eigen value merely crossing one (1.51) and accounting for minimal variance (7.55%) of the total. Both of these items represent the cyber bullying and victimization respectively. The third factor itself may not be meaningful having low indices yet we decided to retain both its items as they measure an important aspect of bullying and results can be subjected to smaller sample size. The total amount of variance explained by three factors was 67.17%.

### Scale-item Characteristics

This portion includes the reliability coefficients and descriptive statistics of the extracted factors and total set of items. Additionally, it presents means and standard deviations for each item, item total correlation and Cronbach's alpha if the particular item is deleted.

Table 5

*Descriptive and Item-Total Statistics of the Olweus Bully Victim Questionnaire*

Item #	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>r<sub>it</sub></i>	<i>α</i> if item deleted
Item 4	2.75	1.38	.58	.91
Item 5	2.59	1.51	.54	.91
Item 6	2.39	1.46	.61	.91
Item 7	2.13	1.43	.62	.91
Item 8	2.40	1.46	.69	.90
Item 9	2.25	1.41	.65	.90
Item 10	2.21	1.43	.75	.90
Item 11	2.25	1.44	.67	.90
Item 12	2.07	1.48	.73	.90
Item 12a	1.09	0.36	.02	.91
Item 24	0.15	0.48	.67	.90

Table Continued

Table 5  
*Descriptive and Item-Total Statistics of the Olweus Bully Victim Questionnaire*

Item #	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	$r_{it}$	$\alpha$ if item deleted
Item 25	2.35	1.41	.41	.91
Item 26	1.75	1.10	.45	.91
Item 27	1.86	1.24	.53	.91
Item 28	1.84	1.28	.52	.91
Item 29	1.70	1.14	.51	.91
Item 30	1.72	1.14	.57	.91
Item 31	1.84	1.20	.56	.91
Item 32	1.88	1.24	.48	.91
Item 32a	1.69	1.17	.09	.91

*Note.*  $r_{it}$  = item total correlation

Item total correlations were computed to evaluate each item in order to confirm whether all the items significantly measure the bullying phenomenon. Table 5 displays that deletion of any individual item changes alpha values to range between .90 and .91. Item to total scale correlations ranged between .41 to .74, except for two items measuring cyber victimization (12a) and cyber bullying (32a) showing correlation of .01 and .08 respectively. However we decided to retain the items for final Urdu version, considering the sample size constraints for current findings. Mean scores of victimization items (4-12) were greater than items measuring bullying (24-32).

The subscale of Bullying shows a mean of 21.05 and a standard deviation 10.78, and the Victimization subscale shows a mean of 16.63 and a standard deviation of 8.56. Victimization ( $\alpha = .94$ ) and bullying ( $\alpha = .80$ ) showed high estimates of reliability coefficient. Reliability of Cyber bullying and victimization factor was also moderately high ( $\alpha = .78$ ) and mean scores were quite low ( $M = 2.14$ ,  $SD = .63$ ) subjected to fewer number of items. Overall internal consistency of the 20 set of items measuring bullying and victimization aspect of OBVQ was also very high with alpha coefficient of .91.

Bullying and victimization scales that represented traditional nature of bullying experience were significantly correlated with each other,  $r = .26$ ,  $p < .01$ , yet the magnitude of this relationship was found to be not so strong. Cyber bullying and victimization was not related to the bullying,  $r = .04$ ,  $p = .18$ , and victimization,  $r = .05$ ,  $p = .30$ .

### Convergent and Discriminant Validity of OBVQ Urdu Version

The construct validity of a questionnaire is ascertained by computing convergent and divergent validity of the measure. To fulfill this purpose, two subscales of Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) (Aggressive Behavior and Anxious/Depressed) were used.

Bullying subscale despite being correlated with anxious/depressed dimension of CBCL exhibited stronger relationship with aggressive behavior,  $r = .78, p < .001$  vs.  $r = .41, p < .001$ . Similarly victimization was significantly related to anxious/depressed tendency,  $r = .49, p < .001$ . No significant relationship was found between victimization and aggressiveness,  $r = .15, p = .09$ .

Above mentioned psychometric properties suggest that the translated Urdu version of Olweus Bully Victim Questionnaire is a reliable and valid measure of identifying bullies and victims in Pakistani school students.

### Discussion

The aim of the current research was to translate Olweus Bully Victim Questionnaire (Olweus, 1996) into Urdu and assess its initial psychometric properties with a sample of elementary school children. The translation process produced fruitful outcomes in finding the rightful Urdu word for bullying. .

The OBVQ provides a standardized definition of bullying and the word is repeatedly used in the questionnaire. While translating OBVQ into Urdu, term '*Bullying*' raised some questions and contradictions; therefore a brief qualitative examination was performed. In view of the debatable definitions of bullying, investigator are advised to be very precise about what is intended by bullying while inquiring students to report how often they bully others or are bullied (Vaillancourt et al., 2008). While reflecting upon the definition (based on OBVQ) of '*Bullying*' children named the phenomenon with a variety of terms. Expert panel found the top listed terms '*Badmashi* (بدمعاشی)' (blackguardism) and '*Ghundagardi* (غنڈہ گردی)' (hooliganism), unsuitable for elementary school version of OBVQ Urdu for being morally sensitive for the minors.

Students' responses for the four terms '*Had se ziyada tang karna karna* (حد سے زیادہ تنگ کرنا)' (teasing/vexing beyond limits), '*Roab jharna* (رعب جمانا)' (impress with an awe), '*Sataana* (ستانا)' (pestering) and '*Dhouns Jamana* (دھونس جمانا)' (oppress and intimidate) were evaluated. This process also resulted in a definition of bullying provided by Pakistani school students which reflects some of the aspects included in

famous definitions provided by researchers (Olweus, 1996; Rigby, 2002) such as power inequality, repetition and intentionality of the offensive behavior. Direct physical harm, intimidation, verbal harm, harm to property, social and psychological harm, sexual harm, power exhibition, and coercion were distinctly recognized as essential components of the four terms described above.

Previous studies on students' perception of bullying documented that majority of the pupils had been unable to identify 'imbalance of power' as a component of bullying; rather 'intent to hurt' was acknowledged as the core feature of bullying (Gordillo, 2011; Vaillancourt et al., 2008). Findings of the present study draw somewhat similar conclusions as harm was the main focus inflicted through physical, verbal, social, psychological and sexual types of abuse. Physical abuse included typical behaviors such as beating, smacking, pushing, hitting, slapping, pulling hair or dress, tying up and locking indoors. Behaviors like scaring, threatening and blackmailing others were categorized as intimidation. Verbal form was characterized by use of abusive language, name calling, yelling and bad mouthing others' family. Behaviors like theft, snatching, hiding, breaking and throwing other's things away, eating lunch without permission or wasting it for the sake of amusement were recognized as harm to property. Power and coercion included exhibiting authority, superiority and pressurizing others. Forcefulness and repetition however, were reported less frequently. Psychological harm reflected the victims' feelings of being afflicted, grieved and distressed. Children particularly mentioned the annoyance without any apparent reason and offender's sense of enjoyment. Researchers agree that students' perception of the victim's suffering and perpetrator's intention not only indicates the seriousness of issue but also proves helpful in deciding the rightful word while searching a term for bullying (Guerin & Hennessy, 2002; Hellstrom et al., 2015).

Experts considered '*Bohat tang krna (teasing too much بہت تنگ کرنا)*' better worded as '*Hud se zayada tang karna*' (teasing beyond limits (حد سے زیادہ تنگ کرنا)). Students' reflections on four short listed terms that aforementioned term (حد سے زیادہ تنگ کرنا) was more closely related to the defining characteristics of bullying followed by '*Dhouns jamana (دھونس جمانا)*'. It better covered physical, verbal and psychological types of abuse, while '*دھونس جمانا*' more accurately grasped the concept of intimidation, demonstration of power and repetition. Therefore the final Urdu version for elementary grade students incorporated both '*Dhouns jamana (دھونس جمانا)*' and '*Hud say zayada tang krna (حد سے زیادہ تنگ)*'

کرنا)'' . Furthermore, discussions with two eminent experts also lend support to the present findings (personal communication, R. Hanif, May, 28, 2011; P. K. Smith, December, 24, 2014). Smith and Monks (2008) evaluated data obtained from cartoon task (recognition method) from different parts of the word including Pakistan. Similar terms i.e. *Ghunda Pan* (غنڈہ پن), *Tang karna* (تنگ کرنا) and *Dhamkana* (دھمکانا) emerged from the study. Further investigation with regard to the perception of the terms identified in the present study and the study conducted by Smith and colleagues in Pakistan, could explain the similarities and discrepancies.

Results from bilingual sample demonstrated highly significant correlations between original and translated versions of OBVQ on all 39 items. It also provides the ground for concurrent validity of the questionnaire.

Exploratory factor analysis resulted in 3 factor solution. Item for being bullied and bullying other were separately loaded which demonstrates that the measure is suitable for identifying students involved in bullying. It can clearly differentiate between bullies and victims in schools. However, items measuring cyber bullying and victimization were loaded distinctively on a separate factor. It may indicate that the students who were involved in bullying others using cyber technology had also been victim to it. Cyber bullying has gained attention of the researchers recently and has been linked to traditional bullying (Hinduja & Patchin, 2010; Ybarra & Mitchell, 2004). It is noteworthy that students in present sample had an average age of 11. 13 years and the sample size were also small. Children at this age usually have access to mobile phones and internet under adult supervision especially in the context of Pakistani culture. Therefore, further inquiry with larger sample size is required to confirm the factor structure obtained from present sample.

The internal consistencies of the OBVQ total scores and for the subscales were computed using Cronbach's  $\alpha$  coefficient. Results showed higher reliability estimates for victimization and the total score ( $> .90$ ), still good internal consistency for bullying subscale (.80) and moderate reliability for items measuring cyber bullying and victimization (.78). It also proved to be reliable across grades and gender. Previous literature on psychometric properties of translated versions of OBVQ has provided similar evidence (Papacostaab, Paradeisiotiab, & Lazarou, 2014). However, further investigation with larger sample is required to confirm the findings. Moreover, current Urdu version was found suitable for elementary school children. Separate Urdu version must be used with

adolescents or high school and college students after incorporating more precise translation of the word bullying.

Nearly all the item-total correlations were above .40 demonstrating that these items should be retained for questionnaire. Only two items (12a and 32a) showed below average correlations. However considering the distinct nature of cyber bullying (as it also emerged as a separate factor) and minimal impact on overall internal consistency of the measure (.90 to .91), both of the items were retained in the final Urdu version.

Additionally, construct validity of the questionnaire was determined by computing the relationship between bullying victimization and two important subscales of Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) that were Anxious/Depressed and Aggressive behavior. Each of these subscales represented internalizing and externalizing dimensions of behavior respectively. Both of these scales were significantly correlated with bullying and victimization subscales of OBVQ. Yet the nature of relationship was stronger between bullying and aggressive behavior; victimization and anxious/depressive tendencies. A number of existing studies have supported this association. Olweus and Solberg (2003) reported that students who scored higher on global item of victimization showed significant inclination towards depression. Other earlier and recent studies have demonstrated consistent support for positive association between peer victimization and internalizing symptoms such as depression and anxiety and also strong relationship between bullying and externalizing behaviors (Boivin, Hymel, & Bukowski, 1995; Reijntjes et al., 2010). The directionality of the relationship is however questionable and future investigations should determine the predictive strength of this relationship.

**Conclusion.** It can be concluded that Urdu version of Olweus Bully Victim Questionnaire (OBVQ) for elementary grades is comparable to the original version in terms of semantic and linguistic equivalence. Additionally, without compromising the psychometric strength, it demonstrated adequate psychometric properties and hence is considered suitable to identify students in different bullying roles in Pakistani schools.

**Limitations and Suggestions.** Students' perception reflects the complexity of bullying phenomenon and also the need for more careful investigation. Since the present study was not basically focused on investigating the perception of students about bullying, therefore gender,

age and grade-wise differences were not taken into account in the first part. Moreover, recall method used in this study may not represent the full range of children's knowledge. Sample size was also small and confined to elementary grades that restricts the generalizability of the translated version. Psychometric properties of OBVQ Urdu version should be further investigated with larger samples of elementary, secondary and higher secondary school students using more sophisticated techniques such as confirmatory factor analysis and item response theory. Indigenous appraisal of bullying may help in developing culturally relevant prevention and intervention programs.

### References

- Achenbach, T. M., & Rescorla, L. A. (2001). Manual for the ASEBA school-age forms & profiles: an integrated system of multi-informant assessment Burlington, VT: University of Vermont. *Research Center for Children, Youth, & Families*, 16-17.
- Akram, B., & Munawar, A. (2016). Bullying victimization: A risk factor of health problems among adolescents with hearing impairment. *Journal of Pakistan Medical Association*, 66(1), 13-17.
- Anjum, N., & Malik, F. (2010). Parenting practices in mothers of children with ADHD: Role of stress and behavioral problems in children. *Pakistan Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 8(1), 18-38.
- Beaton, D. E., Bombardier, C., Guillemin, F., & Ferraz, M. B. (2000). Guidelines for the process of cross-cultural adaptation of self-report measures. *Spine*, 25(24), 3186-3191.
- Bendixen, M., & Olweus, D. (1999). Measurement of antisocial behavior in early adolescence and adolescence: Psychometric properties and substantive findings. *Criminal Behavior and Mental Health*, 9(4), 323-354.
- Beran, T. N., & Lupart, J. (2009). The Relationship between School achievement and peer harassment in Canadian adolescents. *School Psychology International*, 30(1), 75-91. Doi: 10.1177/014303430810185
- Boivin, M., Hymel, S., & Bukowski, W. M. (1995). The roles of social withdrawal, peer rejection, and victimization by peers in predicting loneliness and depressed mood in childhood. *Development & Psychopathology*, 7(4), 765-785.
- Chavez, L. M., & Canino, G. (2005). *Toolkit on translating and adapting instruments*. Cambridge, MA: Human Services Research Institute.

- Cornell, D. G., & Cole, J. C. M. (2012). Assessment of bullying. In S. R. Jimerson, A. B. Nickerson, M. J. Mayer, & M. J. Furlong (Eds.), *Handbook of School Violence and School Safety* (pp. 289–304). New York, NY: Routledge
- Cornell, D., & Sheras, P. (2003). *School Climate Bullying Survey*. Charlottesville: Virginia Youth Violence Project
- Due, P., Holstein, B. E., Lynch, J., Diderichsen, F., Gabhain, S. N., Scheidt, P., & Currie, C. (2005). Bullying and symptoms among school-aged children: international comparative cross sectional study in 28 countries. *European Journal of Public Health, 15*(2), 128-132.
- Field, A. (2005). *Discovering Statistics using SPSS* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). London: Sage Publications
- Frey, K. S., Hirschstein, M., Edstrom, L. V., & Snell, J. L. (2009). Observed reductions in school bullying, nonbullying aggression, and destructive bystander behavior: A longitudinal evaluation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 101*(2), 466–481.  
Doi: 10.1037/ a0013839
- Furlong, M. J., Sharkey, J. D., Felix, E. D., Tanigawa, D., & Green, J. G. (2010). Bullying assessment: A call for increased precision of self-reporting procedures. In S. R. Jimerson, S. M. Swearer, D. L. Espelage, S. R. Jimerson, S. M. Swearer, & D. L. Espelage (Eds.), *Handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective* (pp. 329-345). New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Koo, H., Kwak, K., Smith, P. K. (2008). Victimization in Korean schools: The nature, incidence, and distinctive features of Korean bullying or wang-ta. *Journal of School Violence, 7*(4), 119-139.
- Guerin, S., & Hennessy, E. (2002). Pupils' definitions of bullying. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 17*(3), 249-261.
- Gladden, R. M., Vivolo-Kantor, A. M., Hamburger, M. E., & Lumpkin, C. D. (2014). *Bullying surveillance among youths: Uniform definitions for public health and recommended data elements*. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and U.S. Department of Education
- Gordillo, I. C. (2011). Repetition, Power Imbalance, and Intentionality: Do These Criteria Conform to Teenagers, Perception of Bullying? A Role-Based Analysis. *Children and Youth Services Review, 33*(9), 1608–1615.



- Gorusch, R. L. (1983). *Factor Analysis* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
- Green, J. G., Felix, E. D., Sharkey, J. D., Furlong, M. J., & Kras, J. E. (2013). Identifying bully victims: Definitional versus behavioral approaches. *Psychological Assessment*, 25(2), 651-657.
- Hamburger, M. E., Basile, K. C., & Vivolo, A. M. (2011). *Measuring bullying victimization, perpetration, and bystander experiences: A compendium of assessment tools*. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control
- Hatcher, L. (1994). *A Step-by-Step Approach to Using the SAS System for Factor Analysis and Structural Equation Modeling*. Cary, N.C.: SAS Institute, Inc.
- Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. W. (2010). Bullying, Cyber bullying, and Suicide. *Archives of Suicide Research* 14(3), 206-221. Doi:10.1080/13811118.2010.494133
- Hellström, L., Persson, L., & Hagquist, C. (2015). Understanding and defining bullying—adolescents' own views. *Archives of Public Health*, 73(1), 4. Doi: 10.1186/2049-3258-73-4
- International Test Commission. (2010). *International Test Commission Guidelines for Translating and Adapting Tests*. Retrieved from <http://www.intestcom.org>
- MAPI Institute. (2012). *Linguistic Validation Manual for Health Outcome Assessments*, (2nd ed.). Lyon: MAPI Research Trust
- Morita, Y., Soeda, H., Soeda, K., & Taki, M. (1999). Japan. In P. K. Smith, Y. Morita, J. Junger-Tas, D. Olweus, R. Catalano, & P. Slee (Eds.), *The nature of school bullying: a cross-national perspective*, (pp. 309-323). London: Routledge
- Mynard, H., & Joseph, S. (2000). Development of the multidimensional peer-victimization scale. *Aggressive Behavior: Official Journal of the International Society for Research on Aggression*, 26(2), 169-178.
- Naylor, P., Cowie, H., Cossin, F., Bettencourt, R., & Lemme, F. (2006). Teachers and pupils' definition of bullying. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76(3), 553-576.
- Olweus, D. (1997). Bully/victim problems in school: Facts and intervention. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 12(4), 495-510.

- Olweus, D. (1993). Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do?. *American Psychologist*, 53(1), 754-760. Doi:10.1002/pits.10114
- Olweus, D. (1978). *Aggression in the Schools Bullies and Whipping Boys*. Washington, DC: Hemisphere Press, Wiley.
- Olweus, D., & Solberg, M. E. (2003). Prevalence estimation of school bullying with the Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire. *Aggressive Behavior*, 29(3), 239–268. Doi: 10.1002/ab.10047.
- Olweus, D. (2006). *Olweus' core program against bullying and antisocial behavior: A teacher handbook*. Hazelden Publishing & Educational Services
- Papacosta, E. S., Paradeisioti, A., & Lazarou, C. (2014) Bullying phenomenon and preventive programs in Cyprus's school system. *International Journal of Mental Health Promotion*, 16(1), 67-80, DOI: 10.1080/14623730.2014.888894
- Reijntes, A., Albert, B., Kamphuis, J. H., Prinzie, K., Peter, P., & Michael, J. (2010). Peer victimization and internalizing problems in children: A meta-analysis of longitudinal studies. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 34(4), 244-252.
- Rigby, K. (2002). Towards a definition of bullying. *New Perspectives on Bullying*. London: Jessica Kingsley
- Sawyer, A. L., Bradshaw, C. P., & O'Brennan, L. M. (2008). Examining Ethnic, Gender, and Developmental Differences in the Way Children Report Being a Victim of “Bullying” on Self-Report Measures. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 43(2), 106 – 114.
- Shujja, S. & Atta, M. (2011). Translation and validation of Illinois Bullying Scale for Pakistani children and adolescents. *Pakistan Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 9(1-2), 79-82.
- Smith, P. K., Cowie, H., Olafsson, R., & Liefoghe, A. (2002). Definitions of bullying: a comparison of terms used, and age and sex differences, in a 14-country international comparison. *Child Development*, 73(4), 1119-1133. Doi: 10.1111/1467-8624.00461 C.
- Smith P. K., & Levan, S. (1995). Perceptions and experiences of bullying in younger pupils. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 65(4), 489-500.
- Smith, P. K., Madsen, K. C., & Moody, J. C. (1999). What cause the age decline in reports of being bullied at school? Towards a developmental analysis of risks of being bullied. *Educational Research*, 41(3), 267-285.

- Smith, P. K., & Monks, C. P. (2008). Concepts of bullying: Developmental and cultural aspects. *International Journal of Adolescent Medicine and Health, 20*(2), 101-112.
- Smith, P. K. (2016). Bullying: Definition, types, causes, consequences and intervention. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 10*(9), 519-532.
- Smith, P. K., Talamelli, L., Cowie, H., Naylor, P., & Chauhan, P. (2004). Profiles of non-victims, escaped victims, continuing victims and new victims of school bullying. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 74*(4), 565-581.
- Sousa, V., & Rojjanasrirat, W. (2010). Translation, adaptation and validation of instruments or scales for use in cross-cultural health care research: A clear and user friendly guideline. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice, 17*(2), 268-274.
- Swearer, S. M. (2001). *The bully survey* (Unpublished survey). University of Nebraska-Lincoln
- Vaillancourt, T, McDougall, P., Hymel, S., Krygsman, A., Miller, J., Stiver, K., & Davis, C. (2008). Bullying: Are researchers and children/youth talking about the same thing? *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 32*(6), 486-495.
- Vessey, J., Strout, D. T., DiFazio, R. L., & Walker, A. (2014). Measuring the youth bullying experience: A systematic review of the psychometric properties of available instruments. *Journal of School Health, 84*(12), 819–843. Doi:10.1111/josh.12210
- Wild, D., Grove, A., Martin, M., Eremenco, S., McElroy, S., Verjee-Lorenz, A., et al. (2005). Principles of good practice for the translation and cultural adaptation process for patient-reported outcomes (PRO) measures: report of the ISPOR Task Force for Translation and Cultural Adaptation. *Value Health, 8*(2), 94–104.
- Woods, S., & Wolke, D. (2004). Direct and relational bullying among primary school children and academic achievement. *Journal School Psychology, 42*(2). 135-155.
- Ybarra, M. L., & Mitchell, K. J. (2004). Online aggressors, victims, and aggressor/victims: A comparison of associated youth characteristics. *Journal of Child Psychology & Psychiatry, 45*(7), 1308-1316.

Received January 25, 2017

Revisions Received January 15, 2019