International Journal of Behavioral Development
2003, 27 (3), 243–252
http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/pp/01650254.html

DOI: 10.1080/01650250244000317

Identifying aggressive victims in Chinese children's peer groups

Yiyuan Xu, Jo Ann M. Farver, and David Schwartz
University of Southern California, Los Angeles, USA

Lei Chang
Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China

This study investigated the behavioural profiles and psychosocial adjustment of aggressive victims in Chinese children's peer groups. Participants were 294 elementary school students in Tianjin, PR China (mean age 11.5 years). Peers' nominations and teachers' ratings were combined to form composite scores of aggression and victimisation. A comparison of four subgroups showed that aggressive victims were disliked by peers, rated as hyperactive, had fewer dyadic friends, poorer academic functioning, and lower assertive/prosocial ratings than did nonvictimised aggressors or the normative children. These findings suggest that there may be a common behavioural pattern that is associated with maladjustment among aggressive victims across cultural settings.

The objective of this study was to investigate victimisation in Chinese children's peer groups. Research conducted with Western populations has shown that physical aggression and antisocial conduct diminish during middle childhood and throughout adolescence for both boys and girls (Loeber & Stouthamer-Loeber, 1998). Despite this decline, there is a small minority of children who continue to be involved in a majority of peer conflicts. In many peer groups, these individuals represent a few highly aggressive bullies and the classmates who they verbally and physically victimise (Olweus, 1978; Perry, Kusel, & Perry, 1988).

Children who are frequent targets of bullying are disliked by their peers, lack self-esteem, and are highly anxious (Kupersmidt, Patterson, & Eickholt, 1989; Perry et al., 1988; Schwartz, 2000). Although chronically victimised children share similar behavioural profiles, they are not all alike. Most children are passive victims who are socially withdrawn and submissive; and appear as ''easy marks'' to their bullying peers (Graham & Juvonen, 1998; Pellegrini, 1998; Smith & Brain, 2000). On the other hand, there is a subgroup of victimised children who are oppositional, aggressive, and hot tempered. Labeled as *aggressive victims* (Pellegrini, Bartini, & Brooks, 1999; Schwartz, 2000; Schwartz, Dodge, Pettit, & Bates, 1997), these children are harassed because they irritate their peers and are inclined to fight back (although unsuccessfully) when bullied.

In a prior investigation, Schwartz, Chang, and Farver (2001a) established that peer victimisation exists in Mainland Chinese children's peer groups. Similar to the pattern for Western samples, Chinese children who were frequent targets of peer victimisation, were characterised as submissive and withdrawn, were rejected by peers, and had poor academic functioning. However, Schwartz et al. did not examine their Chinese dataset for subtypes of victimisation. Therefore, the current study builds on this previous work by examining these data to determine whether aggressive victims could be identified in Chinese children's peer groups, and to investigate the behavioural profiles and psychosocial adjustment of these children.

Current studies of children raised in different cultural communities have shown that children's social behaviour cannot be understood separately from the activities they engage in and the larger sociocultural organisation in which those activities are embedded (Farver, 1999; Göncü, Tuerner, Jain, & Johnson, 1999; Harkness & Super, 1996; Whiting & Edwards, 1988). This theoretical framework suggests that the characteristics of children's physical and social environments set the course for particular developmental outcomes. Predominant beliefs about what is desired and appropriate child behaviour guide particular approaches to socialisation. Regularities within settings, customs, and belief systems organise children's developmental experiences and provide the information from which children construct the rules of their culture. Accordingly, behaviours that are associated with negative social outcomes in children's peer groups are likely to be those that are inconsistent with local cultural norms. For example, in Western societies, where assertive and independent behaviour is valued, children who are shy or socially withdrawn are often targets of peer rejection and victimisation. By contrast, in other cultural communities where behavioural restraint is endorsed, shyness or social withdrawal may be associated with positive social and developmental outcomes for children. At the same time, there may be considerable diversity in how shy, withdrawn, or sociable is defined within and across cultural communities.

Unfortunately, most bully/victim research has been carried out with European or North American children. Therefore, little is known about cultural variations in peer victimisation. The Chinese community investigated in the present study provided a unique opportunity to examine current Western

Correspondence should be addressed to Yiyuan Xu, Department of Psychology, SGM 523, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90089-1061, USA; e-mail: yiyuanxu@usc.edu.

This research was supported by faculty grants awarded to the third author from the University of Southern California Zumberge Fund and the Southern California Studies Center.

models of victimisation and the associated subtypes in a non-Western setting. The study also contributes to an ongoing program of research aimed at better understanding how culture shapes children's development and behaviour between and within Asian communities.

Studies of Western populations have found that aggressive victims represent only a small group of victimised children. While many classification schemes and cutoff scores have been used in past investigations, the percentage of children that could be identified as aggressive victims generally varied within a narrow range of approximately 4% to 8% (Schwartz, Proctor, & Chien, 2001b). Commonly, children who were concurrently victimised and aggressive were fewer than the number of children who were high on only one dimension of social maladjustment, (i.e., either highly victimised or highly aggressive).

Similarly, few girls have been identified as aggressive victims (Schwartz, 2000; Schwartz et al., 1997). These apparent gender differences may be attributed to the fact that in Western populations, boys display higher rates of overt aggression, but equivalent or slightly lower rates of relational or indirect aggression than girls (Crick & Grotpeter, 1995, 1996; Lagerspetz, Bjorkquist, & Peltonen, 1988; Salmivalli, Kaukiainen, & Lagerspetz, 2000). Perhaps, if previous studies on aggressive victims had included assessments of relational or indirect aggression, more girls may have been identified.

Preliminary empirical evidence on the social behaviour of aggressive victims presents a fairly consistent pattern for Western children. Olweus (1978) initially identified a small group of aggressive victims in Swedish children's peer groups who were provocative, restless, and hostile. Similarly, Perry and his colleagues (Perry, Perry, & Kennedy, 1992) conceptualised aggressive victims as ineffectual aggressor or high-conflict victims, who had difficulty regulating their affect during interpersonal conflicts, and consistently lost fights and arguments amid displays of anger, frustration, and poorly modulated emotional distress. Across many studies, aggressive victims experience poor academic performance, and have been rated by their teachers as being hyperactive, disruptive, and attention-seeking (Kumpulainen et al., 1989, 1998; Schwartz, 2000), emotionally dysregulated, and low in assertive or prosocial behaviour (Schwartz, 2000).

Aggressive victims were also found to be at high risk for peer rejection and other psychosocial adjustment problems. Using a sociometric procedure, Kupersmidt et al. (1989) reported that aggressive victims were more likely to be rejected by their peers than were either bullies (i.e., nonvictimised aggressors) or passive victims. Similarly, Schwartz (2000) found that aggressive victims were liked least by their peers compared with other victimised or aggressive children.

Several investigators have proposed that highly aggressive children victimise classmates who lack friends, because these bullies have no fear of retaliation from or ostracism by the children's friends (Bukowski, Sippola, & Boivin, 1995; Hodges, Malone, & Perry, 1997; Hodges, Boivin, Vitaro, & Bukowski, 1999; Kochenderfer & Ladd, 1996). Having a friend may help children from being victimised by peers (Pellegrini et al., 1999). However, aggressive victims may lack the social skills required to establish and maintain friendships, which are also associated with resilience. They often have difficulty in establishing and maintaining friendships because of their irritable and dysregulated behaviour. Therefore, aggressive victims may not experience protection from peer harassment (Schwartz, Dodge, Pettit, Bates, & The Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group, 2000).

In summary, compared to passive victims and nonvictimised children, aggressive victims appear to represent an extreme group that is at the greatest risk for social rejection and other negative peer group outcomes. However, it is unclear whether this pattern exists in Mainland China, where children's sociable, aggressive, and prosocial behaviours are viewed and valued in a different way from Western societies (Chen & Rubin, 1992; Chen, Rubin, & Sun, 1992). Furthermore, because Chinese researchers have traditionally been more concerned with children's problematic academic functioning and school adjustment (e.g., Chen & Li, 2000), relatively little attention has been given to maladaptive social behaviour in the peer group.

The Chinese cultural context is of particular interest because the socialisation processes that are linked to positive social outcomes in Chinese peer groups are different from those of children who are raised in Western cultures (Chen & Rubin, 1992; Chen et al., 1992). The most striking difference between Chinese and Western societies is the relative emphasis placed on individualism versus collectivism (Chen, 2000; Triandis, 1986). Although Mainland China has recently experienced rapid change, the core cultural values and norms that foster and maintain a harmonious society remain constant. In contrast to children raised in Western societies, young Chinese children are encouraged to develop self-control, an interdependent sense of self, sensitivity to others, and a cooperative and prosocial orientation (Bond, 1996; Chen, 2000; Ho, 1986; Luo, 1996). Thus, Chinese children may display quiet, withdrawn, or reticient behaviour as a reflection of the emphasis on self-restraint and behavioural inhibition. The shy/sensitivity dimension often associated with maladaptive behavioural patterns and predictive of both peer rejection (Hymel, Rubin, Rowden, & LeMare, 1990; Rubin, Chen, & Hymel, 1993) and victimisation (Boulton, 1999; Schwartz, Dodge, & Coie, 1993) in Western cultures, is instead associated with a good reputation and peer acceptance in the Chinese context (Chen & Rubin, 1992; Chen et al., 1992).

Based on the differences between Chinese and Western societies, and on previous research conducted in both settings, we formulated several research questions. Our first question was whether aggressive victims could be identified in Chinese peer groups. In previous studies with Western samples, peer nominations and multi-informant procedures were used to identify aggressive victims. Children who had standardised, or composite standardised aggression and victimisation scores above a particular cutoff (e.g., 0.8 *SD* above the mean), were classified as aggressive victims (Pellegrini et al., 1999; Schwartz et al., 1997). In the current study a multi-informant approach (peers' nominations and teachers' ratings) and a similar cutoff level (e.g., 0.8 *SD* above the mean) was used to identify aggressive victims. If the heterogeneity of aggressors and victims could be found in Chinese children, subgroups of bully/victims (i.e., aggressive victims, nonaggressive victims, nonvictimised aggressors, and normative children) would be derived from aggression and victimisation ratings. Children who have high ratings on both aggression and victimisation would be classified into the aggressive victim subgroup, children who are high in aggression but low in victimisation would be classified into the nonvictimised aggressor subgroup, children who have high victimisation but low aggression scores would be classified as nonaggressive victims, whereas children

who are low in both aggression and victimisation ratings would be classified as normative children.

Assuming that aggressive victims could be identified in Chinese children, our second question was whether their distribution by gender would be similar to that of Western children. In the few existing studies of gender differences (e.g., Pellegrini et al., 1999), males are over-represented in the aggressive victim subgroup. However, because researchers rarely assessed relational aggression (see Crick & Grotpeter, 1995), the number of female aggressive victims may have been underestimated. In the current study, measures of both overt and indirect or relational aggression were included to identify more female aggressive victims. On the other hand, given that Chinese girls are expected to behave in a compliant and passive manner, and often receive social pressure to behave more submissively than boys, we expected that boys would outnumber girls as aggressive victims.

Our third question was whether Chinese children would have behaviour profiles similar to Western children who were identified as aggressive victims. We focused on three behaviour patterns found to be associated with peer victimisation in Western children: submissive/withdrawn; assertive/prosocial; and hyperactive. Based on research with Western children and on the previous analysis of peer victimisation in the Chinese setting (Schwartz et al., 2001a), we expected that aggressive victims in Chinese peer groups would be less submissive or withdrawn than passive victims.

Given that peer victimisation was found to be negatively correlated with assertive/prosocial behavioural ratings in the first analysis of the Chinese dataset (Schwartz et al., 2001a), and based on prior research showing that prosocial and assertive behaviours are valued in Asian cultures (Farver & Lee-Shin, 1997; Farver & Wimbarti, 1995; Whiting & Edwards, 1988), we expected that the Chinese aggressive victims would receive lower composite assertive/prosocial ratings (i.e., teachers' ratings and peers' nominations) than the other subgroups.

As mentioned above, studies on aggressive victims in Western societies showed that they tend to be hyperactive and engage in frequent off-task behaviours (e.g., Schwartz, 2000). Also, because hyperactivity may differentiate aggressive victims from other subgroups, we predicted that aggressive victims would have higher hyperactivity scores than would the other three subgroups (i.e., nonvictimised aggressors, nonaggressive victims, and normative children) of Chinese children.

Our fourth question was whether the negative psychosocial outcomes associated with aggressive victimisation in Western populations would be similar for Chinese children. That is, because both aggressive and victimised Chinese children are highly disliked by their peers (Chen, Rubin, & Li, 1995a, 1997; Chen, Rubin, Li, & Li, 1999; Schwartz et al., 2001), we expected that aggressive victims would have lower social preference scores than would the other three subgroups.

In addition, because both aggression and victimisation are negatively correlated with Chinese teachers' perceptions of children's school competence achievement (Chen, Rubin, & Li, 1995b; Schwartz et al., 2001a), we predicted that the Chinese aggressive victims would also have poor academic functioning.

The current study analysed a dataset containing multi-informant ratings of children's peer group behaviour to examine subtypes of peer victimisation and associated behavioural outcomes.

Methods

Participants

Participants were 296 children (161 boys, 135 girls) recruited from an elementary school in Tianjin, PR China. Tianjin is one of the largest cities in PR China with a population of about 10 million people. It is an industrial city with most inhabitants employed in factories as technicians and workers, or as government employees. The majority of the population is Han Chinese.

Most elementary schools in Tianjin, like those in other Chinese urban cities, are public schools. Each school has six grades, and has about three to six classes in each grade. Students usually take three to five classes every day (three in the morning), and each class lasts 45 minutes with 10 to 15 minutes as class breaks. The participating school had three Grade 5 and three Grade 6 classes, with approximately 50 students per class. All six classes participated. The children ranged in age from 9.1 to 13.6 years; ($M = 11.5$; $SD = 0.70$). Parents were contacted by their child's teacher in the weeks before data collection, and were given information regarding the study goals and procedures. Parents were informed they could refuse to allow their child to participate without negative consequences. No parent refused participation. Eight of the original 304 children were absent during the questionnaire administration and so did not take part in the study. Two children with missing data were also not entered into the analyses.

Procedure

PEER NOMINATIONS AND TEACHER RATINGS

Data were collected using a teacher rating scale and a peer nomination inventory. All measures were developed from the existing bully–victim literature. The measures were piloted in two North American cities (see Schwartz, 1995, 2000; Schwartz & Proctor, 2000), and were translated and back-translated by a paid language consultant who was native to the region of China where the study was conducted. Composite ratings for children's social behaviour were formed using items from the teacher rating scale and the peer nomination inventory.

Peer nominations were group administered in the classrooms. The inventory contained 16 items to assess social behaviour, aggression, victimisation by peers, and peer acceptance/rejection (see below for details). Children were asked to nominate up to three peers who fit each descriptor. Children were also asked to nominate their friends in their class. There was no limit for the number of friends they could nominate.

Teachers completed the *Social Behavior Rating Scale* (Schwartz et al., 2001a), which contained 46 descriptors of children's social behaviour, peer victimisation, aggression and disruptive behaviour, academic functioning, peer acceptance/rejection, and hyperactivity. Teachers rated each descriptor on a 5-point scale (1 = *almost never true of the child*; 5 = *almost always true of the child*). Teachers were given a small stipend for participation.

COMPOSITE RATINGS

Aggression. To measure children's aggression, we used eight teacher-rating items ($\alpha = .91$) from the Social Behavior

Rating Scale and four peer nomination items ($\alpha = .89$). These items covered overt and indirect or relational forms of aggression (for details of the measures, see Schwartz et al., 2001a). The principal component analysis (PCA) yielded factor loadings varying from .80 to .91 for the peer nomination items, and from .69 to .87 for the teachers' rated items. The correlation between the teachers' ratings and the peer nomination scores was $r = .57$; $p < .0001$. Teachers' ratings and peer nominations of aggression were generated from the standardised mean of the eight teacher items and the total number of nominations received across the four peer nomination items (standardised within each class). We averaged aggression scores between teachers' ratings and peer nomination scores. The mean *aggression ratings* were entered into the analyses.

Peer victimisation. Using the strategy described above for aggression, we computed an index of peer victimisation. We included scales designed to tap multiple subtypes of peer victimisation. In these items, we assessed ''indirect'' and ''relational'' victimisation as well as overt behaviours. We included six teacher-rating items ($\alpha = .89$; PCA loadings varied from .77 to .84), four peer nomination items ($\alpha = .90$; PCA loadings varied from .79 to .95). The PCA (conducted within informant) consistently yielded single-factor solutions (based on the criterion of an eigenvalue greater than 1.0). It should be emphasised that our measures were designed to provide broad coverage of the phenomena of interest and were not optimised for discriminating between subtypes of social experience.

The correlation between the mean of the six teacher rating items and the total number of nominations received across the four peer nomination items (standardised within class) was $r = .46$; $p < .0001$. We averaged the standardised teacher rating summary score and the standardised peer nomination summary score. The means were entered into the analyses as *peer victimisation ratings*.

Submissive/Withdrawn. Eight teacher rating items from Social Behavior Rating Scale were used to assess children's social interaction style. We had initially conceptualised submissiveness and withdrawal as distinct, but related, aspects of internalising behaviour (see Harrist, Zaia, Bates, Dodge, & Pettit, 1997), and included four items to assess each construct. However, a PCA of the eight items failed to yield a coherent two-factor structure. Accordingly, we generated a submissiveness–withdrawal summary from the mean across the combined eight items ($\alpha = .75$; PCA loadings ranged from .32 to .82) and then standardised it across the total sample. A peer nomination item, ''children who like to play alone'' (i.e., children who would rather be alone than be with other children) was also used to index withdrawn behaviour. The total number of nominations each child received for this item was summed and standardised within each class. The correlation between the peers' nomination and the teachers' rating scores was $r = .45$; $p < .0001$. We averaged the submissive–withdrawal scores for the teachers' ratings and peers' nomination scores. The mean *submissive/withdrawn ratings* were entered into the analyses.

Assertive/Prosocial. Six teacher-rated items from the Social Behavior Rating Scale were used to assess children's assertive/prosocial behaviour ($\alpha = .88$). A PCA conducted with the items yielded a single-factor solution (i.e., one factor with an eigenvalue greater than 1.0), with all loadings greater than .50. We generated an assertive/prosocial teacher rating from the mean across the combined six items and standardised it. Two peer nomination items were also used to measure children's assertive/prosocial behaviour (''can stand up for self without hitting, fighting, or getting angry'', ''is a good leader''; $\alpha = .63$). The correlation between the mean of the six teacher rating items and total nominations received across the two peer nomination items (standardised within class) was $r = .43$; $p < .0001$. We averaged the assertive/prosocial scores between teachers' ratings and peer nominations. The mean *assertive/prosocial ratings* were entered into the analyses.

Hyperactivity. A subscale of the Social Behavior Rating Scale (Schwartz et al., 2001a), teachers' rating of hyperactivity, was used to assess hyperactive/impulsive behaviour (''impulsive'', ''easily distracted'', ''difficulties with attention'', ''can't wait for a turn'', ''doesn't remain seated'', ''doesn't play quietly'', ''fidgets''; $\alpha = .89$). The summary scores were generated, standardised, and entered into the analyses as the *hyperactivity ratings*.

Social preference. The Social Behavior Rating Scale contained one item to assess liking (''this child is well-liked by peers''), and one item to assess disliking (''this child is disliked by other children''). The correlation between the two items was $r = -.76$; $p < .0001$. A teacher rating of social preference was generated from the difference between the liking and disliking ratings.

In addition, children were asked to nominate three peers whom they liked most in their class, and three peers whom they liked least in their class. The total number of nominations each child received for these two items was calculated and standardised within class. A peer preference score was generated from the standardised difference between the liked most and liked least scores (Coie, Dodge, & Coppotelli, 1982). The correlation between the peer preference score and the teachers' ratings of acceptance/rejection was $r = .47$; $p < .0001$. We averaged the peer preference score and the standardised teachers' ratings of acceptance/rejection. The means were entered into the analyses as the *social preference ratings*.

Dyadic friendship. Children were asked to nominate their friends in their classes. There was no limit to how many friends they could nominate. The number of reciprocally nominated friends was standardised within each class and entered into the analyses as the *dyadic friendship rating.*

Academic functioning. Children's academic functioning was assessed using three teacher-rated items: ''this child's academic performance is excellent'', ''this child is a good student'', and ''this child has difficulties with school work''—reverse coded ($\alpha = .91$). We also obtained children's mathematics and Chinese language exam scores for the fall and spring semesters across 3 years (six exam scores in total; $\alpha = .90$ for agreement across the language scores; $\alpha = .94$ for agreement across the mathematics scores). The maximum number of points on each test was 100, with a score of 60 points considered as a pass. The correlation between mean mathematics exam scores and mean Chinese language scores was $r = .85$; $p < .0001$. The correlation between the teachers' ratings of academic performance and the mean mathematics and language scores was $r = .70$; $p <$

Table 1
Correlations among child adjustment variables and gender ($N = 294$)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1: Aggression	—	.27**	−.55**	−.36**	−.14*	−.35**	−.04	.76**	.34**
2: Victimisation		—	−.67**	.39**	−.44**	−.58**	−.31**	.46**	.10
3: Social preference			—	−.17**	.69**	.70**	.40**	−.63**	−.22**
4: Withdrawn-submissive				—	−.28**	−.22**	−.25**	−.19**	−.10
5: Assertive-prosocial					—	.56**	.44**	−.35**	−.04
6: Academic functioning						—	.26**	−.52**	−.29**
7: Dyadic friendship							—	−.09	.16**
8: Hyperactivity								—	.37**
9: Gender									—

* $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$

.0001, and $r = .65$; $p < .0001$, respectively. We generated standardised mean summary scores (average of mathematics and language) for academic grades and standardised teachers' academic ratings. We averaged the scores and entered them into the analyses as the *academic functioning ratings*.

RESULTS

Overview

Correlations among the variables are summarised in Table 1. The variables were moderately correlated. For all analyses, the gender term was specified as boys = 1 and girls = 0.

Identification of aggressive victims

First, to determine whether we could identify aggressive victims in Chinese children's peer groups, we applied cluster analysis to differentiate the aggressor/victim subgroups using composite scores (teachers' ratings and peers' nomination) of aggression and victimisation. The two behavioural variables, aggression and victimisation, were entered into a hierarchical clustering analysis. The 294 children for whom we had two measures formed the sample. Using Ward's method, individuals were grouped into clusters by minimising the total sum of the squared deviations of every case from the mean of the cluster to which it belonged. Squared Euclidean distances were used to compute the deviations. The single solution of five groups was imposed to see if we could get the similar distribution of aggressor/victim subgroups (i.e., aggressive victim subgroup, passive victim subgroup, nonvictimised aggressor, normative subgroup, and unclassified children) as in previous Western studies. The distribution of these groups appears in Table 2, and is similar to what is found in most Western studies. For example, Boulton and Smith (1994) identified about 4.4% aggressive victims in a British sample of 158 children (83 boys, mean age = 9.5 years), whereas Perry et al. (1988) found about 5.5% aggressive victims out of 165 American children (83 boys, mean age = 10.6 years) (for review, see Schwartz et al., 2001). Therefore, the results of cluster analysis indicated that the aggressive victim subgroup could be identified in the Chinese sample.

Second, based on prior work with Western samples showing that peer groups could be classified according to peers' nomination scores or teachers' ratings of aggression and victimisation (Schwartz, 2000; Schwartz et al., 1997), we formed four aggressor/victim subgroups using composite ratings of aggression and victimisation (i.e., teachers' ratings and peers' nominations). Because the number of children with extreme scores on both aggression and victimisation was small, a relatively lenient criterion of 0.8 (i.e., 0.8 *SD* above the mean) was applied as the cutoff to identify the subgroups (see Schwartz et al., 1997). This criterion was adopted to balance competing concerns regarding cell size and subgroup distinctiveness. Children whose victimisation and aggression scores were each greater than 0.8 were classified in the aggressive victim subgroup; children whose victimisation scores were greater than 0.8, but whose aggression scores were less than zero, were classified in the nonaggressive victim subgroup; children whose aggression scores were more than 0.8 but whose victimisation scores were less than zero were classified in the nonvictimised aggressor subgroup; and the children whose victimisation and aggression scores were each less than zero were classified into the normative subgroup. This procedure resulted in identifying 14 aggressive victims (13 boys, 1 girl: 4.8% of the sample); 18 nonvictimised aggressors (17 boys, 1 girl: 6.1% of the sample), 18 nonaggressive victims (8 boys and

Table 2
The distribution of cluster analysis results

Cluster of sample	*Subgroups*	*No. (%) of children*	*Mean (SD) by clustered victim-aggressor subgroup*	
			Aggression	*Victimisation*
1	Aggressive victim	19 (6.5%)	1.86 (0.24)	1.41 (0.13)
2	Non-victimised aggressor	20 (6.8%)	1.86 (0.14)	−0.19 (0.08)
3	Non-aggressive victim	15 (5.1%)	−0.51 (0.04)	2.35 (0.25)
4	Normative contrasts	183 (62.2%)	−0.47 (0.02)	−0.37 (0.03)
5	Non-classified children	57 (19.4%)	0.37 (0.04)	0.14 (0.06)

10 girls: 6.1% of the sample), 155 normative children (64 boys and 91 girls: 52.7% of the sample) and 89 unclassified children (57 boys and 32 girls: 30.3% of the sample). Since the group memberships derived from cluster analysis were sensitive to the outliers or extreme members, the following analyses were based on the subgroups derived from arbitrary cutoff criterions of 0.8. The unclassified children were excluded from subsequent analyses.

Gender distribution of aggressive victims

Consistent with the pattern for Western children, Chinese girls were not well represented in the aggressive victim subgroup (only one girl was identified as an aggressive victim). However, this may be because the peers' nominations were limited to three, which may have restricted children's choices of salient behaviours for each sex (i.e., aggression and victimisation). Therefore, we also standardised all of the variables, except academic grades and dyadic friendship, within gender and class (academic grades and dyadic friendship were standardised within class only). This standardisation procedure identified 14 aggressive victims (10 boys, 4 girls); 22 nonvictimised aggressors (12 boys, 10 girls), 17 nonaggressive victims (8 boys and 9 girls), 147 normative children (75 boys and 72 girls), and 91 unclassified children (54 boys and 37 girls). In the subsequent analyses, we reported the results for boys only (peers' nominations standardised within class), and the results for both boys and girls separately (peers' nominations standardised within gender and class).

The social behaviour of aggressive victims

To answer the third and fourth research questions, that is, whether aggressive victims in Chinese children's peer groups would have social behaviour and psychosocial adjustment problems similar to those noted for Western children, a MANOVA was conducted to compare group differences in the three behavioural variables (i.e., *submissive/withdrawal*, *assertive/prosocial*, and *hyperactivity*) and three adjustment variables (i.e., *social preference*, *dyadic friendship*, and *academic functioning*).

Mean levels of victimisation did not differ significantly across the aggressive victim ($M = 1.5606$; $SD = 0.5821$) or nonaggressive victim ($M = 1.9591$, $SD = 0.5234$) subgroups, $t\ (19) = -1.58$, $p > .05$. Similarly, mean levels of aggression did not differ significantly across the aggressive victim ($M = 2.1243$, $SD = 1.0402$) or nonvictimised aggressor ($M = 1.6769$, $SD = 0.7104$) subgroups, $t\ (28) = 1.4$, $p > .05$.

There was a significant main effect of aggressor/victim subgroup, Wilk's $\lambda = .130$ multivariate $F\ (18, 249) = 14.683$, $p < .001$. A series of post hoc univariate ANOVAs were conducted to examine subgroup differences on each individual behavioural and adjustment variable. As shown in Table 3, there were significant differences for all the variables among aggressor/victim subgroups.

Planned contrasts were conducted following each univariate test. Because the current study focused on aggressive victims, comparisons were made between aggressive victims and each of the other three subgroups. In addition, the nonvictimised aggressor and nonaggressive victim subgroups were compared to the normative subgroup. Results of the contrasts are summarised in Table 3. Compared with the three subgroups, aggressive victims had the lowest social preference scores and the highest hyperactivity scores. However, when compared with the nonaggressive victims, the aggressive victims had lower scores on withdrawn/submissive ratings. In addition, compared with the nonvictimised aggressors and the normative group, the aggressive victims had fewer dyadic friends, poorer academic functioning, and lower assertive/prosocial ratings.

Comparisons between the two extreme subgroups (i.e., nonaggressive victims and nonvictimised aggressors) and the normative group also produced significant effects. Boys in the normative subgroup had higher hyperactivity scores but lower academic functioning scores than did the boys in the nonvictimised group. There were no significant differences in the number of dyadic friends for the groups. Also, nonaggressive victims were more withdrawn-submissive, and had fewer dyadic friends, poorer academic functioning, and lower assertive-prosocial scores than the normative group.

Data analyses with boys and girls

Although relatively more nonvictimised aggressive girls were identified using peer nomination scores standardised within both gender and class, the number of female aggressive victims

Table 3

Summary of univariate analyses of the victim-aggressor subgroup differences in adjustment variables for boys only[a]

		Mean (SD) by victim-aggressor subgroup			
Variables	*Main effect of victim-aggressor status (F level)*	*Aggressive victim (n = 13)*	*Nonaggressive victim (n = 8)*	*Nonvictimised aggressor (n = 17)*	*Normative contrast (n = 64)*
Social preference[b]	59.895***	$-1.80\ (0.69)_{234}$	$-0.73\ (0.64)_{14}$	$-0.40\ (0.66)_{14}$	$0.47\ (0.55)_{123}$
Withdrawn-submissive[b]	21.044***	$-0.33\ (0.62)_{2}$	$1.55\ (1.00)_{14}$	$-0.64\ (0.38)_{4}$	$-0.06\ (0.68)_{23}$
Assertive / prosocial[b]	9.686***	$-0.86\ (0.44)_{34}$	$-0.58\ (0.44)_{4}$	$0.18\ (0.89)_{1}$	$0.35\ (0.90)_{12}$
Academic functioning[c]	17.022***	$-1.16\ (0.87)_{34}$	$-1.38\ (0.66)_{4}$	$-0.23\ (0.67)_{14}$	$0.24\ (0.84)_{123}$
Dyadic friends[d]	7.781***	$-0.88\ (0.64)_{34}$	$-0.64\ (0.29)_{4}$	$0.28\ (1.26)_{1}$	$0.41\ (1.04)_{12}$
Hyperactivity[e]	56.238***	$2.24\ (1.04)_{234}$	$-0.45\ (0.56)_{14}$	$1.02\ (0.98)_{14}$	$0.12\ (0.86)_{123}$

[a] All variables were standardised within class only.
[b] Composite scores of peer nomination and teachers' ratings.
[c] Composite scores of teachers' ratings and school grades.
[d] Peer nomination.
[e] Teachers' ratings.
$_{1, 2, 3, 4}$ significant victim-aggressor subgroup comparisons.

Table 4
Summary of univariate analyses of the victim-aggressor subgroup differences in adjustment variables for boys and girls[a]

		Mean (SD) by victim-aggressor subgroup			
Variables	*Main effect of victim-aggressor status (F level)*	*Aggressive victim (n = 14)*	*Nonaggressive victim (n = 17)*	*Nonvictimised aggressor (n = 22)*	*Normative contrast (n = 147)*
Social preference[b]	57.614***	−2.14 (0.67)$_{234}$	−0.98 (1.26)$_{14}$	−0.18 (0.67)$_{14}$	0.60 (0.84)$_{123}$
Withdrawn-submissive[b]	25.193***	0.07 (0.63)$_{23}$	1.39 (1.05)$_{14}$	−0.69 (0.36)$_{14}$	0.002 (0.77)$_{23}$
Assertive / prosocial[b]	11.007***	−0.73 (0.34)$_{34}$	−0.67 (0.56)$_{4}$	0.27 (0.72)$_{1}$	0.20 (0.87)$_{12}$
Academic functioning[c]	28.784***	−1.11 (0.97)$_{34}$	−1.09 (0.84)$_{4}$	0.02 (0.77)$_{1}$	0.36 (0.75)$_{12}$
Dyadic friends[d]	6.215***	−0.72 (0.61)$_{34}$	−0.58 (0.60)$_{4}$	0.16 (0.99)$_{1}$	0.18 (1.03)$_{12}$
Hyperactivity[e]	46.303***	1.53 (0.57)$_{234}$	0.14 (1.03)$_{1}$	0.59 (1.02)$_{14}$	−0.48 (0.61)$_{13}$

[a] All variables except academic functioning and dyadic friendship were standardised within gender and class.
[b] Composite scores of peer nomination and teachers' ratings.
[c] Composite scores of teachers' ratings and school grades (standardised within class only).
[d] Peer nomination (standardised within class only).
[e] Teachers' ratings.
$_{1, 2, 3, 4}$ significant victim-aggressor subgroup comparisons.

was still very small (i.e., four aggressive victim girls). The distribution of aggressor/victim subgroups across gender was similar to what we found standardising within class only. The analyses were rerun for both boys and girls. The MANOVA yielded Wilk's $\lambda = .287$, multivariate $F(18, 507) = 15.607$, $p < .001$. The results of post hoc univariate ANOVAs and multiple comparisons for aggressive victims summarised in Table 4 are similar to the results shown in Table 3.

DISCUSSION

The current study examined aggressive/victim subgroups in Chinese children's peer groups. It was unclear whether this pattern of behaviour and the associated outcomes could be identified in a culture that has very different socialisation goals, childrearing practices, and expectations for children's behaviour. Moreover, we were not certain whether the arbitrary cutoff standardised score criterion used for Western samples would be appropriate in differentiating these aggressor/victim subgroups in a Chinese sample. Therefore, we first carried out a cluster procedure to identify the natural grouping of the children based on the similarity of their aggression and victimisation ratings.

The cluster analysis showed that aggressive victims could be identified in the Chinese children. Accordingly, a 0.8 *SD* cutoff criterion was then applied to classify children into four aggressor/victim subgroups. Consistent with prior work on aggressive victims with Western samples (Pellegrini et al., 1999; Schwartz, 2000), the proportion of children who were categorised as being *both* aggressive and victimised appeared to be quite small. Less than 5% of the sample met the criteria for an aggressive victim. Thus, similar to Western populations, aggressive victims in Chinese children's peer groups were also relatively rare.

Consistent with the results reported for Western children (e.g., Schwartz, 2000), only one female aggressive victim was identified using our 0.8 cutoff criterion. As a result, the psychological functioning of female aggressive victims could not be examined. Although measures of relational aggression were included in this study, we failed to identify female aggressive victims. This finding is probably a result of the strong gender-typed behaviour in Chinese society. In addition, because there are very few aggressive girls in Chinese children's peer groups, it was unlikely there would be many aggressive victims, regardless of the measure being used. However, alternative interpretations are possible. For example, the use of limited choice peer nomination (in our case, up to three nominations were allowed for each item), which may have constrained children's choice of behaviours salient for each sex, and yielded few aggressive victim girls.

The behavioural pattern for Chinese aggressive victims was similar to the one noted for Western children. Aggressive victims in the Chinese peer groups were the most hyperactive and impulsive among the subgroups. In both settings, it appears that impaired emotional regulation and impulsive aggression may explain why aggressive victims are persistently bullied by peers. In addition, peers may find aggressive victims' off-task behaviours aversive and they may respond to them aggressively. Peers' aggressive behaviour may, in turn, lead to aggressive victims' ineffectual reactive aggression. A vicious cycle may begin that serves to externalise and internalise aggressive victims' maladaptive functioning. These consistent findings imply that self-regulation and nonaggressive behaviour may be valued in both Chinese and Western settings. Children who are friendly and able to control their impulses are well-liked in both cultures, whereas children who are not only aggressive, but also impulsive and dysregulated, are rejected, and likely to be victimised by their peers.

Also, consistent with Western research (Schwartz, 2000), Chinese aggressive victims were rarely rated as being withdrawn or submissive. Although a strong link has been found between withdrawn/submissive behaviour and peer victimisation in Western and Chinese cultural contexts (Boivin, Hymel, & Bukowski, 1995; Schwartz et al., 1993, 2001), the peer harassment experienced by the aggressive victims may be associated with their dysregulated and impulsive aggression, and not to their seemingly withdrawn or passive behaviour.

Compared with the normative group, Chinese aggressive victims were characterised as being less assertive and prosocial. Previous analyses with Western samples revealed that children who were rated as low in assertive-prosocial behaviour were frequently targeted for peer victimisation (Schwartz, 2000). Thus, due to their high scores on peer victimisation, it is not

surprising to find that aggressive victims had low composite assertive-prosocial behaviour ratings.

In terms of their undercontrolled off-task behaviours, the Chinese aggressive victims were characterised by their poor academic performance. Since academic success is strongly emphasised in Chinese culture, poor academic functioning may increase peer rejection, and may cause aggressive victims to be more disliked than other subgroups. The aggressive victims also had the lowest ratings on the social preference measure, and had the fewest dyadic friends across the four groups. This pattern supports prior research linking psychosocial maladjustment and peer relationships (Kupersmidt, Coie, & Dodge, 1990; Parker & Asher, 1987), and suggests that similarly to their Western counterparts, Chinese aggressive victims may also be at the highest risk for psychological problems.

In several respects, other Chinese aggressor/victim subgroups shared common characteristics with the aggressor/victim subgroups. For example, all three aggressor/victim subgroups had more impaired social skills (i.e., low levels of assertive-prosocial behaviour), and poorer academic functioning than did the normative group. These children also received lower social preference ratings from their teachers and peers than did the normative children. These results concur with previous findings for Western samples (Schwartz, 2000).

The results also revealed interesting differences among the three aggressor/victim subgroups. The aggressive victims were rated as being more hyperactive than the other subgroups, possibly due to their impaired behavioural and emotional regulation. They also had the lowest social preference ratings among the victims and aggressors. Compared to aggressive victims, nonaggressive victims were rated lower in assertive/prosocial behaviour, academic performance, and number of dyadic friendships. However, consistent with the Western research, nonaggressive victims were characterised by withdrawn/submissive behaviour, whereas the aggressive victims were not (Schwartz, 2000).

The current study replicated the dimensional associations between victimisation and withdrawn/submissive behaviours, and heterogeneity of victimisation found among Western samples (Schwartz, 2000), suggesting that although children's victimisation may be related to their withdrawn or submissive behaviour, some children might be victimised due to their dysregulated emotion and hyperactive off-task behaviours.

Nonvictimised aggressors also differed from aggressive victims in other important ways. Consistent with the notion of an ''effectual aggressor'' (Perry et al., 1992), these children received lower hyperactivity ratings. The nonvictimised aggressors had relatively impaired social skills (i.e., low ratings on assertive/prosocial behaviour), but they were not characterised by reactive emotion, and they had more dyadic friends than did the aggressive and nonaggressive victims. Even though nonvictimised aggressors were disliked by peers (i.e., had low social preference scores), their ability to use aggression as an instrumental strategy may have enabled them to form their own dyadic friends. Thus, they were not as highly rejected as were the aggressive victims. Therefore, it may be reasonable to expect that nonvictimised aggressive children form dyadic friendships, whereas the aggressive victims have few friends because of their reactive aggressive behaviour.

The results of the current study support the theoretical distinctiveness and significance of the aggressive victim subgroup in the Chinese context. Although withdrawn/submissive behaviours have been associated with peer victimisation in Mainland China (Schwartz et al., 2001), consistent with previous Western studies (Schwartz, 2000), heterogeneity exists in the children's social behaviour. A few of the victimised children were not characterised by withdrawn or submissive behaviour, but were classified as being emotionally dysregulated and reactively aggressive.

For a traditional collectivistic society like China, self-control and behavioural restraint are maintained through social norms and family pressure. In societies that stress behavioural and emotional control, it has been found that children tend to manifest more internalising behaviours and affect disturbances (Chen et al., 1995a; Dong, Xia, Lin, & Yang, 1995; Lambert, Weisz, & Knight, 1989). Studies have shown that Chinese parents and teachers are often relatively insensitive to children's emotional problems (Chen, 2000) and that they tend to focus on academic rather than psychological problems. Since emotional dysregulation is associated with aggressive victimisation, it may be that Chinese children who are both aggressive and victimised are relatively neglected. Moreover, because aggressive victims tend to have poor academic performance and are hyperactive, their problems may be construed as academic rather than psychological in the Chinese school system. Similar to Western children, these emotional problems tend to increase with age (Chen & Li, 2000; Chen et al., 1995a). Therefore, the early identification of aggressive victims has both theoretical and clinical significance.

Given that Chinese society emphasises self-control and prohibits dysregulated behaviour, it is not surprising to find that aggressive victims in Chinese children's peer groups were disliked by peers and had few friends. The correspondence of our Chinese findings to previous work with Western samples suggests that the same mechanisms might underlie the development of maladaptive behaviour, such as aggressive victimisation, in both societies. Aggressive children who are impulsive, highly reactive, and easily angered are more likely to be victimised by peers in both cultures because they have a hostile style of social interaction, which provokes peers to respond in kind. Accordingly, a vicious cycle develops that is difficult to reverse.

Our results also suggested that certain behavioural patterns, such as reactive aggression and impulsiveness, may not be tolerated across different cultural settings because this behaviour is detrimental to the maintenance of social order and positive interpersonal relationships. For an interpersonal-oriented culture like China, the tolerance for these ''out-of-control'' behaviours may be even lower than in most Western societies. Accordingly, Chinese children who display such behaviours may have a higher chance of being rejected or victimised by peers.

Although our findings were consistent with the patterns noted for Western peer groups, some distinctive cultural differences did emerge for the aggressor/victim subgroups. For example, the nonaggressive victims did not have poor academic performance compared with normative children in Western samples (Schwartz, 2000). However, these Chinese children did have lower academic performance than the normative group. This finding suggests that academic performance may play an important mediating role in peer rejection and victimisation in Chinese children and that children with poor educational performance may be more likely to be victimised.

Some cautionary remarks should be mentioned here. The

first concern is that we did not directly measure ''culture'' in the current study. To better understand how a particular cultural environment shapes the socialisation of aggressive victims, culturally relevant variables that can explain individual differences must be identified and examined along with children's social behaviour. For example, individual-level variables that reflect a collectivistic or interdependent orientation in Chinese settings may help to interpret these findings in a more culturally appropriate way. This issue needs to be addressed in future studies.

Our second concern is that the participants in the current study are not fully representative of Mainland Chinese children. China is a very diverse country and using a sample from a large urban city does not begin to cover the broad heterogeneity. Also, with the recent urbanisation, many Chinese people have begun to adopt some Western cultural values, producing considerable within-culture variability that may in turn directly influence children's social development and behaviour. Future research should be carried out in rural areas of China.

The third concern is with the measures used in our study. Questions are always raised when a measure that was developed in a Western context is used in another cultural context. Questions may have different meanings across settings, and the answers provided by informants may be affected by culturally appropriate (or inappropriate) values. For example, aggressive behaviour is prohibited in China. Thus, the level of aggression deemed as normal in a Western setting may be considered extreme in the Chinese context. In addition, the identification of aggressive victims may be affected by the correlation between the aggression and victimisation ratings. In our study, teachers' ratings of aggression were significantly correlated with victimisation, while peers' nominations were not. These findings are difficult to interpret and require further study.

Manuscript received October 2001
Revised manuscript received May 2002

References

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 and Psychopathology, 7*, 765–785.

Bond, M.H. (1996). *Handbook of Chinese psychology*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Boulton, M.J. (1999). Concurrent and longitudinal relations between children's playground behavior and social preference, victimization, and bullying. *Child Development, 70*, 944–954.

Boulton, M.J., & Smith, P.K. (1994). Bully/victim problems in middle-school children: Stability, self-perceived competence, peer perceptions, and peer acceptance. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 12*, 315–329.

Bowers, L., Smith, P., & Binney, V. (1994). Perceived family relationships of bullies, victims, and bully/victims in middle childhood. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 11,* 215–232.

Bukowski, W.M., Sippola, L.K., & Boivin, M. (1995, March). Friendship protects ''at risk'' children from victimization by peers. In J.M. Price (Chair), *The role of friendship in children's developmental risk and resilience: A developmental psychopathology perspective.* Symposium conducted at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Indianapolis, IN.

Chen, X. (2000). Growing up in a collectivistic culture: Socialization and socioemotional development in Chinese children. In A.L. Comunian & U.P. Gielen (Eds.), *International perspectives on human development* (pp. 331–353). Lengerich, Germany: Pabst Science Publishers.

Chen, X., & Li, B. (2000). Depressed mood in Chinese Children: Developmental significance for social and school adjustment. *International Journal of Behavioural Development, 24,* 472–479.

Chen, X., & Rubin, K.H. (1992). Correlates of peer acceptance in a Chinese sample of 6-year-olds. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 15*, 259–273.

Chen, X., Rubin, K.H., & Li, B. (1995a). Depressed mood in Chinese children: Relations with school performance and family environment. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 63*, 938–947.

Chen, X., Rubin, K.H., & Li, B. (1995b). Social and school adjustment of shy and aggressive children in China. *Development and Psychopathology, 7*, 337–349.

Chen, X., Rubin, K.H., & Li, D. (1997). Relation between academic achievement and social adjustment: Evidence from Chinese children. *Developmental Psychology, 33*, 518–525.

Chen, X., Rubin, K.H., Li, B., & Li, Z. (1999). Adolescent outcomes of social functioning in Chinese children. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 23*, 199–223.

Chen, X., Rubin, K.H., & Li, Z. (1995c). Social functioning and adjustment in Chinese children: A longitudinal study. *Developmental Psychology, 31*, 531–539.

Chen, X., Rubin, K. H., & Sun, Y. (1992). Social reputation and peer relationships in Chinese and Canadian children: A cross-cultural study. *Child Development, 63*, 1336–1343.

Coie, J.D., Dodge, K.A., & Coppotelli, H. (1982). Dimensions and types of social status: A cross-age perspective. *Developmental Psychology, 18,* 557–570.

Coie, J.D., Dodge, K.A., & Kupersmidt, J.B. (1990). Peer group behavior and social status. In S.R. Asher & J.D. Coie (Eds.), *Peer rejection in childhood*. New York: Cambridge.

Crick, N.R., & Grotpeter, J.K. (1995). Relational aggression, gender, and social-psychological adjustment. *Child Development, 66,* 710–722.

Crick, N.R., & Grotpeter, J.K. (1996). Children's treatment by peers: Victims of overt and relational victimization. *Development and Psychopathology, 8,* 367–380.

Dong, Q., Xia, Y., Lin, L., Yang, B. (1995). The stability and prediction of fears in Chinese children and adolescents: A one-year follow-up. *Journal of Child Psychology & Psychiatry, 36,* 819–831.

Farver, J.M. (1999). Activity setting analysis: A model for examining the role of culture in development. In A. Göncü, (Ed.), *Children's engagement in the world: Sociocultural perspectives* (pp. 99–127). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Farver, J.M., & Lee-Shin, Y. (1997). Social pretend play in Korean- and Anglo-American preschoolers. *Child Development, 68,* 536–544.

Farver, J.M., & Wimbarti, S. (1995). Indonesian children's play with their mothers and older siblings. *Child Development, 66*, 1493–1513.

Göncü, A., Tuermer, U., Jain, J., & Johnson, D. (1999). Children's play as cultural activity. In A. Göncü (Ed.), *Children's engagement in the world: Sociocultural perspectives* (pp. 148–170). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Graham, S., & Juvonen, J. (1998). A social cognitive perspective of peer aggression and victimization. *Annals of Child Development, 13,* 23–70.

Harkness, S. & Super, C.M. (1996). *Parents' cultural belief systems*. Guilford Press.

Harrist, A.W., Zaia, A.F., Bates, J.E., Dodge, K.A., & Pettit, G.S. (1997). Subtypes of social withdrawal in early childhood: Sociometric status and social-cognitive differences across four years. *Child Development, 68,* 278–294.

Ho, D.Y.F. (1986). Chinese pattern of socialization: A critical review. In M.H. Bond (Ed.), *The psychology of the Chinese people* (pp. 1–37). New York: Oxford University Press.

Hodges, E.V.E., Boivin, M., Vitaro, F., & Bukowski, W.M. (1999). The power of friendship: Protection against an escalating cycle of peer victimization. *Developmental Psychology, 35,* 94–101.

Hodges, E.V.E, Malone, M.J., & Perry, D.G. (1997). Individual risk and social risk as interacting determinants of victimization in the peer group. *Developmental Psychology, 33,* 1032–1039.

Hymel, S., Rubin, K.H., Rowden, L., & LeMare, L. (1990). Children's peer relationships: Longitudinal prediction of internalizing and externalizing problems from middle to late childhood. *Child Development, 61*, 2004–2021.

Kochenderfer, B.J., & Ladd, G.W. (1996). Peer victimization: Cause or consequence of school maladjustment? *Child Development, 67*, 1305–1317.

Kumpulainen, K., Räsänen, E., Henttonen, I., Almqvist, F., Kresanov, K., Linna, S., Moilanen, I., Piha, J., Puura, K., & Tamminen, T. (1998). Bullying and psychiatric symptoms among elementary school-age children. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 22,* 705–717.

Kupersmidt, J.B., Coie, J.D., & Dodge, K.A. (1990). The role of poor peer relationships in the development of disorder. In S.R. Asher, & J.D. Coie (Eds.), *Peer rejection in childhood* (pp. 274–305). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kupersmidt, J.B., & Patterson, C.J. (1991). Childhood peer rejection, aggression, withdrawal, and perceived competence as predictors of self-reported behavior problems in preadolescence. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 19,* 427–449.

Kupersmidt, J.B., Patterson, C.J., & Eickholt, C. (1989). *Socially rejected children: Bullies, victims, or both? Aggressors, victims, and peer relationships.* Paper

presented at the Society for Research in Child Development, Kansas City, MO.

Lagerspetz, K.M., Bjorkquist, K., & Peltonen, T. (1988). Is indirect aggression more typical of females? *Aggressive Behavior, 14,* 403–414.

Lambert, M.C., Weisz, J.R., & Knight, F. (1989). Over- and under-controlled clinic referral problems of Jamaican and American children and adolescents: The culture general and the culture specific. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *57,* 467–472.

Loeber, R., & Stouthamer-Loeber, M. (1998). Development of juvenile aggression and violence: Some common misconceptions and controversies. *American Psychologist, 53*, 242–259.

Luo, G. (1996). *Chinese traditional social and moral ideas and rules*. Beijing, China: The University of Chinese People Press.

Olweus, D. (1978). *Aggression in the schools: Bullies and their whipping boys*. Washington, DC: Hemisphere.

Parker, J.G., & Asher, S.R. (1987). Peer relations and later personal adjustment: Are low-accepted children at risk? *Psychological Bulletin, 102,* 357–389.

Pellegrini, A.D. (1998). Bullies and victims in school: A review and call for research. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 19,* 165–176.

Pellegrini, A.D., Bartini, M., & Brooks, F. (1999). School bullies, victims, and aggressive victims: Factors relating to group affiliation and victimization in early adolescence. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91,* 216–224.

Perry, D.G., Kusel, S.J., & Perry, L.C. (1988). Victims of peer aggression. *Developmental Psychology, 24*, 807–814.

Perry, D.G., Perry, L.C., & Kennedy, E. (1992). Conflict and the development of antisocial behavior. In C.U. Shantz & W.W. Hartup (Eds.), *Conflict in child and adolescent development* (pp. 301–329). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Perry, D.G., Willard, J., & Perry, L. (1990). Peers' perceptions of the consequences that victimized children provide aggressors. *Child Development, 61*, 1289–1309.

Rigby, K. (1994). Psychosocial functioning in families of Australian adolescent schoolchildren involved in bully/victim problems. *Journal of Family Therapy, 16,* 173–187.

Rubin, K.H., Chen, X., & Hymel, S. (1993). Socio-emotional characteristics of aggressive and withdrawn children. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 39*, 518–534.

Salmivalli, C., Kaukiainen, A., & Lagerspetz, K. (2000). Aggression and sociometric status among peers: Do gender and type of aggression matter? *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 41,* 17–24.

Schwartz, D. (1995, March). *The behavioral correlates of peer victimization.* Poster presented at the biennial meetings of the Society for Research in Child Development, Indianapolis, IN.

Schwartz, D. (2000). Subtypes of aggressors and victims in children's peer groups. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 28*, 181–192.

Schwartz, D., Chang, L., & Farver, J.M. (2001a). Correlates of victimization in Chinese children's peer groups. *Developmental Psychology, 37*, 520–532.

Schwartz, D., Dodge, K.A., & Coie, J.D. (1993). The emergence of chronic peer victimization in boys' play groups. *Child Development, 64*, 1755–1772.

Schwartz, D., Dodge, K.A., Pettit, G.S., & Bates, J. (1997). The early socialization of aggressive victims of bullying. *Child Development, 68,* 665–675.

Schwartz, D., Dodge, K.A., Pettit, G.S., Bates, J.E., & The Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group. (2000). Friendship as a moderating factor in the pathway between early harsh home environment and later victimization in the peer group. *Developmental Psychology, 36,* 646–662.

Schwartz, D., & Proctor, L.J. (2000). Community violence exposure and children's social adjustment in the school peer group: The mediating roles of emotion regulation and social cognition. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 68*, 670–683.

Schwartz, D., Proctor, L. J., & Chien, D. H. (2001b). The aggressive victims of bullying: Emotional and behavioral dysregulation as a pathway to victimization by peers. In J. Juvonen & S. Graham (Eds.), *Peer harassment in school: The plight of the vulnerable and victimized* (pp. 47–174). New York: The Guilford Press.

Smith, P.K., & Brain, P. (2000). Bullying in the schools: Lessons from two decades of research. *Aggressive Behavior, 26,* 1–9.

Triandis, H.C. (1986). Collectivism and individualism: A reconceptualization of a basic concept in cross-cultural psychology. In C. Bagley & G. Verma (Eds.), *Personality, cognition, and values: Cross-cultural perspectives of childhood and adolescence*. London: Macmillan.

Whiting, B., & Edwards, C. P. (1988). A cross-cultural analysis of sex differences in the behavior of children aged 3 through 11. In G. Handel (Ed.), *Childhood socialization* (pp. 281–297). New York: Hawthorne.