SOCIETY REGISTER | 2017 | 1(1): 75-87 | ISSN 2544-5502
http://societyregister.eu/ | DOI: 10.14746/sr.2017.1.1.07

ALEKSANDRA TLUSCIAK-DELIOWSKA
The Maria Grzegorzewska Pedagogical University in Warsaw
adeliowska@aps.edu.pl

TWO SIDES OF THE COIN: A PERSON- AND PROCESS-CENTERED ANALYTICAL APPROACH TO SCHOOL BULLYING PHENOMENON[1]

Abstract: Over the past four decades of research on school bullying have produced an extensive body of knowledge about the nature of this phenomenon, its determinants and consequences. Bullying has been examined and explained in individual as well as in contextual terms, and from a wide range of different theories and research methods. In the literature, it can be found some attempts to sort out scientific approaches to bullying.

In this article, which should be treated as review-style essay, I will present two complementary approaches to analyzing school bullying, namely (1) person-oriented analytical approach which focuses on analyzing of individual traits and characteristics of children involved in school bullying, and (2) processual analytical approach that emphasizes the processes involved. These approaches were distinguished based on the review of Polish and foreign literature on school bullying.

Keywords: bullying; peer violence; theoretical perspectives; analytical perspectives; research.

Theoretical Perspectives of School Bullying: An Introduction to Further Considerations

Bullying is not a new problem for educational settings, however, in the recent years its importance is being recognized commonly. School bullying is a very complex phenomenon. Cornell and Limber (2015) stated that this situation is potential for confusion and controversy over its meaning, severity and relation with other constructs. Despite the differences in defining bullying by different authors (see i.e. Griffin & Gross 2004; Volk, Dane & Marini 2014), certain common elements are identified. The conventional definition of bullying includes three main characteristics: (1) intentional harm-doing, (2) a power imbalance between aggressor and victim, and (3) repetition of the aggressive behavior.

[1] Only a few issues related to the main theme have been presented in this article. Detailed explication of these issues with critical analysis were presented in the book "Dręczenie szkolne. Społeczno-pedagogiczna analiza zjawiska" [School bullying. Socio-educational analysis of the phenomenon]. Warszawa 2017: Wydawnictwo APS, pp. 208.

Bullying can take many different forms. The most often distinguished are: physical bullying, verbal abuse, social exclusion and cyberbullying. Physical bullying refers to overt physical aggression, which can occur in the form of beating, pushing, digging, spitting. Verbal intimidation includes the behavior of overt verbal aggression involving ridiculing, insulting, name-calling. Social exclusion refers to a situation where the perpetrator, for example, manipulates social relationships in such a way as to undermine the social standing of the victim in the peer group. This form includes such aggressive behaviors as spreading gossip, ignoring, isolating, setting a group against the individual. Recently, through to the development of modern communication technologies, bullying has been extended by the use of these tools. That is why cyberbullying can be expressed in a variety of ways, such as threats and intimidation via comments on social-networking sites, unwanted texting, repeatedly harassing, publicly posting, sending or forwarding personal or private information or images, online exclusion, etc. (Pyżalski 2012). At the same time, it should be remembered that these forms of harassment do not constitute isolated "beings" (see i.e. Tłuściak-Deliowska 2017: 28), and therefore one bully may undertake various aggressive behaviors falling within each of the aforementioned forms. Results of numerous studies have pointed the negative short and long-term consequences of bullying for all participants (Olweus 1993; Griffin & Gross 2004; Espelage & Swearer 2003).

Over the four decades of research on school bullying have produced an extensive body of knowledge about the nature of this phenomenon, its determinants and its consequences. Bullying has been examined and explained in individual as well as in contextual terms, and from a wide range of different theories and research methods. In the literature, it can be found some attempts to sort out scientific approaches to bullying.

Research on school bullying can be thought of as having gone through four waves described by Smith (2012). First wave may be dated from the 1970s, when the systematic study of bullying in Scandinavia has been started, with Olweus' pioneering research, to 1988. During this time period, the focus was mainly on physical and verbal bullying, and was primarily examined through questionnaires. The second phase covers the years 1989-1990, when the problem of bullying started to appear in books and journal articles as well as surveys in other countries beyond Scandinavia were beginning to be carried out. Besides self-report surveys, some studies started to use peer nominations methodology. The first major preventive and intervention actions were launched. The bullying typology was broadening and researchers included indirect and relational bullying. The third wave is 1991-2003. During this period, bullying became an important part of international research programs. A notable methodological step was the introduction of participant roles in bullying, from Salmivalli's work in Finland (Salmivalli et al. 1996). The fourth phase, which began in 2004, is the stage when aggressive behaviors involving new communication technologies (cyberbullying) are included in bullying research.

The theoretical and empirical studies on school bullying could be systematize, considering the research paradigms in social sciences, namely quantitative *versus* qualitative. It would also be possible to refer to specific theories and concepts explained aggressive and violent behaviors, including psychological theories (i.e. social information processing model, see i.e. Crick & Dodge 1994; theory of mind, see i.e. Sutton et al. 1999; etc.), sociological (i.e. theoretical model of resource control theory; Hawley 1999, 2007) integrative theories (among which extremely popular

is the socio-ecological theory of Bronfenbrenner 1979; Espelage 2014; Espelage & Swearer 2004). However, this kind of solution would be closer to the situation described in the metaphor of blind men around the elephant of bullying, referred by Thornberg (2015a). Then, it would be possible to find out that each of them explains only "a piece" of the school bullying phenomenon, moreover, the simple adding of theories would be naive. For this reason, it is better to look for another "key" and to find some perspectives which organized researchers' thoughts and ideas about school bullying and make them clear to others.

Yoneyama and Naito (2003), based on the review the Japanese literature on bullying (*ijime*) stated that the understanding of this phenomenon may be two-fold: as individualized issue as well as social issue (individual model *versus* collective model). In the authors' opinion, the explanation as to why some students bully others has been sought primarily within the personal attributes of the bully and the victim. The second perspective identified by cited authors is based on sociological framework. Bullying as a social issue may be treated as structural problem inherent in the particular social milieu. For this reason, fundamental solution of school bullying problem comes with the revision and change of the social structure itself. Similar perspectives are indicated by other authors of this issue.

Slee and Mohyla (2007) made a distinction between first- and second- order perspectives on bullying. The first-order perspective refers to theories explaining bullying in individual terms, such as individual dysfunctions, traits and intentions, while the second-order perspective refers to theories explaining bullying as part of social processes contextualized in the particular situation. This distinction is also referred to by Schott and Sondergaard (2014; they used terms: paradigm one and paradigm two), Koushold and Fisker (2015), Thornberg (2015a), Horton and Forsberg (2015). Synthetic presentation of assumptions of these paradigms was made by Hellfeldt (2016) in her dissertation. She concluded that the first paradigm focuses on individual dysfunctions, while the second paradigm understands and explains bullying as social processes which occurs within a wider context in which different norms and structures interact with bullying behaviors.

It can be said that the theoretical perspectives on school bullying identified by the above-mentioned authors are similar. They try to compose two opposites, like individual *versus* collective, psychology *versus* sociology, unit *versus* system. Some theoretical perspectives on bullying distinguished in this way are a set of assumptions that inform the questions researchers ask and the kinds of answers we arrive at as a result. In this sense, the identified theoretical perspectives can be understood as a lens through which school bullying researchers look, serving to focus or distort what researchers see.

Some authors, like Thornberg (2015a) or Hellfeldt (2016) underline the need for a third paradigm. Thornberg (2015a) argued that the social-ecological framework provides the opportunity for the various theoretical perspectives to come together in addressing the micro-, meso-, exo-, and macro-systems of school bullying and hence the complex interplay of individual and contextual factors. He stated that there is today a tension between theoretical perspectives on bullying, but also a need for investigating the social and contextual aspects of bullying further. He also argued that school bullying researchers need to engage in dialogue if they would like to better understand the problem of school bullying.

In this article, I will present two complementary approaches to analyzing school bullying, namely (1) personological approach which focuses on analyzing of

individual traits and characteristics of children involve in school bullying, and (2) processual approach that emphasizes the processes involved. In some aspects, they are similar to previously presented theoretical perspectives. It was assumed that analytical approaches are use of analysis to break a problem of school bullying down into the elements necessary to solve it. These approaches were distinguished based on the review of Polish and foreign literature on school bullying.

This article is written in review style essay. My aim is to present two complementary approaches to analyzing school bullying, their assumptions and logic. Although, this article provides short background to presented perspectives on school bullying, the literature I have cited should not be considered as a complete list. Detailed presentation and analysis of the school bullying phenomenon from both analytical perspectives is the subject of my book entitled "School bullying. Socio-educational analysis of the phenomenon" (2017) (in original: Dręczenie szkolne. Społeczno-pedagogiczna analiza zjawiska).

Person-centered Analytical Approach in School Bullying Research

The first identified perspective is a personological orientation (person-centered), due to the predominant concentration on individuals involved in bullying. This approach refers to the perspective mentioned earlier in this article as first-order paradigm or individual model. For this analytical perspective characteristic is that the combination of traits of the individual becomes the key and center of interest of researchers. The trait is defined as a relatively constant, person-specific, generalized tendency to specific behaviors manifested in different situations (Strelau 2004: 658). In this analytical perspective emphasis is given in intra- and interpersonal factors. Due to the fact, that school bullying is explained by individual personality-behavioral traits, this kind of approach can be defined also as clinically.

The subject of the analysis is therefore the 'person' or 'group of several persons' and the factors conditioning their behaviors. Therefore, attention focuses in particular on students who exhibit aggressive behavior (the categories and intensity of these behaviors are analyzed), experience them, and / or witness such situations. In this perspective, the 'resources' of an individual are considered, while taking into account the role of family environment factors as a primary educational environment. Research in this perspective focuses primarily on the search for risk factors and protective factors to become perpetrators and / or victims, and therefore focus on determining certain parameters that determine the behavior of individuals. Based on a strictly empirical quantitative approach, researchers and practitioners seek to identify the causes of harassment, to predict the circumstances of their occurrence, and to develop intervention programs based on empirical evidences.

Research conducted in this field focuses on seeking explanations and the causes of aggressive behavior of the individual as well as identifying the characteristics of the victim for which he or she becomes a victim. Thanks to this approach, both the psychological portrait of the perpetrator and the victim were created. Olweus (1993) first described children who perpetrate bullying (bullies). Bully may be considered as a child who manifests intentional and repeated aggressive behaviors toward other children. Olweus (1993) pointed to the following characteristics of the bully: the fascination with violence and its tools, the impulsivity, the need for domination, the lack of compassion for the victim, the average or slightly higher than the

average student's self-esteem. Olweus found also that bullies are characterized by low or at most average levels of fear and insecurity. This type of individual traits and characteristics were analyzed in later empirical studies. This is how a typical perpetrator of a school bullying was constructed as an unmatched aggressor who has a clear lack of social skills. Meanwhile, the myriad of research that has been carried out since then, has caused this image to be slightly altered and supplemented. Cook et al. (2010) have conducted a meta-analysis of empirical studies conducted since 1970 on school bullying based on which the profile of typical bully has been updated. It is a student who exhibits extrinsic behavior (aggression, opposition and resistance to the environment, rebelliousness, disobedience, destructiveness, explosiveness), but may also have internalization symptoms, social skills as well as school achievement, negative attitudes and beliefs towards others, having difficulties with solving interpersonal problems, come from a family that can be described as conflicting and of low parental control, sees the school through the prism of negative atmosphere in it. Based on these descriptions (and many other research embedded in this perspective), it can be stated that group of perpetrators is not homogeneous in terms of intra- and interpersonal traits. What is true about some of them (e.g. social rejection) does not have to be relevant to other bullies. Of course, the common feature is the manifestation of violent behaviors.

Victim may be defined as a child who is a target of bully. Olweus (1993) found that victimized children, in general, were more anxious, insecure and have lower levels of self -esteem than not bullied children. These victims were labeled as 'passive victims' (called also 'submissive victims', Olweus, 2010), since their submissiveness and insecurity signaled to others that they were 'easy' targets and were unlikely to resist a possible attack. In the case of 'classic' victims, their intrapersonal qualities, such as shyness, anxiety, withdrawal, and interpersonal traits such as peer dismissal, lack of friends, increase the likelihood that no one will stand in their defense and reassure them in an unfavorable, isolated position. These features student may have as personality characteristics that make them susceptible to successful attacks, but may also be acquired as a result of systematic victimization (see Juvonen and Graham, 2014). Besides passive victims, Olweus (1993) also identified children whose we termed 'provocative victims' or 'bully-victims' (Griffin & Gross 2004). These children are described as hyperactive, irritating, hot-headed and aggressive. They trigger other children to initiate negative actions against them. This category of school bullying role has been described as the most problematic and, in keeping with this research paradigm, studies have tried to identify factors relating to those children who are categorized as bully/victims (Veenstra et al. 2005).

The traditional classification of students involved in school bullying distinguishing the perpetrator, victim, bully-victim and non-engaged peers was, in time, criticized as insufficient for the full description of the phenomenon (see Gini et al., 2008). Especially the question of the other students, called 'uninvolved' was doubtful. Studies have shown that when it comes to bullying, most students not only have awareness what is going on (for example because of the repetition of activities), but more than once witnesses a variety of bullying incidents and behaves in different ways. Hence, apart from the perpetrator and the victim, the different bystanders' roles have been identified and distinguished (Salmivalli et al. 1996). For example, children could be involved either as (1) 'ringleaders', initiating

and organizing the bullying or as (2) 'followers', joining in and participating in the negative, harm-doing behaviors when they have begun. (3) Reinforcers of bullies provide positive feedback through watching, laughing, cheering and so on. In addition to these roles, so-called (4) 'outsiders' and (5) 'defenders' have been identified. It means children who may be actually unaware of the bullying, or who act in different ways to protect or help the victim or hinder the bully.

This new trend of research - concerned on bullying bystanders - is also embedded in a personological perspective, because another 'behavioral entity' has been added to the perpetrator and victim in order to explain the occurrence of school bullying. Discovery of bullying bystanders is, however, a pivotal point in the process-oriented perspective on school bullying, nevertheless the focus on the actions taken by individual witnesses and the intra- or interpersonal determinants of such behaviors is still typical for person-centered analytical approach.

The person-centered analytical perspective has contributed greatly to a significant theoretical output devoted to bullying. The personal characteristics (and deficits) of victims and bullies and other involved students has been one of the most widely studied area of bullying. Within this approach many important assumptions about the characteristic features of the phenomenon has been formulated. The negative consequence of such personological orientation is the association of bullying with some individuals whose 'imperfections' constitute a 'defect' and that's why individual is responsible for the systematic manifestation of aggressive behavior or become a victim. The value of the person-oriented approach is limited by the fact that the vision of the school bullying phenomenon in a fragmented manner, focused on isolated components, without taking into account the dynamics, processes and many contexts that translates into a mechanistic and static approach to the problem.

Polish literature about aggressive and violent behaviors among schoolchildren is dominated by a person-centered orientation (see Tłuściak-Deliowska 2017). Plenty of books and scientific articles begin with an indication of the characteristics of the perpetrator and the victim, whereby they can be identified easily in the school group. Then practitioners 'armed' with this type of information can watch their pupil group closely, 'pick up' those who need intervention and / or need help, design and implement programs to eliminate unwanted behaviors. Therefore, the consequence of the personological perspective on peer harassment is that it is a 'behavioral entity' that is the core of the undertaken diagnostic, preventive and remedial procedures. It seeks to provide objective diagnosis and analysis of the individual and its environment by identifying verifiable factors within the students' personality and correlations with the social environment factors. Then the effects of this analysis are compared with the image of the ideal educational environment, and the change is planned. This approach is understandable from the point of view of pedagogical practice, furthermore research should also serve and be a starting point for developing strategies of intervention. However, as Koushold and Fisker (2015) pointed, this way of understanding can be critiqued as merely individualistic, categorizing, behavioral and stigmatizing.

Also as a consequence of this orientation, it may be perceived the finding that the characteristic of school bullying (namely imbalance of power, intentionality of harm, repetition of behavior) are identified with the effect of the characteristics of the student. For example, the imbalance of power is reduced to a disproportion between the characteristics of the perpetrator and the victim, such as body

composition, character or temperamental traits, ability to use new technology tools, etc. In addition, these characteristics are treated in a stable manner, (rather) fixed attribute. However, it turns out that although we managed to describe the specific psychological portraits of individuals involved in school bullying phenomenon, based on a review of recent research in this field, it could be noticed that groups of these students (even bullies or victims or bystanders) were not at all homogeneous groups in terms of analyzed characteristics. Which points the need to look for another explaining key of school bullying phenomenon.

Process-centered Analytical Approach in School Bullying Research

The second analytical orientation was called a processual perspective (process-centered), because of the analysis the school bullying phenomenon through analyzing the social processes.

Characteristic in this perspective is emphasize on the complex processes involved. These processes may be socially and culturally in nature. The analyzed processes can be break down into the smaller pieces necessary to explain them. Processes are a series of phenomena that affect the individual or a social group. These groups and individuals clash with each other under the influence of various types of causal or structural-functional relationships. As a result of these phenomena, there are various socio-cultural transformations.

In the process-oriented perspective, the individual characteristics of the involved students come to the background, as the first one are the bullying activating and supporting processes. Instead of static analysis, there are dynamic analyzes, trying to reconstruct processes, understand their context, mutual conditioning and interdependence. Bullying is not just a simple series of negative actions taken and repeated by the same student. Phenomenon is explained by processes, such as the dynamics of a group (social positioning processes, differentiation of power), interactive processes and the culture that determines them. The process approach attempts to answer questions about the mechanisms and processes involved in the phenomenon of peer harassment, but also shows this phenomenon in a wider social and cultural context.

Attention to the social and group side of the phenomenon by 'entangling' most students in the peer group (classroom) leads to the analysis of peer ecology and intragroup dynamics (see also Rodkin, Espelage & Hanish 2015). Rodkin and Hodges (2003) defined peer ecology as a part of children's microsystem that involves children interacting with, influencing and socializing with each other (p. 385). Gest and Rodkin (2011) described the classroom peer ecology as encompassing (a) the richness of interpersonal ties, (b) social structure or status hierarchy, and (c) patterns of social behaviors exhibited by classroom peers (see also Rubin, Bukowski, & Parker 2006). Amongst the members of a peer group, there is a state of interdependence, through which the behaviors, attitudes, opinions, and experiences of each member are collectively influenced by the other group members. In conclusion, pupils occupying certain positions within the group structure (in the classroom) do not remain idle or passive towards each other. They are in a state of continuous exerting social interactions resulting from peer ecology. From this point of view, it could be found that the phenomenon of school bullying is a product of the conditions and situations in which all students are present, but also depends on the tasks they perform.

Taking into account the social mechanisms that occur in the peer group, school bullying can be treated as an effect of the social positioning process where, in the course of interactions between members of the group, differences in positions occupy themselves, and that implies their particular actions. School bullying is based on processes related to peer status, acquisition and maintenance of that status (see i.e. research Veenstra et al. 2007; Veenstra et at. 2010). Based on many research describing the bully, it could be noted that the perpetrator, despite the prevailing opinion, is perceived by his peers as popular, has prestige and authority, but it does not mean he/she is liked by them (see i.e. Caravita & Cillessen 2012). Furthermore, bullies are particularly popular in those classes that are clearly hierarchical (Garandeau, Lee and Salmivalli 2014). Explanation of such situation may be the following. From individual that occupies a central position in a group it is expected that he or she will maintain this position. However, it should be noticed that perceived popularity, the social status of an individual in a group are not fixed properties that after acquired become non-viable. Also, keep in mind that they are characteristics of a relationship, not an individual trait. The benefits of the effectiveness of popularity-enhancing actions are therefore reinforcing the frequency of the behavior of such behavior to maintain its position. Hence, in order to maintain its dominant status within the group, the perpetrator must control other peers (see Garandeau & Cillessen 2006). Power in the group to which the perpetrator is seeking is 'fluid' and mutable; hence, it is legitimate to state that the imbalance of power is situational and relational rather than localized in the individual and resulting from its permanent characteristics (Thornberg 2015a). The pupil's power is not permanent because the dynamics of changes in each group is strong. The power centers may also change. Hence it is so important for a pupil with power to use his/her already existing power to consolidate the existing social hierarchy. This type of finding, which is the starting point for analyzing pupils' positions and roles in bullying, gives a glimpse into the phenomenon of school bullying in a structural and functional way. Bullying is understood as the result of the social dynamics of individuals belonging to a peer group.

Based on the research concentrated on bullying bystanders (i.e. Salmivalli et al. 1996; Salmivalli et al. 2011) it can be stated, that the peer harassment does not make sense without the whole peer group, without the proper social context and processes in it. It means synchronizing individuals with the group and positioning each other, which in turn has positive and negative consequences in the context of harassment for students in different social positions. Meanwhile, harassment can also be useful for the group as a whole. What is the profit for the whole peer group? From the group's perspective, the phenomenon of harassment is not pathological. On the contrary, the harassment of a student within such a group is beneficial to the group as it demonstrates the self-regulation of social processes and ensures its apparent cohesion and homeostasis. Thanks to the repeatability of these activities, the created differences between positions are maintained. Thus, the moral order in the social group signifies the state of social order. Social group governance means a way of organizing and operating in which the principles and rules of the operation are coherent and consistent with each other, are respected and safeguard unity in orderly multiplicity. Each group, including the school class (peer group) needs this order to protect themselves from the excessive number of conflicts that would prevent coordination of meeting individual and social needs and / or hindering communication and social cohesion. The order and predictability of the social world

of a group are determined by norms that are specific systems of constructs with values. Maintaining order is possible under the condition that members conform to the group norms and thus the presence of social control measures. From this point of view, the perpetrator can be seen as a disposer of sanctions, acting as a reference to the order of those who break up, disrupt order, or break group norms. From the perspective of the peer group, harassment is a normative norm that is supported by its members who are the 'guardians' of this order (see i.e. Garandeu & Cillessen 2006; Garandeu, Lee & Salmivalli 2014; Klein & Cornell 2010; Davies 2011; Komendant-Brodowska 2014; Tłuściak-Deliowska 2017).

Based on the above-mentioned issues, it has been pointed out that the central 'objects' in the school bullying phenomenon are the pupils in the social relations system conditioned by certain structures within which their actions are embedded. The student actions are implication from the inner dynamics of the group. The discussed processes explained how the positioning of pupils takes place and how the structure of bullying is produced, which is in relation to power and social influence. However, these processes are somewhat impersonal. Analysis, first of all components, then processes, are done 'from the outside'. In this way, to the top layer of the social order that created the phenomenon of bullying may be pointed. This analysis may be complemented by the analysis of interactive processes. This step can 'fill in' and 'saturate' the impersonal social processes mentioned earlier.

It is worth referring to symbolic and interactive processes, somewhat more subjective in their essence and analyzed 'inwardly'. Their quintessence is the process of conferring and interpreting the meanings produced in mutual student interactions. Analyzes conducted in this way are inspired mainly by symbolic interactionism (Blumer 2007). Hence, school class (peer group) can be recognized as a place of permanent negotiations, which result in the crystallization of school bullying. Social roles are understood not as something done and externally imposed on individual, but as something that is still arising in interpersonal interactions. From this point of view the role of bully, victim, various roles of bystanders are not static, but social and processional. They are constructed by interacting with them. More stable identity patterns and role patterns can be recognized if they are shared by a group over a longer time period. In this way, the role of bullying participants should be considered, which is preserved in the effect of various interventions. 'Roles are played' and important is what shape takes on this role as it is played by individual actors and how relationships are formed with different partners. Reality described by young people can be interpreted through the ongoing negotiations' processes. By communicating and responding to their own reactions, and above all by giving them meaning, applying them and changing them in the interpretative process that accompanies each other, students negotiate their group membership and identity, as well as their role in the school bullying. They are continuous processes, unstable, indicating the possibility of a change of order that is not revolutionary, but rather evolves from the interpretation of conflicts and behaviors. In this way, the accent is shifted from the process of role-playing social status in the group for interactive and cognitive-symbolic processes. Such processes in the context of school bullying have been described based on research carried by i.e. Thornberg (2015b), Forsberg and Thornberg (2016), Konieczna (2015).

In addition, it should be noted that bullying is a part of a wider dynamic mosaic of social phenomena, hence the appeal in this perspective to the culture of the group. Culture is a 'background' element for building a definition of a situation, but

culture also arises as a result of individuals' actions. Culture provides an interpretative framework for students who interact with each other, how they should think about individual behaviors, and how to act (Dernowska & Tłuściak-Deliowska 2015). Bullying is therefore the product of social activities that are perpetuated by forms of culture, including school culture and the penetrating peer culture. If we want to know the context of interaction for particular students' behaviors, we should look at the peer culture and / or the school culture and its components.

The logic of process-centered perspective was presented above with signaling what processes can be analyzed to clarify school bullying phenomenon. Like person-centered perspective, this analytical perspective is not free from limitations. A complex and dynamic approach to school bullying phenomenon and concentration on processes cause methodological difficulties, such as the capture of these processes. Furthermore, adopting only a process perspective can result in perceptions of pupils as involuntary objects driven by certain social 'forces' responsible for the positioning of the pupils in processes by which bullying is constituted. The students then can be treated as 'entangled', drawn into the phenomenon due to the action of a particular social power, with no influence on it. In addition, the indicated processes are typical for all social groups. From this perspective a pessimistic view emerges, because it can be concluded that nothing can be done with the phenomenon of peer harassment, because the processes by which bullying is constituted are a natural part of the social world functioning. Such isolated perception results in significant reductionism. Meanwhile, the implication of the processual perspective is to point out that bullying is a social process that draws pupils into social dynamics but reflects the behavior of individuals.

Conclusions

The distinction between the two analytical perspectives (person- and process-centered) of school bullying has made it possible to systematize the theoretical work of school bullying researchers as well as to provide a basis for further exploration of this phenomenon. The use of a specific 'analytical language' defines our way of seeing a school bullying phenomenon.

Although the processual perspective allows to ask other questions than the personological perspective, it is important to admit that the analyzed processes involved the same students, which have been characterized in a personological perspective. It confirms the belief that only one of these perspectives involves one-sidedness and means incomplete capture of the phenomenon. Based on this, it can be stated that the factors revealed by research conducted in the person-oriented analytical perspective result increase the probability of entanglement / involvement in school bullying, but only in conjunction with some processes and 'here and now' context. It is impossible to define the bully without the victim, and vice versa, as well as the two persons and the relationship that unites them would not exist without the bystanders and if not the social mechanisms they are subject to. Thus, in my opinion, only taking into account both perspectives provides to know and full understand the phenomenon of school bullying. Metaphorically speaking, it can be said that, due to the person-oriented perspective the researcher learns what time

it is, and due to the process-oriented perspective, is familiar with the mechanism of the watch.

REFERENCES

Blumer H. 2007. *Interakcjonizm symboliczny*, tlum. G. Woroniecka. Kraków: NOMOS.

Bronfendbrenner U. 1979. *The Ecology of Human Development: Experiments by Nature and Design.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Caravita S.C.S, Cillessen A.H.N. 2012. "Agentic or Communal? Associations between Interpersonal Goals, Popularity, and Bullying in Middle Childhood and Early Adolescence". *Social Development* 21(2): 376-395.

Cook C.R., Williams K.R., Guerra N.G., Kim T.E., Sadek S. 2010. "Predictors of bullying and victimization in childhood and adolescence: a meta-analytic investigation". *School Psychology Quarterly* 25(2): 65-83.

Cornell, D., Limber, S.P. 2015. "Law and Policy on the concept of bullying at school". *American Psychologist* 70(4): 333–343.

Davies B. 2011. "Bullies as Guardians of the Moral Order or an Ethic of Truths?" *Children & Society* 25: 278-286.

Dernowska U., Tłuściak-Deliowska A. 2015. *Kultura szkoły. Studium teoretyczno-empiryczne*. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls.

Espelage, D.L. 2014. "Ecological Theory: Preventing Youth Bullying, Aggression, and Victimization". *Theory Into Practice* 53(4): 257-264.

Espelage, D.L., Swearer S.M. 2004. *Bullying in American schools: A social-ecological perspective on prevention and intervention*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Espelage D.L., Swearer S.M. 2003. "Research on school bullying and victimization: what have we learned and where do we go from here?" *School Psychology Review* 12(3): 365-383.

Forsberg C., Thornberg R. 2016. "The social ordering of belonging: Children's perspectives on bullying". *International Journal of Educational Research* 78: 13-23

Garandeau C.F., Cillessen A.H.N. 2006. "From indirect aggression to invisible aggression: A conceptual view on bullying and peer group manipulation". *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 11: 612-625.

Garandeau C.F., Lee I.A., Salmivalli Ch. 2014. "Inequality Matters: Classroom Status Hierarchy and Adolescents' Bullying". *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 43(7): 1123-1133.

Gest S.D., Rodkin P.C. 2011. „Teaching practices and elementary classroom peer ecologies". *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology* 32(5): 288-296.

Gini, G., Albiero, P., Benelli, B., Altoe, G. 2008. „Determinants of adolescents' active defending and passive bystanding behavior in bullying". *Journal of Adolescence* 31: 93–105.

Griffin S.R., Gross A.M. 2004. "Childhood bullying: Current empirical findings and future directions for research". *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 9(4): 379–400.

Hawley, P.H. 1999. "The ontogenesis of social dominance: A strategy-based evolutionary perspective". *Developmental Review* 19: 97-132.

Hawley, P.H. 2002. "Social dominance and prosocial and coercive strategies of resource control in preschoolers". *International Journal of Behavioral Development* 26: 167-176.

Hellfeldt K. 2016. *The Hurt Self. Bullied Children's Experiences of Social Support, Recognition and Trust at School*, Örebro Studies in Social Work 18. Sweden: Örebro University.

Horton P, Forsberg C. 2015. "Essays on school bullying: theoretical perspectives on a contemporary problem". *Confero* 3(1): 6-16.

Konieczna A. 2015. *Członkowie klasy wobec sytuacji „odrzucania kolegi".* Warszawa: Wydawnictwo APS.

Komendant-Brodowska A. 2014. *Grupowe uwarunkowania przemocy szkolnej.* Doctoral dissertation, Uniwersytet Warszawski.

Kousholt K., Fisker T.B. 2015. "Approaches to Reduce Bullying in Schools – A Critical Analysis from the Viewpoint of First- and Second-Order Perspectives on Bullying". *Children & Society* 29(6): 596-603.

Olweus, D. 1993. *Bullying at School: What We Know and What We Can Do*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Rodkin P.C., Espelage D.L., Hanish L.D. 2015. "A relational framework for understanding bullying. Developmental antecedents and outcomes". *American Psychologist* 70(4): 311-321.

Rodkin P.C., Hodges E.V.E. 2003. "Bullies and victims in the peer ecology: four questions for psychologist and school professionals". *School Psychology Review* 32(3): 384-400.

Rubin K.H., Bukowski W., Parker J., 2006. „Peer interactions, relationships and groups". [in] Damon W, Lerner R, Eisenberg N, (eds.). *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 3. Social, emotional, and personality development*. 6th ed Wiley; New York. pp. 571–645.

Salmivalli C., Voeten M., Poskiparta E. 2011. „Bystanders Matter: Association Between Reinforcing, Defending and the Frequency of Bullying Behavior in Classrooms". *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescence Psychology* 40 (5): 668-676.

Salmivalli, C., K. Lagerspetz, K. Björkqvist, K. Österman, Kaukiainen A. 1996, "Bullying as a group process: participant roles and their relations to social status within the group", *Aggressive Behavior* 22: 1-15.

Schott R.M., Sondergaard, D.M. 2014. "Introduction: new approaches to school bullying", [in:] Schott R.M., Sondergaard, D.M. (Eds.), *School Bullying: New Theories in Context* (p. 1-17). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Slee P.T., Mohyla J. 2007. "The PEACE Pack: An evaluation of interventions to reduce bullying in four Australian primary schools". *Educational Research* 49(2): 103-114.

Smith, P. K. 2012. "Cyberbullying and cyber aggression", in S. R. Jimerson., A. B. Nickerson., M. J. Mayer., and M. J. Furlong (eds.), *Handbook of School Violence and School Safety. International Research and Practice,* New York, Routledge, pp. 93-103 (2nd ed.).

Sutton, J., Smith, P.K., & Swettenham, J. 1999. "Bullying and 'theory of mind': A critique of the "social skills deficit" view of anti-social behavior". *Social Development* 8: 117-127.

Strelau J. 2004. „Różnice indywidualne: opis, determinant i aspekt społeczny". [in] J. Strelau (Eds.) *Psychologia. Podręcznik akademicki.* Gdańsk: GWP, s. 653-682.

Thornberg R. 2015a. "The social dynamics of school bullying: The necessary dialogue between the blind men around the elephant and the possible meeting point at the socioecological square". *Confero* 3(1): 1-41.

Thornberg R. 2015b. "The social dynamics of school bullying: The necessary dialogue between the blind men around the elephant and the possible meeting point at the socioecological square". *Confero* 3(1): 1-41.

Tlusciak-Deliowska A. 2017. *Dreczenie szkolne. Spoleczno-pedagogiczna analiza zjawiska.* Warszawa: Wydawnictwo APS.

Veenstra R., Lindenberg S., Munniksma A., Dijkstra J.K. 2010. „The complex relations between bullying, victimization, acceptance and rejection: giving special attention to status, affection and sex differences". *Child Development* 81: 480-486.

Veenstra R., Lindenberg S., Zijlstra B.J.H., De Winter A.F., Verhulst F.C. 2007. "The dyadic nature of bullying and victimization: testing a dual-perspective theory". *Child Development* 78(6): 1843-1854.

Veenstra, R., Lindenberg, S., Oldehinkel, A. J., De Winter, A. F., Verhulst, F. C., Ormel, J. 2005. "Bullying and victimization in elementary schools: a comparison of bullies, victims, bully/victims, and uninvolved preadolescents". *Developmental Psychology* 41(4): 672.

Volk A.A., Dane A.V., Marini Z. A. 2014. „What is bullying? A theoretical redefinition". *Developmental Review* 34: 327-343.

Yoneyama S., Naito A. 2003. "Problems with the paradigm: the school as a factor in understanding bullying (with special reference to Japan)". *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 24: 315-330.