




United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization




Sustainable
Development
Goals



Behind the numbers:
Ending school violence
and bullying

UNESCO Education Sector

Education is UNESCO's top priority because it is a basic human right and the foundation on which to build peace and drive sustainable development. UNESCO is the United Nations' specialized agency for education and the Education Sector provides global and regional leadership in education, strengthens national education systems and responds to contemporary global challenges through education with a special focus on gender equality and Africa.



The Global Education 2030 Agenda

UNESCO, as the United Nations' specialized agency for education, is entrusted to lead and coordinate the Education 2030 Agenda, which is part of a global movement to eradicate poverty through 17 Sustainable Development Goals by 2030. Education, essential to achieve all of these goals, has its own dedicated Goal 4, which aims to *"ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all."* The Education 2030 Framework for Action provides guidance for the implementation of this ambitious goal and commitments.



Published in 2019 by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
7, place de Fontenoy
75352 Paris 07 SP, France

© UNESCO 2019

ISBN 978-92-3-100306-6

<https://doi.org/10.54675/TRVR4270>

Revised edition



This publication is available in Open Access under the Attribution-ShareAlike 3.0 IGO (CC-BY-SA 3.0 IGO) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/igo/>). By using the content of this publication, the users accept to be bound by the terms of use of the UNESCO Open Access Repository (<http://www.unesco.org/open-access/terms-use-ccbysa-en>).

The designations employed and the presentation of material throughout this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of UNESCO concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

The ideas and opinions expressed in this publication are those of the authors; they are not necessarily those of UNESCO and do not commit the Organization.

Cover photo credit: Pikul Noorod/Shutterstock.com

Graphic design: Ana C. Martin

Printed by UNESCO

Printed in France

Behind the numbers:

Ending school violence

and bullying

Foreword

School-related violence in all its forms is an infringement of children's and adolescents' rights to education and to health and well-being. No country can achieve inclusive and equitable quality education for all if learners experience violence and bullying in school.

This UNESCO publication provides an up-to-date and comprehensive overview of global and regional prevalence and trends related to school-related violence and examines the nature and impact of school violence and bullying. It reviews national responses, focusing on countries that have seen positive trends in prevalence and identifies factors that have contributed to an effective response to school violence and bullying.

Addressing school violence and bullying is essential in order to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), in particular SDG 4, which aims to ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all, and SDG 16, which aims to promote peaceful and inclusive societies.

Monitoring progress in this regard requires accurate data on prevalence and trends in school violence and bullying, and on how effectively the education sector is responding to it. This publication aims to contribute to monitoring progress towards the achievement of safe, non-violent, inclusive and effective learning environments.

School violence and bullying can be devastating for the victims. The consequences include children and youth finding it difficult to concentrate in class, missing classes, avoiding school activities, playing truant or dropping out of school altogether. This has an adverse impact on academic achievement and future education and employment prospects. An atmosphere of anxiety, fear and insecurity is incompatible with learning and unsafe learning environments can, therefore, undermine the quality of education for all learners.

This publication builds on previous UNESCO work on school violence and bullying including publication of the *School Violence and Bullying: Global Status Report* (UNESCO, 2017), and we trust that it will be useful to everyone who has an interest in preventing and addressing school violence and bullying. We also hope that it will make an important contribution to the Safe to Learn Campaign, which aims to end all violence in schools by 2024, by raising awareness and catalyzing action to eliminate school violence and bullying.



Stefania Giannini
Assistant Director-General for Education

Acknowledgements

This report was developed under the leadership of Soo-Hyang Choi, Director of UNESCO's Education Sector's Division for Peace and Sustainable Development. Preparation of the report was coordinated by Christophe Cornu, with the support of Yongfeng Liu, and thanks are also due to the following colleagues at UNESCO for their valuable review and comments: Jenelle Babb, Chris Castle, Cara Delmas and Joanna Herat; and Kathy Attawell (consultant), who wrote the text.

Laura Kann (formerly at the United States (US) Centers for Disease Control and Prevention) conducted the secondary analysis of the data on school violence and bullying collected through the Global Student Health Survey. Frank Elgar (McGill University, Canada) and Petr Badura (University of Groningen, Netherlands and Palacky University Olomouc, Czech Republic) conducted the secondary analysis of the data collected through the Health Behaviour in School-aged Children study. Edinburgh Innovations Ltd. (University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom) synthesised the quantitative data and analytical findings from the secondary data analyses and other available sources, and conducted qualitative country case studies, with research work led by Deborah Fry, supported by Eilidh Moir, Chad Hemady, Tabitha Casey, Charles Holton, Karina Padilla Malca, Sujin Yoon, Zain Kurdi, Elvira Caceres Ruiz, Dana Dabbous and Stuart Elliott. Charlotte Pram Nielsen (United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)) supervised the case study on Côte d'Ivoire conducted by Marie Devers (consultant).

We acknowledge the substantial inputs of key informants on national education sector responses to school violence and bullying in selected countries, who included the following:

- Eswatini: Zandile Masangane (Ministry of Health), Bethusile Mahlalela and Phumzile Ncube (Ministry of Education and Training), Mpendulo Masuku (Deputy Prime Minister's Office), Edwin Simelane (UNESCO Eswatini), Sakhile Dlamini (World Vision, Eswatini), Thabo Magagula (Save the Children), Lindiwe Mhlanga and Gcinaphi Ndlovu (Swaziland Action Groups Against Abuse);
- Italy: Giovanni Vespoli (Ministry of Education, University and Research), Simona Caravita (Catholic University of the Sacred Heart), Erika Bernacchi and Marco Zelano (UNICEF Office of Research-Innocenti) and Ersilia Menesini (University of Florence);
- Jamaica: Fern M. McFarlane (Ministry of Education), Rebecca Tortello (UNICEF Jamaica), Maureen Samms-Vaughan (University of the West Indies) and Cirenía Chavez (UNICEF Office of Research-Innocenti);
- Lebanon: Fadi el Hage (Saint Joseph University, Beirut), Zeena Zakharia (UMass Boston), Salem Dib (United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) Education Programme Lebanon), Nadine Said (Education Department) and Miled Abou Jaoude (Save the Children International);
- Netherlands: Michael Hoppe (Ministry of Education, Culture and Science), G.E. Huitsing (University of Groningen), Daan Wienke and Patricia Bolwerk (Stop Bullying Now Foundation);
- Peru: Fredy Sánchez (Ministry of Education), Rosa Vallejos (Save the Children) and Alfredo Gastelo (Municipality of San Miguel);
- Republic of Korea: Hyeyoung Hwang, Misuk Sun and Nayoung Kim (Institute of School Violence Prevention, Ewha Womans University), and Jong Ik Lee and Seung Hye Kim (Foundation for Preventing Youth Violence);
- Sweden: Hugo Wester (Ministry of Education) and Jacob Flärdh Aspegren (Friends International Centre against Bullying);
- Uganda: Angela Nakafeero (Ministry of Education and Sport) and Dipak Naker (Raising Voices Uganda);
- Uruguay: Verónica Massa (Human Rights Directorate - Administración Nacional de Educación Pública) and Juan Carlos Noya (Liceo Alemán, Montevideo).

UNESCO also extends a special thank you to the following external reviewers: Marta Santos Pais (Special Representative of the UN Secretary General on Violence against Children), Manos Antoninis (Global Education Monitoring Report), Sujata Bordoloi (United Nations Girls' Education Initiative (UNGEI) Secretariat), Patrick Burton (Centre for Justice and Crime Prevention, South Africa), Jane Davies and Stuart Cameron (Global Partnership for Education), James O'Higgins Norman (UNESCO Chair on Tackling Bullying in School and Cyberspace/Irish National Anti-Bullying, Research and Resource Centre, Ireland) and Tae Seob Shin (Institute of School Violence Prevention, Ewha Womans University, Republic of Korea).

Table of contents

Executive Summary	7
1. Introduction	11
1.1 Objectives.....	11
1.2 Data sources and definitions	11
1.3 Target audience.....	15
1.4 Structure of the report.....	15
2. Current status of school violence and bullying	16
2.1 Prevalence	16
2.2 Changes in prevalence over time	22
2.3 Influencing factors	25
2.4 Consequences.....	31
2.5 Regional snapshots.....	34
3. What are the characteristics of effective national responses to school violence and bullying?.....	46
3.1 Success factors.....	48
3.2 Constraining factors	51
3.3 Consistency between country success factors and global conceptual frameworks.....	53
3.4 Relationship between the prevalence of violence in society and in schools	55
4. Conclusions and recommendations	56
Annex 1.	58
References	
Annex 2.	60
Prevalence of students who reported being bullied, by sex, age and most common types and drivers of bullying, by country or territory*	
Annex 3.	68
Prevalence of students who reported being in physical fights or physically attacked during the past 12 months, by country or territory	

Acronyms

CDC	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
DHS	Demographic and Health Survey
HBSC	Health Behaviour in School-aged Children (study)
GSHS	Global School-based Student Health Survey
ICT	Information and communication technology
IPV	Intimate partner violence
LGBT	Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender
NGO	Non-governmental organization
PIRLS	Progress in International Reading Literacy Study
PISA	Programme for International Students Assessment
SACMEQ	Southern and Eastern African Consortium for Monitoring Educational Quality
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SWAGAA	Swaziland Action Group Against Abuse
TERCE	Third Regional Comparative and Explanatory Study
TIMSS	Trends in Mathematics and Science Study
UN	United Nations
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNGEI	United Nations Girls' Education Initiative
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNGA	United Nations General Assembly
UNSC	United Nations Security Council
VACS	Violence Against Children Survey
WHO	World Health Organization

Executive summary

Why is this publication important?

This publication provides an overview of the most up-to-date evidence on school violence and bullying, including global and regional prevalence and trends, and of evidence from successful national responses to school violence and bullying. It is both significant and innovative because it:

- brings together for the first time in one place a wealth of quantitative data from two large-scale international surveys, the Global School-based Student Health Survey (GSHS) and the Health Behaviour in School-aged Children (HBSC) study, which cover 144 countries and territories in all regions of the world, and from a wide range of other global and regional surveys (see Data sources in Chapter 1);
- provides, again for the first time, an analysis of trend data from the same two surveys, to show changes in the prevalence of school violence and bullying over time;
- presents regional snapshots of the status of school violence and bullying; and
- includes qualitative data on national responses, based on a series of country case studies specially commissioned by UNESCO to increase understanding of the factors that contribute to a reduction in school violence.

What do the data tell us about school violence and bullying?

The scale of the problem

Almost one in three students (32%) has been bullied by their peers at school at least once in the last month. In all regions except Europe and North America, physical bullying is the most common and sexual bullying is the second most common type of bullying. In Europe and North America, psychological bullying is the most common type of bullying. Cyberbullying affects as many as one in ten children. More than one in three students (36%) has been involved in a physical fight with another student and almost one in three (32.4%) has been physically attacked at least once in the past year. Information about sexual violence perpetrated by peers is limited but evidence from sub-Saharan Africa suggests that a schoolmate is more likely to be the perpetrator than a teacher, especially for boys.

Globally, physical violence perpetrated by teachers is uncommon but, in some countries, children report high levels of physical violence at the hands of their teachers. Corporal punishment, which is a form of physical violence, is still allowed in schools in 68 countries and is frequently used in many of these countries.

The factors that influence vulnerability to school violence and bullying

School violence and bullying affects both girls and boys, but there are differences between the sexes. Boys are more likely to have been involved in a physical fight and to have been physically attacked than girls. Physical bullying is more common among boys than among girls, while the opposite is true for psychological bullying. Age is also a factor. As children grow older, they are less likely to be bullied, to be involved in a physical fight or to be physically attacked. In contrast, older students appear to be more at risk of cyberbullying than younger students.

Children who are perceived to be 'different' in any way are more likely to be bullied. International surveys reveal that physical appearance is the most common reason for being bullied, with race, nationality or skin colour the second most common reason. Children from poorer families as well as migrant children, also appear to be more vulnerable to bullying and cyberbullying. Other studies show that students seen as gender non-conforming, including those who are or are perceived as lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender (LGBT), are more at risk of school violence and bullying than those who fit into traditional gender norms.

The consequences of bullying

Children who are frequently bullied are nearly three times more likely to feel like an outsider at school and more than twice as likely to miss school as those who are not frequently bullied. Children who are bullied have worse educational outcomes than children who do not. They score lower in mathematics and reading tests, and the more often they are bullied the worse their score. Children who are frequently bullied are also more likely to expect to leave formal education after finishing secondary school compared with children who are not frequently bullied.

School violence and bullying affects the overall attainment of the student population of a school. Poor discipline and an unsafe school environment are associated with lower academic achievement and, more specifically, students in schools where bullying is frequent score lower in science tests than those in schools where bullying occurs less often.

Bullying can have a significant impact on children's mental health, quality of life and risk behaviours. Children who are bullied are around twice as likely to feel lonely, to be unable to sleep at night and to have contemplated suicide as those who are not bullied. Self-reported quality of health and life satisfaction is lower among children who are bullied and who are both bullies and victims of bullying than those who are not involved in bullying. Bullying is also associated with higher rates of smoking, alcohol and cannabis use, and earlier sexual experience.

The trends in school violence and bullying

Bullying has decreased in almost half of countries and territories. Of 71 countries and territories with trend data on the prevalence of bullying for a period ranging from 4 to 12 years between 2002 and 2017, 35 have seen a decrease, 23 have seen no significant change and 13 have seen an increase in prevalence.

A similar proportion of countries have seen a decrease in physical fights or physical attacks. Of the 29 countries and territories with trend data on involvement in a physical fight, 13 have seen a decrease in prevalence, 12 have seen no change and four have seen an increase. Physical attacks have decreased in half of countries. Of 24 countries and territories with trend data on the prevalence of physical attacks, 12 have seen a decrease, 10 have seen no change and two have seen an increase.

Cyberbullying is a growing problem. Data from seven countries in Europe show that the proportion of children aged 11-16 years who use the Internet and who had experienced cyberbullying increased from 7% in 2010 to 12% in 2014.

Clarifications about the data:

- The definitions used in this report for different forms of school violence and different types of bullying are based on the definitions and questions used in the main international surveys, in particular the GSHS and the HBSC (see Definitions in Chapter 1);
- The report considers bullying separately from other forms of violence, because available data show that bullying is the most common form of school violence and because the main international surveys monitor bullying separately;
- The report focuses primarily on violence and bullying that takes place in schools and therefore does not include violence and bullying that takes place outside school premises or on the way to and from school; and
- The report includes data on violence perpetrated by peers and by teachers, although it is important to note that most school violence and bullying is perpetrated by other students.

What are effective national responses?

Based on case studies of six countries that have succeeded in reducing school violence and bullying – Eswatini, Italy, Jamaica, Lebanon, Republic of Korea and Uruguay – and two countries that have maintained low levels over time – the Netherlands and Sweden – there are a number of factors that contribute to effective national responses.

Political leadership and high-level commitment, together with a robust legal and policy framework that addresses violence against children and school violence and bullying. Many successful countries also have an emphasis in national policies on promoting a safe learning environment and a positive school and classroom climate and a strong commitment to child rights and empowerment.

Collaboration and partnerships. At national level, this includes partnerships between the education sector and other sector ministries, civil society organizations, academic institutions, professional associations and the media. At school level, it includes partnerships involving all stakeholders in the school community, including head teachers, teachers, other staff, parents and students, local authorities and professionals in other sectors. More specifically, the involvement of all students, including bystanders, and the use of peer approaches, have been a key factor in countries that have made the most progress.

Evidence-based approaches, informed by accurate and comprehensive data and systematic evaluation of the effectiveness of existing programmes. Effective systems for routine reporting and monitoring of school violence and bullying, and rigorous evaluation of the impact of programmes and interventions are also critical.

Training and support for teachers and care and support for affected students. Training in successful countries has focused on developing skills to prevent and respond to school violence and bullying and to use positive approaches to classroom management.

The case studies also identified a number of factors that can limit the effectiveness and impact of national responses. These include lack of data on specific aspects of school violence and bullying and on the sub-groups of students who are most vulnerable, low coverage of interventions, and lack of systematic monitoring of school violence and bullying and of robust evaluation of the impact of programmes.

What needs to be done?

The findings and conclusions of this report reinforce the recommendations of the 2016 and 2018 Reports of the UN Secretary-General to the United Nations (UN) General Assembly on Protecting Children from Bullying. These include the need to:

- ensure that legislation is in place to safeguard the rights of children and to underpin policies to prevent and respond to school violence and bullying;
- improve the availability of accurate, reliable and disaggregated data and implement evidence-based initiatives that are informed by sound research;
- train and support teachers to prevent and respond to school violence and bullying;
- promote whole-school approaches that engage the wider community, including students, teachers, other school staff, parents and local authorities;
- provide information and support to children to enable them to speak up and seek support;
- promote the meaningful participation of children in efforts to prevent and respond to school violence and bullying;
- give priority to children who are especially vulnerable, as a result of race, ethnicity, disability, gender or sexual orientation; and
- establish child-friendly and gender-sensitive reporting, complaint and counselling mechanisms and restorative approaches.

1. Introduction

1.1 Objectives

The purpose of this report is to present a synthesis and new analysis of the available evidence on school violence and bullying, based on the latest and most comprehensive data. The aim is to raise awareness, share lessons learned and encourage countries to take evidence-based action to prevent and respond effectively to school violence and bullying. Specifically, the report:

- provides an overview of the global and regional prevalence of and trends in school violence and bullying and;
- summarizes global and regional evidence on the nature, drivers and consequences of school violence and bullying;
- reviews responses to school violence and bullying, focusing on countries that have seen positive trends in prevalence, in order to identify the factors that have contributed to progress; and
- provides evidence-based recommendations for action for the education sector.


1.2 Data sources and definitions

School violence is widespread, occurs in all countries and affects a significant number of children and adolescents. It is mostly perpetrated by peers but, in some cases, is perpetrated by teachers and other school staff.

School violence includes physical, psychological and sexual violence. As Figure 1 shows, physical violence includes physical attacks, physical fights, corporal punishment and physical bullying; psychological violence includes verbal abuse, emotional abuse, social exclusion and psychological bullying; and sexual violence includes completed and attempted non-consensual sex acts, unwanted touching, sexual harassment and sexual bullying.

This report addresses bullying and the different types of bullying – physical, psychological and sexual – as a separate issue. This is because available data show that bullying is the most common form of school violence and because the main global surveys monitor bullying separately from other forms of violence.

Figure 1. Conceptual framework of school violence and bullying



Data sources

This report is based on a wide range of quantitative and qualitative data sources including international surveys (Table 1), a review of the literature, and country case studies.

Data are drawn in particular from two large-scale international surveys – the World Health Organization (WHO) Global School-based Student Health Survey (GSHS);¹ and the Health Behaviour in School-aged Children (HBSC) study², conducted by the HBSC Consortium. Together they provide data from 144 countries and territories (96 GSHS and 48 HBSC) in all regions of the world. The HBSC covers countries in Europe and North America; the GSHS covers countries in other regions. They both focus on violence and bullying that takes place in schools (although the GSHS does not specify the location of physical attacks), and therefore the scope of this report does not include violence and bullying that takes place outside school premises or on the way to and from school.

Other key data sources include the Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS)³, Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS) and Trends in Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS)⁴, Programme for International Students Assessment (PISA)⁵, Third Regional Comparative and Explanatory Study (TERCE)⁶, and Violence Against Children Surveys (VACS)⁷.

Data from all these data sources are intended to be nationally representative and are disaggregated data by sex, with the exception of the DHS, which only collects data on violence from female respondents. Country data tables are included in Annexes 2 and 3.

Data were also included from the UBS Optimus studies in China, South Africa and Switzerland; the UN Multi-Country Study on the Drivers of Violence Affecting Children; the Young Lives Longitudinal Study conducted in Ethiopia, India, Peru and Viet Nam; and the Global Kids Online studies in Argentina, Brazil, the Philippines, Serbia, and South Africa.

Box 1. Clarifications about the data

Data on the prevalence of bullying and different types of bullying are drawn mainly from the GSHS and the HBSC, supplemented by PIRLS and PISA data. Data on the prevalence of bullying are available for all regions, but only North America and Europe include data on the prevalence of bullying others. Comparable data on cyberbullying are available only for North America and Europe.

Data on physical fights and physical attacks are drawn from the GSHS only, as the HBSC does not include questions on these forms of violence. Data on physical fights and physical attacks are therefore available for GSHS regions and sub-regions, but not for North America and Europe.

The two large international surveys do not collect data on sexual violence perpetrated by peers, or physical or sexual violence perpetrated by teachers; data on these forms of violence are drawn from other surveys, including the DHS and VACS, and from other sources. Data on gang-related violence and violent attacks on schools are drawn from a range of sources.

Data on changes in prevalence of bullying over time are drawn from the GSHS and HBSC, and data on changes in prevalence of physical fights and physical attacks are drawn from the GSHS. Global Kids Online is the source of trend data on cyberbullying.

Global comparable data are available only for factors that influence bullying, not other forms of violence. Data on the drivers of bullying – physical appearance, race, nationality or colour, and religion – are available for GSHS regions and sub-regions and some HBSC countries. The HBSC and PISA collect data on bullying, socio-economic status and immigration status. PISA also collects data on bullying and the school environment, peer support and family support. International surveys do not collect data on school violence based on sexual orientation and gender identity or expression, so data on this are drawn from other specific national surveys.

1 Data collected between 2003 and 2017.

2 Data collected between 2001 and 2014.

3 The DHS are implemented by ICF international.

4 Both PIRLS and TIMSS are managed by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).

5 PISA is managed by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).

6 The Regional Comparative and Explanatory Studies, including TERCE, are managed by the Latin American Laboratory for Assessment of the Quality of Education (LLECE/UNESCO).

7 The VACS are implemented by the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, UNICEF and the Together for Girls Partnership.

Table 1. International surveys that collect data on school violence and bullying

Survey	Managing institution	Year	Age group	Countries/regions
School-based surveys assessing health-related behaviours and outcomes				
Global School-based Student Health Survey (GSHS)	World Health Organization (WHO)	Since 2003; survey conducted every 3-5 years (for most countries)	13-17 year olds since 2013, and previously 13-15 year olds	96 countries and territories across all regions except Europe and North America
Health Behaviour in School-aged Children study (HBSC)	HBSC Consortium	Since 1983; survey conducted every 4 years; next survey in 2021-22	11, 13 and 15 year olds	48 countries and territories in Europe plus Israel, and North America
School-based surveys assessing learning outcomes				
Estudio Regional Comparativo y Explicativo (ERCE) (Regional Comparative and Explanatory Study)	Latin American Laboratory for Assessment of the Quality of Education (LLECE)/UNESCO	Since 2006; survey conducted in 2006 (SERCE) and 2013 (TERCE); next survey in 2019	8-9 year olds (Grade 3) and 11-12 year olds (Grade 6)	15 countries in Latin America (TERCE)
Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS)	International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA)	Since 2001; survey conducted every 5 years; next survey in 2021	9-10 year olds (Grade 4)	65 countries across all regions
Programme for International Students Assessment (PISA)	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)	Since 2015; conducted every 3 years; next survey in 2021	15 year olds	72 countries in Africa, Asia, Europe and Latin America
Trends in Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS)	International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA)	Since 1999; conducted every 4 years; next survey in 2019	9-10 year olds (Grade 4) and 13-14 year olds (Grade 8)	77 countries and territories across all regions, with the majority in Europe
Population-based surveys				
Demographic and Health Survey (DHS)	ICF International. Contributions from United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), WHO and United Nations Programme on AIDS (UNAIDS). Funded by United States Agency for International Development (USAID)	Since DHS Phase 5 (2003-2008); conducted every 4 years; current survey phase 2013-18	15-49 year olds	Over 90 countries and territories
Violence Against Children Survey (VACS)	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), UNICEF, Together for Girls Partnership	Since 2007	18-24 year olds; 13-17 year olds	Reports available from 11 countries from Africa (8), Asia (2) and Latin America (1).

Data from these sources were supplemented by a review of the literature, which focused on multi-country studies and reports such as the Know Violence in Childhood global report, UNICEF's latest statistical analysis report on violence against children; and UNESCO global and regional reports on school violence and bullying and school-related gender-based violence (SRGBV). In addition, the review explored existing global systematic reviews, meta-analyses and nationally representative population-based studies.

UNESCO also commissioned a series of qualitative country case studies to identify factors that have contributed to reducing or to maintaining a very low prevalence of school violence and bullying, and to identify common challenges. The countries were selected based on an analysis of trend data collected through the GSHS or the HBSC. These countries were selected to represent different regions – Africa, Asia, the

Caribbean, Europe, the Middle East and South America – and different levels of socio-economic development. The selection also represents different education systems in terms of the balance of public, private and faith-based schools; and the level at which decisions are made about education policies, curricula, teacher training and school programmes, i.e., whether this is at national, regional, local or school levels. The 11 case study countries⁸ included:

- Six countries where the prevalence of school bullying or physical violence, or both, has decreased significantly: Eswatini, Italy, Jamaica, Lebanon, Republic of Korea, and Uruguay;

⁸ UNESCO commissioned 13 case studies in total; it was not possible to complete case studies for Fiji and Trinidad and Tobago.

- Two countries where the prevalence of school bullying or physical violence, or both, has been low for a long period of time: the Netherlands and Sweden;
- Two countries that have made progress in specific areas of their national response to school violence and bullying: Côte d'Ivoire, which has strengthened routine collection of data and monitoring of the prevalence of school bullying and violence, and Peru, which has developed a national mechanism to facilitate the systematic reporting of incidents of school violence;
- One country that offers lessons on scale-up of interventions: Uganda.

The country case studies are based on qualitative data from key informants.⁹ Among other questions, key informants were asked: why the prevalence of school violence and bullying has decreased or remained low; what factors – both within and beyond the education sector – have contributed to this; which of these factors has had the greatest impact; and what evidence is available. In addition to identifying success factors, the case studies also explored factors that limit the effectiveness of national responses to school violence and bullying.

Definitions

The definitions of different forms of school violence and different types of bullying used in this report are based on the definitions and questions used in the main international surveys, in particular the GSHS and the HBSC.

Bullying - Bullying is characterised by aggressive behaviour that involves unwanted, negative actions, is repeated over time, and an imbalance of power or strength between the perpetrator or perpetrators and the victim. Frequency of bullying is measured in different ways by different surveys. For a student to be considered a victim of bullying, aggressions should occur at least once or twice a month or more.

There is no standard definition of bullying or cyberbullying in international surveys, with only three surveys – the GSHS, HBSC and PISA – providing explicit definitions. The Global Kids Online survey does not refer to cyberbullying and uses “online hurtful behaviour” instead. Depending on the survey, students are asked about their experience of different types of bullying – physical, psychological, sexual and cyberbullying. The following definitions of different types of bullying used in this report are based on the definitions and questions that are

used in the main international surveys – the GSHS and HBSC – that collect data on bullying:

- **Physical bullying** includes repeated aggression such as being hit, hurt, kicked, pushed, shoved around or locked indoors, having things stolen, having personal belongings taken away or destroyed, or being forced to do things. It is different from other forms of physical violence such as physical fights and physical attacks.
- **Psychological bullying** includes verbal abuse, emotional abuse and social exclusion and refers to being called mean names, being teased in an unpleasant way, being left out of activities on purpose, excluded or completely ignored, and being the subject of lies or nasty rumours.
- **Sexual bullying** refers to being made fun of with sexual jokes, comments or gestures.¹⁰
- **Cyberbullying** includes being bullied by messages, i.e. someone sending mean instant messages, postings, emails and text messages or creating a website that makes fun of a student or by pictures, i.e. someone taking and posting online unflattering or inappropriate pictures of a student without permission; it also refers to being treated in a hurtful or nasty way by mobile phones (texts, calls, video clips) or online (email, instant messaging, social networking, chatrooms) and online hurtful behaviour.

Physical fights - There are two different definitions of physical fights. In the GSHS, a physical fight “occurs when two students of about the same strength or power choose to fight each other” and therefore is a form of physical violence between peers. The HBSC uses a different definition that does not refer specifically to school-related violence or to violence between peers, as it can occur between a student and “a total stranger, a parent or other adult family member, a brother or sister, a boyfriend or girlfriend or date, a friend or someone known by the student”. Data on physical fights presented in this report are therefore from the GSHS only.

Physical attacks - Only the GSHS collects data on physical attacks, defined as “when one or more people hit or strike someone (a student in this case), or when one or more people hurt another person (student) with a weapon (such as a stick, knife or gun)”. Therefore, although it can be a form of physical violence between students, it is not necessarily perpetrated only by peers. The HBSC does not collect data on physical attacks against students, so data presented in this report is also from the GSHS only.

⁹ In some countries, it was difficult to identify key informants able to provide a long-term perspective on the national response to school violence and bullying, including actions taken prior to or during the period for which trend data were available, or to provide an explanation for why prevalence had decreased or remained low.

¹⁰ Sexual jokes, comments or gestures are characterised as sexual harassment in some countries, including from a legal perspective, but not in others, particularly in the school environment. For these reasons, they are referred to as sexual bullying in this report. Sexual bullying is a form of sexual violence.

Sexual violence - Sexual violence is defined in the DHS as forced sexual intercourse or any other sexual acts against one's will; and in VACS as completed non-consensual sex acts (such as rape), attempted non-consensual sex acts, abusive sexual contact (such as unwanted touching), and non-contact sexual abuse (such as threatened sexual violence, exhibitionism, and verbal sexual harassment).

Physical violence perpetrated by teachers - This is defined as the intentional use of physical force with the potential to cause death, disability, injury or harm, regardless of whether it is used as a form of punishment.

Corporal punishment perpetrated by teachers - In school, corporal punishment is defined as any punishment in which physical force is used and intended to cause some degree of pain or discomfort, however light. Most involves hitting children, with the hand or with an implement, but it can also involve kicking, shaking, throwing or scratching children.

Data analysis and synthesis

Data analysis and synthesis involved review of existing secondary analysis and synthesis of large global datasets, review of data from the literature review, and new secondary analyses of the GSHS and HBSC data sets commissioned by UNESCO. Additional secondary analysis was conducted using the data from the Multi-Country Study on Men and Violence to further explore relationships between school violence in childhood and intimate partner violence (IPV) in adulthood.

Data limitations

Preparing this report revealed some of the challenges in using and comparing data from multiple surveys. These include:

- differences in the scope of different surveys and in the definitions of school violence and bullying used;
- differences in questions on bullying, including on types, drivers and frequency of bullying;
- differences in the age range covered by different surveys;
- differences in the timeframe for reporting experience of violence and bullying used by different surveys;
- differences in the frequency of data collection.

In addition, in countries where universal primary and secondary education are not mandatory, school-based surveys may not reach children who have already dropped out of school – anecdotal evidence suggests that corporal punishment and harsh treatment from teachers, as well as early and unintended pregnancy resulting from sexual violence have been linked to students' early exit from schooling (Pereznieto, et al., 2010).

The country case study methodology had some limitations. In particular, it highlighted weaknesses in monitoring and analysis of data at country level; the need to improve awareness of the situation nationally; and for countries to improve their analysis of the impact of their actions on school violence and bullying.

Preparing this report also identified some key data gaps. These include data on: psychological bullying; school-related sexual violence; bullying and violence related to disability; bullying and violence related to migration; corporal punishment and other violence perpetrated by teachers; links between gang violence and school violence and bullying; the potential correlations between family factors and school violence and bullying; and the links between violence in school and in other settings.

1.3 Target audience

The report is intended primarily for education policy makers and planners, teachers and teachers' unions, school management and staff. We hope it will also be useful for others with an interest in preventing and addressing school violence and bullying including those working in other sectors, such as health, gender and youth, justice and law enforcement, donor and technical agencies, civil society organizations, researchers, parents' associations and youth organizations.

1.4 Structure of the report

This report is organised as follows:

- Chapter 2 provides an overview of the current status of school violence and bullying. It includes global data on its prevalence of school violence and; changes in prevalence over time; factors that increase vulnerability; and the educational and health consequences of school violence and bullying. It also includes regional snapshots, which summarise key data by region and sub-region.
- Chapter 3 draws on country case studies to assess national responses, focusing on countries that have seen a decrease in school violence and bullying, in order to identify the factors that contribute to and limit effective responses. It also includes a brief analysis of the links between violence in schools and violence in wider society.
- Chapter 4 summarises the main conclusions and recommendations regarding effective national responses to school violence and bullying.


2. Current status of school violence and bullying

2.1 Prevalence

This section provides an overview of the prevalence of different forms of school violence and bullying. It includes analysis of data on school violence and bullying perpetrated by peers – including bullying (and different types of bullying), physical fights, physical attacks¹¹ and sexual violence – and by teachers – including corporal punishment, other physical violence, and sexual violence. It also presents data on other forms of violence that affect schools, including gang-related violence and violent attacks on schools.

Data on the prevalence of bullying and different types of bullying are drawn mainly from the GSHS and the HBSC, supplemented by PIRLS and PISA data. Data on physical fights and physical attacks are drawn from the GSHS only as the HBSC does not include questions on these forms of violence. These two international surveys do not collect data on sexual violence perpetrated by peers or physical or sexual violence perpetrated by teachers; data on these forms of violence are drawn from other surveys, including the DHS and VACS, and from other sources. Data on gang-related violence and violent attacks on schools are drawn from a range of sources.

Figure 2. Percentage of students who were bullied, in a physical fight or physically attacked, by region



Sources: Secondary analysis calculations based on GSHS data and HBSC data (for Europe and North America only).


¹¹ According to the GSHS definition, physical attacks on students may be perpetrated by peers or by other people.

Globally, one in three children experiences bullying and a similar proportion are affected by physical violence


Bullying by peers

Globally, almost one in three students has been bullied in the past month. Available data from all regions show that 32% of students have been bullied in some form by their peers at school on one or more days in the past month (GSHS, HBSC). Across GSHS countries, the prevalence of having been bullied ranged from 7.1% to 74%. Across HBSC countries, the prevalence ranged from 8.7% to 55.5%.

Asia



Pacific



Some children are bullied very frequently. GSHS data from 96 countries and territories show that, overall, almost one in five (19.4%) students had been bullied at school on one or two days, one in 20 (5.6%) on three to five days, and one in 13 (7.3%) on six or more days during the previous month. PIRLS data from 50 countries and territories across all regions show that 29% of 9-10 year olds had been bullied every month and 14% had been bullied every week in the past school year.

There are significant differences in the prevalence and frequency of bullying between regions. The proportion of students reporting that they have been bullied is highest in sub-Saharan Africa (48.2%), North Africa (42.7%) and the Middle East (41.1%) and lowest in Europe (25%), the Caribbean (25%) and Central America (22.8%) (Figure 2). Students were most likely to report having been bullied at school on six or more days during the previous month in sub-Saharan Africa (11.3%) and least likely to report this in Central America (4.1%).


Physical and sexual bullying are the two most frequent types of bullying in GSHS regions; psychological bullying is the most frequent type of bullying in HBSC regions

Physical bullying is the most frequent type of bullying in many regions. Based on GSHS data from 96 countries and territories, 16.1% of children who have been bullied say that they have been hit, kicked, shoved around or locked indoors (Figure 3).¹² Physical bullying is one of the two most common types of bullying in all GSHS regions except Central America and South America; the highest reported prevalence is in the Pacific and sub-Saharan Africa. In HBSC countries where the question about different types of bullying was asked, being hit, kicked or pushed was the least frequently reported type. PISA data from 72 countries show that 4% of students report that they had been hit or pushed around at least a few times a month in the past year. The lower prevalence reported by PISA may reflect differences in the recall period¹³ and the age of respondents. Only 15-year-olds participate in the PISA study, and global data indicate that older children are less likely to experience physical bullying than younger children.

¹² Regional median prevalence data for Europe and North America not available.
¹³ The recall period is "the past 12 months" in the GSHS while it is "the past couple of months" in the HBSC.

Sexual bullying is the second most frequent type of bullying in many regions. Based on GSHS data from 96 countries and territories, 11.2% of children who have been bullied report being made fun of with sexual jokes, comments or gestures (Figure 3). Sexual bullying is one of the top two most common types of bullying in Central America, the Middle East and North Africa, but in North America and Europe it was reported less frequently than psychological bullying (HBSC).

Figure 3. Percentage of students who were bullied, by type of bullying



Source: Secondary analysis calculations based on GSHS data. Regional median data for Europe and North America not available.

Psychological bullying is reported more frequently in North America and Europe than in other regions. HBSC data show that 28.4% of students in North America and 15% in Europe report being left out of activities on purpose or ignored. Psychological bullying is reported less frequently, and is less common than physical or sexual bullying in other regions. Overall, based on GSHS data from 96 countries and territories, 5.5% of students report being left out of activities on purpose or ignored (Figure 3); the reported prevalence was highest in Central America (7.5%) and South America (7.2%). As noted earlier, some of the differences in prevalence between HBSC and GSHS regions may be due to the difference in recall periods and the age of respondents.

Cyberbullying is less frequent but affects a significant minority of children. Available data suggest that around one in ten children have experienced cyberbullying. In Canada and Europe, 10.1% have been cyberbullied via messages¹⁴ and

8.2% have been cyberbullied via pictures¹⁵ (HBSC). Data from other sources show that 13% of children aged 9-16 years in Australia and 6% of children aged 9-16 years in the European Union report being cyberbullied (Livingstone et al., 2011). The Global Kids Online study found that the percentage of 9-17 year old internet users reporting online hurtful behaviour¹⁶ was 35% in Serbia, 29% in the Philippines and 20% in South Africa, and 77% among 13-17 year olds in Argentina. The Brazilian Kids Online Survey 2015 found that, among 9-17 year olds who were Internet users, 20% reported having been subjected to cyberbullying and 12% had behaved offensively online (Kids Online Brazil, 2016). Data from Argentina, Brazil, the Philippines, Serbia and South Africa also showed that between 12% and 22% of children had received messages with sexual content in the past year (Global Kids Online).

Physical fights between peers

More than one in three students in GSHS regions has been involved in a physical fight in the past year. Based on data from 96 countries and territories, 36% of students reported being in a physical fight with another student at least once in the past year (Figure 2) (GSHS). Across all GSHS countries, the prevalence of being involved in a physical fight ranges from 10.2% to 75.1%. Overall, around one in ten students reports a high frequency of physical fighting. In the past year, 10.6% had been in a physical fight two or three times and 8.1% four or more times.

There are regional differences in the prevalence and frequency of involvement in a physical fight. The prevalence was highest in North Africa and the Middle East and lowest in Central America and Asia (Figure 2). Students were most likely to report involvement in a physical fight four or more times in the past year in the Pacific (12%), the Middle East (12.8%) and North Africa (13.3%) and least likely to report this in Central America (4.9%), South America (5%) and Asia (5.7%).

Physical attacks

Almost one in three students in GSHS regions has been physically attacked in the past year. Based on data from 96 countries and territories, 32.4% of students have been physically attacked at least once in the past year (Figure 2) (GSHS). Across all GSHS countries, the prevalence ranged from 10.1% to 71%. Around one in ten students reports a high frequency of physical attacks. In the past year, 9.6% had been physically attacked two or three times and 9% four or more times.

¹⁵ Taking and posting online unflattering or inappropriate pictures of someone.

¹⁶ The Global Kids Online Study refers to children who are victims of "online hurtful behaviour", rather than cyberbullying, described as being treated in a hurtful or nasty way by mobile phone (texts, calls, video clips) or online (email, instant messaging, social networking, chatrooms).

¹⁴ Instant messages, postings, emails and text messages.

There are also regional differences in the prevalence and frequency of physical attacks. The prevalence of physical attacks was highest in the Pacific, North Africa and sub-Saharan Africa (36.4%), and lowest in South America and

Central America (Figure 2). Students were most likely to report being physically attacked four or more times in the Pacific (12.4%), North Africa (11%) and sub-Saharan Africa (10%).

Box 2. Gang-related violence and school violence

Gang violence is the intentional use of violence by a person or group of persons who are members of, or identify with, any long-lasting, street-orientated youth or armed group whose identity includes involvement in illegal activity (WHO, 2015). Gangs are usually formed in the community, not specifically in schools, and gang violence affects communities beyond schools. Although there is limited evidence about the links between gang violence and school violence and bullying, gang violence can potentially affect schools in different ways including:

- Gangs can recruit members in schools;
- Gang members from the same school can engage in violence on the school premises or around their school;
- Gang members from the same school can commit violence against other students in the same school who belong to a different gang or who do not belong to a gang;
- Gangs may perpetrate violence against other schools and students in the community where they are active, even if these students do not belong to a gang.

There is little global data on the prevalence of these different forms of gang violence in and around schools. However, available evidence suggests that gang violence is more common in schools where students are exposed to other forms of community violence and where they fear violence at school (UN, 2016). For example, the Multi-country Study on the Drivers of Violence Affecting Children highlights the link between community violence and violence against children in other settings including schools (Maternowska et al., 2018). Growing up in neighbourhoods with high levels of crime has been identified as a risk factor for youth violence, including gang violence (WHO, 2010; WHO, 2015; Krug et al., 2002); one study found that children who knew many adult criminals were more likely to engage in violent behaviour by the age of 18 years than those who did not (WHO, 2015).

Gang violence is often associated with carrying weapons, including in school (UN, 2016). A study of 10-19-year-olds in the UK found that 44% of those who reported belonging to a delinquent youth group had committed violence and 13% had carried a knife in the previous 12 months versus 17% and 4% respectively among those who were not in such a group (Sharp et al., 2004). A meta-analysis of 14 countries in North America, Europe, the Middle East, Central and South America, sub-Saharan Africa and the Pacific also showed that carrying a weapon at school is associated with bullying victimization (Valdebenito et al., 2017).

Comparison of GSHS data on school violence and bullying for countries that are particularly affected by gang violence suggests, however, that the links may be limited. In El Salvador and Guatemala, for example, where gang violence is a serious problem, GSHS data show that the prevalence of bullying, physical fights and physical attacks reported by school students is relatively low, and is similar to prevalence in other countries in Central America where gang violence is less prevalent. It is possible that gang violence mainly affects out-of-school children and youth, but more research is needed to explore the relationship between gang violence and school violence.

Sexual violence perpetrated by peers

Both boys and girls are victims of sexual violence in schools. Available evidence suggests that perpetrators are more likely to be other students rather than authority figures including teachers. There is little comprehensive global data on the prevalence of sexual violence within schools. However, data from seven countries in sub-Saharan Africa show that the perpetrator of the first incident of sexual violence, as reported by young people aged 18-24 years, is more likely to be a classmate or schoolmate than an authority


figure including a teacher.¹⁷ The percentage who reported that the first instance of sexual violence was perpetrated by a classmate or schoolmate ranged from 6.9% in Zambia to 15.5% in Malawi for girls and from 8.6% in the United Republic of Tanzania to 26.6% in Nigeria for boys (VACS). Data from another reliable source (DHS) confirm that the prevalence of sexual violence towards students by teachers is relatively low in sub-Saharan Africa (see below section on sexual violence perpetrated by teachers).

¹⁷ Authority figures include teachers, police/security persons, neighbours and religious leaders. VACS data are not disaggregated by categories and therefore it is not possible to determine the proportion of sexual violence perpetrated by teachers specifically.

Physical violence perpetrated by teachers


Corporal punishment, which is a form of physical violence, is still used in schools in many countries. Corporal punishment is legally prohibited in schools in 132 countries, but is still allowed in 68. A survey of 63 countries, including 29 where corporal punishment in school is banned, found that the proportion of students who had experienced corporal punishment at school was 90% or more in nine countries, 70-89% in 11 countries and 13-69% in 43 countries (Figure 4) (Gershoff, 2017).

Figure 4. Percentage of students who experienced corporal punishment in 63 countries



Data source: Gershoff, 2017

Figure 5. Percentage of 18-24 year olds who experienced childhood physical violence reporting teachers as perpetrators of first incident



- Females reporting a female teacher as perpetrator
- Females reporting a male teacher as perpetrator
- Males reporting a female teacher as perpetrator
- Males reporting a male teacher as perpetrator


Data source: VACS

Globally, the prevalence of physical violence perpetrated by teachers is low, but this is not the case in all regions.

In some countries, children report high levels of physical violence at the hands of their teachers. Data from five countries in Africa, Asia and the Caribbean – Cambodia, Haiti, Malawi, Nigeria and the United Republic of Tanzania – identify teachers, particularly male teachers, as the perpetrators of a large proportion of physical violence experienced by

children (Figure 5) (VACS). In the Good Schools Study in Uganda, more than 75% of 9-16 year olds reported physical violence from a teacher in the past year, the most common form of violence reported by children in the study (Devries et al., 2018). DHS data, which is for females only, show lower reported prevalence of physical violence perpetrated by teachers (Figure 6).¹⁸ Overall, among women aged over 15 years who had experienced physical violence, 6.2% in West and Central Africa, 5.1% in East and Southern Africa, 0.6% in Asia and 0.2% in Eastern Europe reported that the perpetrator was a teacher. However, in West and Central Africa, prevalence ranged from 0.1% to as high as 17.9% and in East and Southern Africa from 1.1% to as high as 19.3%.

Figure 6. Prevalence of women aged over 15 years who had experienced physical violence who reported that the perpetrator was a teacher




Data source: DHS

¹⁸ Data collected between 2005 and 2017.

Sexual violence perpetrated by teachers

The prevalence of sexual violence perpetrated by teachers is low, although this is not the case in all countries. Data are only available for some regions and countries. DHS data, which are for three sub-regions and for females only, show that the median prevalence of women who reported a first instance of forced sex perpetrated by a teacher is between 0.5% and 0.8%, although the prevalence ranges from 0% to as high as 7.1% in Central Africa (Figure 7).

Figure 7. Prevalence of women who reported a first instance of forced sex perpetrated by a teacher, when they were aged over 15 years, in sub Saharan Africa



Data source: DHS

Box 3. Violent attacks on schools

Violent attacks on schools are not always seen as school violence but violence **against** schools. They include two specific forms of violence: mass school shootings, sometimes perpetrated by students or former students; and, in countries affected by conflict, indiscriminate or targeted attacks on schools¹⁹ by individuals and groups involved in the conflict.

Between 1991 and 2015, 59 school shootings - defined as incidents carried out with at least one firearm on the grounds of an elementary or secondary school, and involving two or more victims with at least one fatality -, were documented in 14 countries. School shootings are more likely to occur in countries where students can easily access firearms: nearly three in four of these have occurred in the USA. (UNICEF, 2017)

In countries affected by conflict, attacks on education became more common between 2013 and 2017, with 41 countries that experienced more than five attacks on education in which at least one incident was a direct attack or killed at least one person, compared to 30 countries between 2009 and 2012. More than 1,000 incidents of attacks on schools were reported in four of the nine countries most heavily affected by attacks on education: Democratic Republic of the Congo, Israel/Palestine, Nigeria and Yemen. Between 500 and 999 attacks on schools were documented in four other countries: Afghanistan, South Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, and Ukraine. In total, the Global Coalition to protect Education from Attack found attacks on education in 74 countries. (Global Coalition to protect Education from Attack, 2018)


¹⁹ The Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack considers six categories of attacks on education: physical attacks or threats of attacks on schools; physical attacks or threats directed at students, teachers and other education personnel; military use of schools and universities; child recruitment at, or en route to or from, school or university; sexual violence by armed parties at, or en route to or from, school or university; attacks on higher education.

2.2 Changes in prevalence over time

This section draws on GSHS and HBSC data to analyse changes in the prevalence of bullying over time and on GSHS data to analyse changes in the prevalence of physical fights and physical attacks over time. It also draws on the most recent trend data available on cyberbullying from the Net Children Go Mobile project co-funded by the European Commission's Better Internet for Kids Programme.

Overall, many countries have seen a decline in the prevalence of bullying, but fewer have seen a decrease in physical fights or physical attacks

Figure 8. Number of countries where bullying, physical fights, and physical attacks have increased, decreased or remained stable



Sources: Secondary analysis calculations based on GSHS and HBSC data. HBSC for Europe and North America (students aged 11, 13 and 15); GSHS for the other regions (students aged 13-15). Data collected between 2002 and 2017. Years of data collection and intervals between rounds of data collection vary depending on countries.

Changes in bullying prevalence over time

Bullying has decreased in almost half of countries. Of the 71 countries and territories with trend data, 35 have seen a decrease in the prevalence of bullying (Figure 8 and Figure 9) (GSHS, HBSC). There are some differences between the sexes. Among male students, a significant decrease in bullying was identified in nine GSHS countries: Eswatini, Fiji, Indonesia, Jamaica, Lebanon, the Maldives, Namibia, Seychelles and Uruguay. Among female students, a significant decrease was identified in seven GSHS countries: Eswatini, Fiji, Indonesia, Jamaica, Lebanon, Tonga and Trinidad and Tobago. Bullying prevalence rates for both male and female students decreased in Eswatini, Fiji, Indonesia, Jamaica and Lebanon.

Bullying prevalence has increased in almost one in five countries, and has remained unchanged in one in three countries. Of the 71 countries and territories with trend data, 13 have seen an increase in the prevalence of bullying and 23 have seen no significant change (GSHS, HBSC). Again, there are differences between the sexes. Among male students, a significant increase in bullying was identified in four GSHS countries: Myanmar, Oman, Philippines and the United Arab Emirates. Among female students, a significant increase was identified in nine GSHS countries and territories: Egypt, Kuwait, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, the Philippines, Rodrigues (Mauritius), Thailand and the United Arab Emirates. Bullying prevalence rates for both male and female students increased in Myanmar, the Philippines and United Arab Emirates.

Figure 9. Trends in the prevalence of students who were bullied, in physical fights or physically attacked

Country or territory	Data reference period	Bullying	Physical fights	Physical attacks	Country or territory	Data reference period	Bullying	Physical fights	Physical attacks
Anguilla	2009, 2016	◆	▼	◆	Luxembourg	2002, 2014	▼	○	○
Argentina	2007, 2012	◆	▲	◆	Macedonia (FYROM)	2002, 2014	▼	○	○
Armenia	2002, 2014	▼	○	○	Maldives	2009, 2014	▼	◆	◆
Austria	2002, 2014	▼	○	○	Malta	2002, 2014	◆	○	○
Belgium-Flemish	2002, 2014	▼	○	○	Mauritius	2007, 2011	◆	◆	◆
Belgium-French	2002, 2014	▲	○	○	Mongolia	2010, 2013	◆	◆	◆
Benin	2009, 2016	◆	◆	▼	Morocco	2006, 2016	▲	◆	▼
Bulgaria	2002, 2014	◆	○	○	Myanmar	2007, 2016	▲	▲	▲
Canada	2002, 2014	◆	○	○	Namibia	2004, 2013	◆	▼	○
Cook Islands	2011, 2015	◆	▼	◆	Netherlands	2002, 2014	▼	○	○
Croatia	2002, 2014	▼	○	○	Norway	2002, 2014	▼	○	○
Czech Republic	2002, 2014	◆	○	○	Oman	2005, 2015	◆	▲	▼
Denmark	2002, 2014	▼	○	○	Philippines	2003, 2015	▲	▼	○
Egypt	2006, 2011	◆	◆	◆	Portugal	2002, 2014	▼	○	○
Estonia	2002, 2014	▼	○	○	Rodrigues (Mauritius)	2007, 2011	◆	◆	▲
Eswatini	2003, 2013	▼	▼	○	Romania	2002, 2014	▼	○	○
Fiji	2010, 2016	▼	▼	▼	Russian Federation	2002, 2014	▲	○	○
Finland	2002, 2014	▲	○	○	Seychelles	2007, 2015	◆	○	○
France	2002, 2014	▼	○	○	Slovakia	2002, 2014	▲	○	○
Germany	2002, 2014	▼	○	○	Slovenia	2002, 2014	◆	○	○
Greece	2002, 2014	▼	○	○	Spain	2002, 2014	▼	○	○
Greenland	2002, 2014	▼	○	○	Sri Lanka	2008, 2016	◆	◆	▼
Guyana	2004, 2010	◆	◆	○	Sweden	2002, 2014	▼	○	○
Hungary	2002, 2014	▲	○	○	Switzerland	2002, 2014	▼	○	○
Iceland	2002, 2014	▼	○	○	Thailand	2008, 2015	▲	◆	◆
Indonesia	2007, 2015	▼	▼	▼	Tonga	2010, 2017	▼	▼	◆
Ireland	2002, 2014	▲	○	○	Trinidad and Tobago	2007, 2011	▼	▼	▼
Israel	2002, 2014	▼	○	○	Ukraine	2002, 2014	▼	○	○
Italy	2002, 2014	▼	○	○	United Kingdom, England	2002, 2014	▼	○	○
Jamaica	2010, 2017	▼	▼	▼	United Kingdom, Scotland	2002, 2014	▲	○	○
Jordan	2004, 2007	◆	◆	○	United Kingdom, Wales	2002, 2014	▲	○	○
Kuwait	2011, 2015	◆	◆	◆	United Arab Emirates	2005, 2016	▲	◆	▼
Latvia	2002, 2014	◆	○	○	United States	2002, 2010	▼	○	○
Lebanon	2005, 2017	▼	▼	▼	Uruguay	2006, 2012	▼	▼	▼
Lithuania	2002, 2014	▼	○	○	Yemen	2008, 2014	◆	▼	▼

▲ Increased ▼ Decreased ◆ No significant changes ○ Trend data not available

Source: HBSC for countries and territories in Europe and North America, and GSHS for countries and territories in other regions. Depending on the countries, there were two or more rounds of data collection.

Changes in the prevalence of physical fights over time

Fewer than half of countries have seen a decrease in involvement of students in physical fighting. Of the 29 countries and territories with trend data on involvement in a physical fight, 13 have seen a decrease, 12 have seen no change and four have seen an increase (Figure 8 and Figure 9) (GSHS). The pattern was similar for male and female students, although in the Cook Islands, Morocco, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, and Yemen, prevalence significantly decreased among male students, but did not change significantly among female students, and in Tonga, prevalence significantly decreased among female students, but did not change significantly among male students. Prevalence rates for physical fights for both male and female students decreased in Anguilla, Eswatini, Fiji, Indonesia, Jamaica, Lebanon, Namibia, the Philippines and Uruguay. The prevalence rate among female students increased in the Maldives but not among male students. In Oman, the prevalence rate significantly increased among male students, but did not change significantly among female students.

Changes in the prevalence of physical attacks over time

Physical attacks have decreased in half of countries. Of 24 countries and territories with trend data on the prevalence of physical attacks, 12 have seen a decrease, 10 have seen no change and two have seen an increase in prevalence (Figure 8 and Figure 9) (GSHS). The pattern was similar for male and female students, although in the Maldives, Morocco, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, and Yemen, the prevalence rates significantly decreased among male students, but did not change significantly among female students, and in Sri Lanka and Tonga, the prevalence rates significantly decreased among female students, but did not change significantly among male students. Prevalence rates for physical attacks for both male and female students decreased in Benin, Fiji, Jamaica, Indonesia, Lebanon, Oman and the United Arab Emirates. In Mongolia, the prevalence rate significantly increased among female students, but did not change significantly among male students.

Among the 30 countries and territories with trends data for the prevalence of bullying, physical fights and physical attacks, six countries have seen a decrease in the prevalence of all three of these forms of violence – Fiji, Indonesia, Jamaica, Lebanon, Trinidad and Tobago and Uruguay.


Changes in prevalence of cyberbullying over time

Cyberbullying is a growing problem

Although the prevalence of cyberbullying is relatively low compared with other forms of school violence and bullying, it is an increasing problem. In seven European countries²⁰, overall, the proportion of

children aged 11-16 years who use the Internet and reported that they had experienced cyberbullying increased from 7% in 2010 to 12% in 2014 (Figure 10) (Mascheroni and Cuman, 2014).

Figure 10. Change in the percentage of children aged 11-16 who use the Internet reporting being cyberbullied in Europe



Data source: Mascheroni and Cuman, 2014.

²⁰ Belgium, Denmark, Ireland, Italy, Portugal, Romania, United Kingdom

2.3 Influencing factors

Children who are perceived to be ‘different’ in any way are more at risk of bullying. Key factors include: not conforming to gender norms, physical appearance, race, nationality or colour

This section summarises data on factors that influence bullying:

- Both the GSHS and HBSC collect data on the following factors: physical appearance, race, nationality or colour; and religion.
- The HBSC and PISA collect data on social status and immigration status.
- PISA collects data on the school environment, and peer and family support.
- The GSHS, HBSC and PISA also provide data disaggregated by sex, which have been used here to analyse sex differences in the forms of violence and

types of bullying experienced. International surveys do not collect data on school violence based on sexual orientation, so this section draws on other data from specific national surveys to discuss this factor.

- Finally GSHS, HBSC and TIMSS data are used to analyse the relationship between student age and school violence and bullying.

Sex differences


School violence and bullying affects both boys and girls, but in different ways

Globally, girls and boys are equally likely to experience bullying.

GSHS data show that the global prevalence of bullying is 30.4% among girls and 34.8% among boys aged 13-15; HBSC data show similar findings,

with prevalence of 28.2% among girls and 30.1% among boys (Figure 11). There are, however, considerable differences between regions. Boys are much more likely to be bullied than girls in the Middle East, North Africa and the Pacific (GSHS). In Europe and North America, the difference was significant in 23 countries, with boys reporting a lower prevalence of bullying than girls in 18 countries, and girls reporting a lower prevalence than boys in five countries (HBSC).

Figure 11. Percentage of boys and girls affected by different types of school violence and bullying



Sources: Secondary analysis calculations based on GSHS and HBSC data.

Boys are more likely to experience physical bullying; girls are more likely to experience psychological bullying. Data from GSHS countries show that, overall, boys (21.5%) are more likely to experience physical bullying than girls (10.1%). PISA data also suggest that boys are more likely to experience physical bullying than girls, but that girls (6.1%) are slightly more likely than boys (4.7%) to experience psychological bullying.

Girls are more likely than boys to experience bullying based on physical appearance. In all GSHS regions, girls report being made fun of because of how their face or body looks more frequently than boys, with the difference being particularly striking in Asia, the Caribbean and sub-Saharan Africa (GSHS).


Globally, there are no major differences in the extent to which girls and boys experience sexual bullying, but there are regional differences. Across all GSHS regions, 10.3% of girls and 11.6% of boys report being made fun of with sexual jokes, comments or gestures. However, girls are more likely to report sexual bullying in Asia, the Caribbean and North Africa, while boys are more likely to report it in Central America, the Middle East, the Pacific, South America and sud-Saharan Africa.

Girls are more likely than boys to be cyberbullied via messages but there is less difference between the sexes in the prevalence of cyberbullying via pictures. In Europe and North America, sex differences in the prevalence of cyberbullying via messages were significant in 27 of 42 countries: prevalence was higher among girls in 24 countries and among boys in three countries. Sex differences in the prevalence of cyberbullying via pictures were significant in 26 of 42 countries: prevalence was higher among boys in 14 countries and among girls in 12 countries (HBSC).

Boys are more likely than girls to have been involved in a physical fight and to have been physically attacked. Globally, 45.4% of boys and 25.4% of girls have been involved in a physical fight in the past year; there are significant differences between the sexes across all GSHS regions. Globally, 38.6% of boys and 25.9% of girls have been physically attacked in the past year. While there are significant differences in some GSHS regions, there is little difference in others, for example, the Pacific, sub-Saharan Africa and Central America.

Boys are more likely to experience harsh discipline in school than girls. PISA data show that boys report a higher median prevalence than girls of feeling they have been more harshly disciplined than other students, across all regions, except for the Middle East (Figure 12). Other data from four countries suggest that boys are more likely than girls to experience corporal punishment perpetrated by teachers (Ethiopia 44% versus 31%, India 83% versus 73%, Peru 35% versus 26%, Viet Nam 28% versus 11%) (Portela and Pells, 2015; Know Violence in Childhood, 2017).


Figure 12. Median percentage of students reporting that teachers disciplined them more harshly than other students, across selected regions



Data source: PISA 2015

Age differences

As children grow older, they are less likely to experience violence and bullying perpetrated by peers. Globally, the proportion of students who report being bullied declines with increasing age: from 33% in those aged 13 years to 32.3% in those aged 14 years, and to 30.4% in those aged 15 years (GSHS). The trends are the same in Europe and North America, where students aged 15 years are less likely to be bullied (23.7%) than those aged 13 years (29.6%) and 11 years (32.6%) (HBSC). TIMSS data show a similar trend, with the prevalence of being bullied decreasing from 43% among those aged 10 years to 36% among those aged 14 years (Figure 13). With respect to psychological bullying specifically, a global meta-analysis showed that, globally, between 70% and 80% of all boys and girls aged 8-11 years had experienced psychological violence from a classmate in the past year, but this decreased to 50% among those aged 12-17 years (Devries et al., 2018). Physical attacks and fights perpetrated by peers are also more common in younger teenagers, with prevalence decreasing as they get older (GSHS) (Figure 16). The same global meta-analysis also showed that the prevalence of physical violence from a classmate decreased after the age of 12 years among boys (Devries et al., 2018).

Figure 13. Percentage of students who were bullied, in physical fights or physically attacked, by age

Data sources: Secondary analysis calculations based on GSHS and HBSC data; TIMSS. The HBSC and GSHS data reflect the global median prevalence whereas TIMSS data show the international average.

Age differences are less pronounced for bullying perpetration. HBSC data suggest that age may have less impact on bullying perpetration. The differences between age groups were less pronounced, with reported prevalence of bullying others of 22.9% in those aged 11 years, 27.5% in those aged 13 years and 26.1% in those aged 15 years.


Older students may be more exposed to cyberbullying. HBSC data suggest that older students may be more exposed to cyberbullying than younger students. For cyberbullying via messages, prevalence estimates varied little between students aged 11 years and those aged 15 years but, of the 22 countries with significant differences between age groups, 11-year-olds reported the highest prevalence in only three countries. For cyberbullying via pictures, the youngest age category reported the lowest prevalence.

Available evidence indicates that the frequency of corporal punishment in school declines with age. In two of the Young Lives countries for which trend data have been analysed, the frequency of corporal punishment decreased significantly between the ages of 8 and 15 years. At age 8, nearly one in three children surveyed in Peru and Viet Nam reported they had experienced corporal punishment but, among the same respondents at age 15, this had declined to less than one in ten (Portela and Pells, 2015).

Not conforming to gender norms

Students viewed as gender non-conforming are at higher risk of school violence and bullying. This includes students who are, or are perceived as, lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender (LGBT), and those who do not conform to stereotypes of masculinity and femininity, such as boys viewed as 'effeminate' or girls viewed as 'masculine'. Data from New Zealand show that lesbian, gay and bisexual students were three times more likely to be bullied and transgender students were five times more likely to be bullied than their heterosexual peers; and in Norway, 15%-48% of lesbian, gay and bisexual students reported being bullied compared with 7% of heterosexual students (UNESCO, 2016). In the USA, a large national school-based survey found that 11.2% of students identified as gay, lesbian or bisexual or were unsure about their sexual orientation, and that they were significantly more likely to be bullied at school, cyberbullied, and involved in a physical fight at school than students who identified as heterosexual (Figure 14) (Kann, L. et al., 2016). In a study in Australia, 60%-70% of LGBT youth reported experiencing bullying due to their sexual orientation or gender identity (Hillier et al., 2010). In Thailand, the prevalence of bullying among LGBT youth due to their sexual orientation or gender identity was 55% (UNESCO, 2014). Other data suggest that one in three non-LGBT students who do not conform to gender norms experience school violence and bullying (Know Violence in Childhood, 2017).

Figure 14. Percentage of high school students in the USA who were bullied on school property, electronically bullied or in a physical fight at school, by sexual orientation




Data source: Laura Kann et al, 2016

Physical appearance

Physical appearance is the most frequent reason for bullying. Globally, 15.3% of students who have been bullied report being made fun of because of how their face or body looks (Figure 15) (GSHS). This was one of the top two most frequent forms of bullying in all GSHS regions except for the Middle East, North Africa and the Pacific. One in three students in North America and one in four students in Europe who have been bullied report that this was based on their physical appearance (HBSC). There is little data on the specific aspects of physical appearance that increase vulnerability to bullying.

Figure 15. Percentage of students who were bullied because of their physical appearance; race, nationality or colour; or religion



Source: Secondary analysis calculations based on GSHS data: among students who were bullied on one or more days during the 30 days before the survey

Being dissatisfied with your body and being overweight are associated with bullying. Overall, in Europe and North America, body image dissatisfaction is more prevalent among children who are bully-victims²¹ (52.1%) and those who are bullied (50.9%) than among bullies (43.1%) and those not involved in bullying (39.7%). Being overweight or obese is also more prevalent among bully-victims (18%) and victims (17.2%) than among bullies (15.2%) and those not involved in bullying (13%) (HBSC).

21 Bully-victims are students who are both bullies and victims of bullying.

Race, nationality or colour

Bullying based on race, nationality or colour is the second most frequent reason for bullying reported by students.

Across all GSHS regions, 10.9% of students (11.9% of boys and 8.9% of girls) who had been bullied reported that this was based on their race, nationality or colour (Figure 13). The highest rates were reported in the Pacific (14.2%) and sub-Saharan Africa (13.5%). In Europe, 8.2% of students who have been bullied reported that this was based on their race, nationality or colour.²²

22 HBSC data on race, nationality, and colour as drivers of bullying were collected in only six countries in Europe.

Religion

Compared to other factors, religion is mentioned by far fewer students as a reason for being bullied. Across all GSHS regions, 4.6% of students (3.8% of girls and 5.4% of boys) who had been bullied reported that this was based on their religion (Figure 15). The highest rates were reported in the Pacific (6.3%) and sub-Saharan Africa (8.8%). In Europe, 3.6% of those bullied reported that this was based on religion.²³

23 HBSC data on religion as a driver of bullying were collected in only five countries in Europe.

24 Note the study did not ask where the violence occurred.

Box 4. School violence and bullying and disability

There is limited data on the experience of school violence and bullying among children living with disabilities. Available evidence suggests that children with disabilities are at increased risk of physical and sexual violence (Jones et al., 2011), but there is little comprehensive or comparable data on location or perpetrators. Reasons for increased vulnerability to violence and bullying include stigma, discrimination and isolation from potential protective factors, and specific disabilities, such as difficulties with communication, that make it difficult for children to report experiences of violence (Fry et al., 2017).

In the few school-based studies that have been conducted, both peers and teachers are cited as perpetrators of violence. In Uganda, 84% of children living with a disability reported that they had experienced violence perpetrated by peers or school staff in the past week, compared to 54% of children without disabilities. Girls with disabilities were more likely to report sexual violence from male peers than girls without disabilities (7.8% vs. 3.7%); this was also true for boys (4.5% vs. 1.1%). Girls with disabilities were also more likely to report psychological violence from their female peers than girls without disabilities (27.5% vs. 19%) (Devries et al., 2014).²⁴ Research from the USA shows that students with disabilities report repeated victimization, and this was more common among students with autism in elementary and middle school and among students with physical disabilities in high school (Blake et al., 2012). Other research from the USA suggests that certain types of disabilities are associated with being bullied and being a bully-victim (Farmer et al., 2012) and with bullying behaviour (Blake et al., 2016).


In the USA, children with disabilities are reported to be more likely to be recipients of corporal punishment from teachers, together with children from ethnic minorities (Sullivan, 2009). In Uganda, girls with disabilities were slightly more likely to report physical violence from school staff than girls without disabilities (98% versus 93.9%) (Devries et al., 2014). The limited data available also show that children with certain difficulties may be more vulnerable. In Uganda, for example, children with self-care difficulties were found to be 18.6 times more likely to report sexual violence from staff and 17.1 times more likely to report a severe injury from school staff (Kuper et al., 2016).

Socio-economic status

Socio-economic disadvantage is associated with increased risk of being bullied.

PISA data show that this is the case in all regions, except for the Caribbean and Central America, where there is little difference between students of different socio-economic status, and East Asia, where more advantaged students experience slightly higher rates of bullying. PISA data also show that students in disadvantaged schools are more likely to report being a victim of bullying than those in advantaged schools. In Europe and North America (Figure 16), students who perceive their family social status as low or very low were more likely to report being bullied than those perceiving themselves as from middle or average or high or very high social classes (HBSC).

Figure 16. Percentage of students who were bullied, by self-perceived family social status



Source: Secondary analysis calculations based on HBSC data.


A similar relationship is seen between self-perceived social status and cyberbullying. In 34 of 42 countries, students who perceive their family social status as low or very low were more likely to report being cyberbullied via messages (17.6%) than those from middle or average (10.1%) or high or very high (9.6%) social classes. The same pattern was seen for cyberbullying via pictures in 27 of 42 countries (HBSC).

The relationship between socio-economic status and punishment perpetrated by teachers is less clear. PISA data show a very small difference between more and less advantaged students in self-reported harsh discipline by teachers. However, in the USA, poorer children were found to be among the most frequent victims of corporal punishment in school (Sullivan, 2009). Similarly, the Young Lives study found that children from economically disadvantaged households were significantly more likely to experience corporal punishment from teachers in Peru and Viet Nam, compared to children from more advantaged households in the same community (Portela and Pells, 2015).

Migrant status

Immigrant students are more likely to be bullied than their native-born peers. Data from Europe and North America show that immigrant students are more likely to be bullied (33%) than their native-born peers (26.3%) (Figure 17). Immigrant students are also more likely to experience cyberbullying by messages (14.2%) than their native-born peers (9.4%), although there are differences between countries (HBSC).

Figure 17. Percentage of students who were bullied, by immigration status




Source: Secondary analysis calculations based on HBSC data.

School environment, peer and family support

The school environment, relations with peers and family support can influence the prevalence of bullying

A positive school environment reduces bullying. Bullying occurs more often in schools with poor discipline and where teachers treat students unfairly. Data from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries show that the proportion of students who are victims of frequent bullying is 7 percentage points higher in schools with a poor disciplinary climate in class than in schools with a positive disciplinary climate²⁵ (Figure 18). The data also show that bullying is 12 percentage points higher in schools where students report that teachers treat them unfairly²⁶ (PISA).

Figure 18. Percentage of students in OECD countries who were bullied, by perceived disciplinary climate



Data source: PISA 2015

25 PISA 2012 asked students to describe the frequency with which interruptions occur in mathematics lessons. This included how often – “never”, “in some”, “in most” or “in all” mathematics lessons – students don’t listen to what the teacher says; there is noise and disorder; the teacher has to wait a long time for students to quieten down; students cannot work well; and students don’t start working for a long time after the lesson begins. These responses were combined to create a composite index of disciplinary climate. A school with a positive or negative disciplinary climate is one where the average index of disciplinary climate is statistically higher or lower than the average level in the country.

26 Being treated unfairly refers to students reporting that teachers disciplined them more harshly than other students, and/or ridiculed them in front of others and/or said something insulting to them in front of others, “a few times a month” or “once a week or more”.

There appears to be a relationship between peer-related factors and bullying. HBSC data show that children who are not involved in bullying are more likely to perceive their classmates to be kind and helpful (75.1%), compared with bully-victims (60.5%) and victims (59.8%). Similarly, students who are not involved in bullying are more likely to report that their classmates accept them as they are (83%), compared with bully-victims (62.1%) and victims (58.4%). The findings were similar from a composite score on a 3-item classmate support scale, with higher scores indicating higher levels of perceived support from classmates. Bullies (8.7), bully-victims (7.9) and victims (7.8) had lower median scores than those who were not involved in bullying (9.1) (HBSC). However, GSHS data found the opposite, indicating that students who were bullied were more likely to perceive their classmates as supportive (GSHS).

Family support and communication can be an important protective factor. In HBSC countries, children with more family support are less likely to be bullied or to bully others; bullies, bully-victims and victims have lower scores for family support. Similarly, children who are not involved in bullying others, and who are not bullied, score higher on the quality of family communication compared with bullies, bully-victims and victims. PISA data from OECD countries also show that students who report that their parents support them when they have difficulties at school are less likely to report being bullied. Again, GSHS data showed the opposite, indicating that students who were bullied were more likely to score higher on family support.²⁷ More comprehensive and comparable global data are needed to better understand the association between peer and family support and vulnerability to school violence and bullying.

²⁷ The conflicting findings might suggest that the survey questions might not have been fully credible to measure protective factors as complex constructs, or that the findings provide evidence of the resilience of students – even those who are being bullied.

Box 5. Experience of multiple forms of violence by children and adolescents

Some children and adolescents experience violence and bullying in multiple settings and in multiple forms. Increasingly, therefore, research on children and violence is focusing on multiple forms of victimization or 'polyvictimization' (Finkelhor et al., 2005). A systematic review found that polyvictimization is more prevalent among children in low- and lower middle-income countries than among those in high- and upper-middle income countries, and that it increases the negative mental health and health risk behaviour outcomes associated with violence and bullying (Le et al., 2016).

There is very little data on the extent to which children who experience school violence and bullying also experience violence in other settings such as the home and the community. One exception is the Multi-Country Study on the Drivers of Violence Affecting Children, which showed that children's experience of severe punishment or violence in the home could be a risk factor for bullying perpetration and/or victimization at school (Maternowska et al., 2018). For example, in Zimbabwe, children's experiences of severe punishment at home and lack of family support were found to be risk factors for bullying behaviour at schools (Ncube, 2013). In Italy, children who experienced physical or sexual abuse or neglect at home were found to be at greater risk of becoming bullies at school and of being bully-victims (Bernacchi et al., 2016). Other risk factors identified for bullying perpetration and/or victimization include parental health and psychological problems, low parental education, and low family income (Bianchi and Moretti, 2006; Caso et al., 2011; Bardi and Borgognini, 2001; Baldry, 2003; Arace et al., 2013).

2.4 Consequences

This section summarises available evidence on the educational and health consequences of school violence and bullying. Global comparable data are available only for the consequences of bullying, not for the consequences of other forms of school violence. Data on educational consequences are largely drawn from PISA, supplemented by PIRLS and TERCE data. Data on health consequences are largely drawn from the GSHS, HBSC and PISA. Discussion of longer-term social consequences, specifically the relationship between school violence and bullying and intimate partner violence (IPV) in adulthood, is based on data from a UN multi-country study.



Educational consequences

Children who are frequently bullied are more likely to feel like an outsider at school. Children who are frequently bullied are almost three times more likely to report feeling like an outsider at school than those who are not frequently bullied (Figure 19). In OECD countries, 42% of those who are frequently bullied report feeling like an outsider at school compared with 15% of those who are not frequently bullied (PISA). Children who are frequently bullied are also about twice as likely to skip school more often (Figure 19). In other data, psychological bullying has been shown to have a negative effect on socialization and feelings of acceptance (TERCE) and that as bullying decreases, students' sense of belonging at school increases (PIRLS).

Being bullied undermines the sense of belonging at school and affects continued engagement in education


Being bullied can affect continued engagement in education. Children who are frequently bullied are more likely to want to leave school after finishing secondary education than those who are not frequently bullied (Figure 19). PISA data found that almost 45% of students who were frequently bullied, versus 35% of those not frequently bullied, wanted to leave formal education after finishing secondary school.

Figure 19. Educational consequences of bullying


	 Frequently bullied	 Not frequently bullied
Expected to end their education at the secondary level	44.5%	34.8%
Feel like an outsider (or left out of things at school)	42.4%	14.9%
Skipped school at least 3-4 days in previous two weeks	9.2%	4.1%
Feel anxious for a test even if well prepared	63.9%	54.6%

Data source: Relationship between being frequently bullied and other student outcomes, OECD average, PISA 2015


Figure 20. Impact of bullying on learning outcomes, mean scores*



Data source: Difference in learning achievement between students who were bullied and not bullied, PIRLS 2015



Data source: Difference in learning scores between students who were bullied and those who were not bullied, TERCE



Data source: Relationship between being frequently bullied and other student outcomes, OECD average, PISA 2015

*Surveys use different achievement scores. They are based on the achievement across all participating countries. The scale centerpoint is set to correspond to the mean of overall achievement or mean performance across countries. PIRLS: The scale has a typical range of achievement between 300 and 700. The centerpoint is 500. TERCE: The centerpoint is 700 for both reading scores and mathematics scores. PISA: the mean performance for science is 493.

Educational outcomes are lower for children who are bullied

Children who are bullied score lower in tests than their non-bullied peers. In 15 Latin American countries, students who were bullied scored lower in mathematics and reading tests than students who were not bullied (Figure 20) (TERCE). Students who were bullied achieved between 9.6

and 18.4 points less in mathematics, and between 5.8 and 19.4 points less in reading. Data from the TERCE study also showed that psychological bullying may have a greater effect on learning than physical bullying. For example, in Argentina, psychological bullying was associated with a score of 20 points less in mathematics, and physical bullying was associated with a score of 10 points less in mathematics; a similar picture was seen in Chile.

The more often a student is bullied, the worse their scores. Performance is between 9.2 and 10.9 points lower if a student experiences one event of bullying but between 42.8 and 61 points lower if they experience six events of bullying (TERCE). PIRLS data show that the average achievement for students who said they were never or almost never bullied was 521 compared with 507 for those who said they were bullied monthly and 482 for those who said they were bullied weekly. In addition, students who are bullied frequently are more likely to feel anxious before a test than other students, even when they are well prepared (Figure 19) (PISA). Data from OECD countries also show that students in schools where bullying is frequent score 47 points lower in science than

students in schools where bullying occurs less frequently (PISA).

Poor discipline and an unsafe school environment are associated with lower academic achievement. TIMSS and PIRLS data show that primary and secondary schools where principals felt there were moderate to severe discipline problems or where teachers reported the environment to be less than safe and orderly, were associated with lower academic achievement.


Health consequences

Children's mental health and well-being can be adversely impacted by bullying

Bullying is associated with higher rates of feeling lonely and suicidal. Children who are bullied are around twice as likely to feel lonely, to be unable to sleep at night and to have contemplated suicide as those who are not bullied

(GSHS). Overall, in GSHS countries, during the past 12 months, 18.3% of children who were bullied felt lonely most of the time or always, 17.2% were so worried that they could not sleep at night, and 23.4% had seriously considered attempting suicide, compared with 8.2%, 7% and 12% respectively of those who were not bullied (Figure 21). The VACS data show that all forms of childhood violence influence negative health outcomes including risky sexual behaviours, substance misuse and mental health.

Figure 21. Differences in mental health status and the prevalence of risk behaviours between students who were bullied and those who were not bullied



Source: Secondary analysis calculations based on GSHS data.

School violence can cause physical injuries and harm.

PIRLS data suggest that globally, 28.1% of students report being injured at school by another student. The prevalence is highest in the Middle East, with 41.9% of students reporting having been injured at school by another student, and lowest in Eastern Europe, where the prevalence is 15.9%. These data highlight the high prevalence of self-defined injury resulting from school violence and bullying. Other forms of school violence, such as corporal punishment, can also cause injury (Gershoff, 2017).

Bullying is associated with higher rates of smoking, alcohol and cannabis use. In Europe and North America, rates of current alcohol use and of lifetime smoking and cannabis use are higher among bullies and bully-victims than among victims only, or those who are not involved in bullying (HBSC). In other regions, children who are bullied are more likely than those who are not bullied to have smoked cigarettes, to have consumed alcohol, and to have used cannabis in the previous month (Figure 21) (GSHS).


Bullying is also associated with earlier age of first sexual experience. In Europe and North America, among students aged 14-15 years, bullies and bully-victims were found to be more likely to have had sexual intercourse than victims only or those not involved in bullying in the majority of countries (HBSC). In other regions, among students aged 13-15 years, those who are bullied are more likely to have ever had sexual intercourse than those who are not bullied (Figure 21) (GSHS).

Bullying is associated with lower rates of self-reported life satisfaction and health. Students who are bullied frequently are more likely to report low life satisfaction (a value of 4 or less on a scale of 1 to 10) than those who are not bullied. In OECD countries, 26% of students who are frequently bullied report low life satisfaction (PISA). Students who are bullied (29.1%), bully-victims (28%) or bullies (33.8%) are also less likely to report their self-rated health as excellent than those who are not involved in bullying (39.6%) (Figure 22) (HBSC).

A United Nations multi-country study on men and violence in six countries in Asia and the Pacific found that 40% of adult men surveyed reported having been hit by a teacher during their childhood and 27.3% reported that they had bullied others during their childhood. Adult men who reported being hit by a teacher were more likely to report perpetrating IPV in adulthood; the same applied to adult men who reported that they had bullied others in school or the community (Fulu et al., 2013).

Figure 22. Differences in self-reported health status between students who were bullied and those who were not bullied

Median % of students who rated their health as excellent*



Presence of ill-health symptoms at any frequency (0-8)**



Source: Secondary analysis calculations based on HBSC data, 2013/2014

* Students are asked "In general, would you say your health is excellent, good, fair, or poor?" and can choose between excellent (1) versus good, fair or poor (0).

** Symptoms include 4 psychological and 4 physical symptoms: headache; stomach-ache; back ache; feeling low; irritability or bad temper; feeling nervous; difficulties in getting to sleep; feeling dizzy. The frequency of each symptom is scored on a 5-point scale: 0 = rarely or never, 1 = every month, 2 = every week, 3 = more than once a week, 4 = every day. Incidence rate of those eight symptoms at any frequency (0-8)

2.5 Regional snapshots

This section summarizes key data, mainly from the GSHS and the HBSC, on school violence and bullying by region and sub-region. These snapshots highlight the most prevalent forms of school violence and bullying, the main types of bullying, and the key drivers. They also describe changes in the prevalence of school violence and bullying in regions and sub-regions for which trend data are available.



Asia and the Pacific

Asia

The prevalence of bullying in the Asia region, at 30.3% (range 7.1%-51.2%), is slightly lower than the global median prevalence of 32%. There is little difference in bullying prevalence between the sexes, at 31.2% among boys and 28.3% among girls.

Physical bullying is the most frequent type of bullying overall and for boys (22.2%), followed by sexual bullying (10.5%). Girls are equally likely to report physical bullying (10.9%) and sexual bullying (10.9%). Girls (6.6%) are slightly more likely than boys (4.6%) to report psychological bullying.

Physical appearance is reported to be the main driver for bullying by girls (19.2%) and they are twice as likely to report this as boys (9.8%). Boys are slightly more likely to report bullying that is related to race, nationality or colour (10.4%) than girls (7.3%) and the same for bullying based on religion (4.1% vs. 2.4%).

The overall prevalence of physical fights in Asia, at 24.6% (range 10.2%-46.3%), is the lowest of all regions. The prevalence of physical attacks is higher, at 32.8%. There are, however, significant differences between the sexes. Boys (35.9%) are twice as likely to report involvement in a physical fight as girls (17.4%) and are also more likely to report being physically attacked (39.2% versus 24.7%).

Out of six countries in the Asian region for which the trends data were available, only Indonesia, Asia has seen an overall decrease in bullying. Only one country, Indonesia, has seen a decline in bullying, physical fights and physical attacks. The Philippines has seen a decline in physical fights, and Sri Lanka has seen a decline in physical attacks.

Pacific

The prevalence of bullying in the Pacific region, at 36.8% (range 25.1%-74%), is above the global median prevalence of 32%, and the Pacific has the fourth highest prevalence of bullying of any region. There is relatively little difference in bullying prevalence between the sexes, at 39.8% among boys and 32% among girls.


Physical bullying is the most frequent type of bullying reported by both boys and girls who have been bullied, but the prevalence of physical bullying is higher in boys (29%) than in girls (19%). The differences between the sexes are less pronounced for sexual bullying – at 10.3% in boys and 9.3% in girls – and for psychological bullying – at 4.3% for boys and 5.4% for girls.

Physical appearance is reported to be the main driver for bullying by girls (13.2%) and they are more likely to report this than boys (8.5%). Boys are more likely to report that bullying is related to race, nationality or colour (15.1%) than girls (10.2%), whereas there is no difference for bullying based on religion, which is also reported least frequently by both sexes.

The prevalence of physical violence in the Pacific region is high. The overall prevalence of physical fights, at 38.1% (range 30.5%-75.1%), is the fourth highest of all regions. Boys (48.7%) are more likely to report involvement in a physical fight than girls (35.2%), but the prevalence in girls is high compared with other regions. The overall prevalence of physical attacks is far higher, at 48.4%, and the Pacific has the highest reported prevalence of this form of physical violence of any region. There is little difference between the sexes, with 49% of boys and 46.9% of girls reporting having been physically attacked and, again, the prevalence in girls is high compared with other regions.

In terms of trends, Fiji, has seen a decline in bullying, physical fights and physical attacks. Tonga has seen a decline in bullying and physical fights, and the Cook Islands have seen a decline in physical fights.

Figure 23. Status of school violence and bullying in Asia Pacific



Source: Secondary analysis calculations based on HBSC data.

Europe

The overall prevalence of bullying reported in Europe is 25%, which is below the global median of 32%, and Europe has the second lowest prevalence of bullying of any region. There is little difference between the sexes in the prevalence of bullying victimization, at 30.1% for boys and 28.2% for girls. In contrast, reported prevalence of bullying others shows that this behaviour is far more prevalent among boys (33%) than among girls (19.2%).

In Europe, girls (11.7%) are slightly more likely to experience cyberbullying via messages than boys (9.3%), whereas boys (8.1%) are slightly more likely to experience cyberbullying via pictures than girls (7.5%).

Available data on different types of bullying show that psychological bullying is the most frequent type, with 25.7% of students who had been bullied reporting being called names, 15.3% reporting being left out and 19.5% reporting that lies or rumours had been spread about them. Sexual bullying was, marginally, the second most frequent type of bullying, with 11% of students who had been bullied reporting this, and physical bullying the third most frequent,


with 10.4% of students who had been bullied reporting this. This is different from most other regions, except for North America, where physical bullying and sexual bullying are the top two most common types of bullying. Some of the difference in prevalence of different forms of bullying between HBSC and GSHS regions may be because of the difference in survey age groups and recall periods.

Based on available data, one in four students who has been bullied reports that this was based on their physical appearance, 8.2% of students report that this was based on their race, nationality or colour,²⁸ and 3.6% report that this was based on their religion.²⁹

Overall, Europe has seen a decline in the prevalence of bullying in schools over time, with 25 countries and territories reporting a significant decrease. However, eight countries and territories in the region have seen an increase in the prevalence of bullying.

²⁸ HBSC data on race, nationality, and colour as drivers of bullying collected in only six countries in Europe.
²⁹ HBSC data on religion as a driver of bullying were collected in only five countries in Europe.

Figure 24. Status of school violence and bullying in Europe



Source: Secondary analysis calculations based on HBSC data.

North America

The overall prevalence of bullying reported in North America is 31.7%, which is close to the global median of 32%. There is little difference between the sexes in the prevalence of bullying victimization, at 30.5% for boys and 32.8% for girls. However, North America is one of only two regions – sub-Saharan Africa is the other – where girls report a higher prevalence of bullying than boys. In contrast, reported prevalence of bullying others shows that this behaviour is more prevalent among boys (30.1%) than among girls (23.8%).


In North America, girls are more likely to experience cyberbullying, with 13.6% reporting cyberbullying via messages, compared with 6.7% of boys, and 9.7% reporting cyberbullying via pictures, compared with 6.3% of boys.

Available data on different forms of bullying, for Canada only, show that psychological bullying is the most frequent type, with 36.5% of students who had been bullied reporting

being called names, 28.4% reporting being left out and 29.4% reporting that lies or rumours had been spread about them. Sexual bullying was the second most frequent type of bullying, with 19% of students who had been bullied reporting this, and physical bullying the third most frequent, with 13.4% of students who had been bullied reporting this. This is different to most other regions, except for Europe, where physical bullying and sexual bullying are the top two most common types of bullying. Some of the differences in prevalence of different forms of bullying between HBSC and GSHS regions may be because of the difference in age groups and recall periods. One in three students in North America who has been bullied reports that this was based on their physical appearance.

In terms of trends, based on the HBSC data, the prevalence of bullying has remained stable in Canada, while the USA has seen a decline in bullying over time.

Figure 25. Status of school violence and bullying in North America



Source: Secondary analysis calculations based on HBSC data.

*Data available for Canada only.

Latin America and the Caribbean

Central America

Globally, the Central America sub-region has the lowest prevalence of bullying, at 22.8% (range 19%-31.6%), and there is little difference in bullying prevalence between the sexes. This is consistent with PISA data collected in 2015 in Costa Rica and Mexico.

Sexual bullying is the most frequent type of bullying for both boys (15.3%) and girls (10.8%). Physical bullying is the second most frequent type of bullying for boys (13.3%) and psychological bullying is the second most frequent type of bullying for girls (8.2%). Girls are far less likely to report physical bullying (4.5%) than boys.

Overall, students in Central America report a higher prevalence of psychological bullying than the global median of 5.5%. Data from the Third Regional Comparative and Explanatory Study (TERCE), conducted in 2013 in four countries in the sub-region, show that students report more psychological bullying than physical bullying. This may reflect differences in questions asked about bullying in the TERCE and the GSHS.

Physical appearance is reported to be the main driver for bullying by both boys (14.2%) and girls (24.2%), although the proportion of girls reporting this is far higher. Boys (11.2%) are more likely than girls (8.4%) to report that bullying is related to race, nationality or colour, while girls (4.8%) are more likely than boys (2.2%) to report that bullying is related to religion.

The prevalence of physical violence in schools in Central America is low relative to other regions. The overall prevalence of physical fights, at 25.6% (range 22.1%-36%), is the second lowest of all regions – only Asia has a lower prevalence – and Central America also has the lowest proportion of students reporting being involved in a physical fight four or more times in the past year (4.9%). There is, however, a significant difference in prevalence between the sexes. Boys (33.9%) are twice as likely to report involvement in a physical fight as girls (16.9%).

The overall prevalence of physical attacks in schools in Central America, at 20.5%, is the lowest of any region. The difference between the sexes is less significant than for physical fights, with boys reporting only a slightly higher prevalence of physical attacks (21.7%) than girls (18%).

South America

The prevalence of bullying in South America, at 30.2% (range 15.1%-47.4%), is slightly lower than the global median of 32%. The prevalence of bullying is similar in boys (31.7%) and girls (29.3%). Data collected through PISA in 2015 in five countries in the sub-region reveal a lower prevalence of bullying, ranging from 16.9% in Uruguay to 22.1% in Colombia.

Physical bullying is the most frequent type of bullying reported by boys who have been bullied (13.6%), followed

by sexual bullying (10.8%), and psychological bullying (5.6%). The picture is different for girls. Sexual bullying (9.4%) and psychological bullying (9.4%) are the most frequent types of bullying reported by girls who have been bullied, followed by physical bullying (5.4%). Students in South America report a higher prevalence of psychological bullying than the global median of 5.5%. TERCE 2013 data from eight countries in the sub-region show that students report more psychological bullying than physical bullying and, as in Central America, this may reflect difference in questions asked.

The most frequent driver of bullying is physical appearance. Differences between the sexes are not significant, with 14% of boys and 15.8% of girls reporting that they were bullied because of their physical appearance. Boys (8.4%) are more likely than girls (5.6%) to report that bullying is related to race, nationality or colour. Only 3.7% of boys and 3.9% of girls report that it is related to their religion.

The overall prevalence of physical fights, at 31.3% (range 20.2%-39.4%), is below the global median of 36%, but this masks significant differences between the sexes. The prevalence of being involved in a physical fight is 45.3% among boys compared with 20.8% among girls.

The overall prevalence of physical attacks, at 25.6%, is below the global median of 31.4%, and is the second lowest prevalence of any region. Again, however, there are significant differences between the sexes, with boys reporting a higher prevalence of physical attacks (34.1%) than girls (21.5%).

In terms of trends, out of three countries in South America for which the trends data were available, only Uruguay has shown a significant decline in bullying, physical fights and physical attacks.

Caribbean

Globally, the Caribbean has the second lowest prevalence of bullying, at 25% (range 13.3%-29.9%) of any region; only Central America has a lower prevalence. The prevalence of bullying in the Caribbean is similar in boys (25%) and in girls (24.8%).

Physical bullying is the most frequent type of bullying reported by boys who have been bullied (23.9%), followed by sexual bullying (9.8%) and psychological bullying (4.5%). The picture is different for girls. Sexual bullying is the most frequent type of bullying reported by girls who have been bullied (11.3%), followed by physical bullying (7.3%) and psychological bullying (4.6%).


Girls (25.7%) are far more likely than boys (12.9%) to report that bullying is related to their physical appearance. There was not a significant difference between boys and girls reporting that bullying was related to race, nationality or colour (11.7% versus 9.7%) or to religion (6% versus 3.2%).

In contrast to bullying, the prevalence of physical violence is high in the Caribbean, especially among boys. The overall prevalence of physical fights, at 38.3% (range 25.9%-47.5%), and

of physical attacks, at 33.8% is higher than the global median (36% and 31.4%, respectively). There are significant differences between the sexes, with boys reporting a higher prevalence of physical fights (46.4%) than girls (28.6%) and a higher prevalence of physical attacks (41.9%) than girls (27.2%).

Out of three countries in the Caribbean for which trends data were available, Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago, have seen a significant decline in bullying, physical fights and physical attacks. Anguilla has seen a significant decline in physical fights.

Figure 26. Status of school violence and bullying in Latin America and the Caribbean



Source: Secondary analysis calculations based on HBSC data.

Middle East and North Africa

Middle East

Globally, the Middle East region has the third highest prevalence of bullying overall, at 41.1% (range 17.5%-59.5%), and the third highest prevalence of bullying both among boys, at 45.4%, and among girls, at 33.4%.

A similar proportion of boys who have been bullied report physical bullying (18.8%) and sexual bullying (18%) as the most frequent type. The same pattern is seen for girls, with 10.1% reporting that physical bullying and 10.8% reporting that sexual bullying were the most frequent forms. The Middle East has the highest proportion of boys reporting sexual bullying as the most frequent form of bullying of any region. Psychological bullying was the third most common form of bullying reported, by 3.7% of boys and 5.5% of girls who had been bullied.

In contrast to other regions, race, nationality or colour is the most frequent driver of bullying reported by male students. Boys are more likely than girls to report that bullying is related to race, nationality or colour (12.3% versus 8.2%). Physical appearance comes second for boys (8.4%) while it is a slightly more important driver for girls (9%). Religion is mentioned by a smaller number of both boys and girls (6.1% versus 3%).

The prevalence of physical violence among boys, especially of physical fights, is high in the Middle East. The overall prevalence of physical fights, at 42.8% (range 37.1%-50.6%) is higher than the global median of 36%, and the Middle East has the second highest prevalence of being in a physical fight of any region – only North Africa reports a higher prevalence. The Middle East also has the second highest proportion of students reporting being involved in a physical fight four or more times in the past year (12.8%). The overall prevalence of physical attacks, at 31%, is similar to the global median of 31.4%. There are significant differences between the sexes, however, with boys reporting a higher prevalence of physical fights (56%) than girls (29.9%), and a higher prevalence of physical attacks (38.4%) than girls (23.6%).

In most countries in the Middle East the prevalence of bullying has been stable, except for the United Arab Emirates, where it increased and for Israel and Lebanon, where it declined. Lebanon has also seen a decline in physical fights and physical attacks. Yemen has seen a decline in physical fights and physical attacks. Oman and the United Arab Emirates have seen a decline in physical attacks.

North Africa

Globally, the North African region has the second highest prevalence of bullying, at 42.7% (range 30.6%-70%), and the second highest prevalence of bullying both among boys, at 46%, and among girls, at 39%.


Physical bullying is the most frequent type of bullying reported by boys (23.4%), and sexual bullying the second most frequent (13.6%). Sexual bullying is the most frequent type of bullying reported by girls (17.9%), and physical bullying the second most frequent (10.8%). Psychological bullying is the third most common type of bullying reported by both boys and girls, with little difference between the sexes (5.4% versus 6.3%).

Race, nationality or colour is the most common driver of bullying for both boys (12.3%) and girls (11.8%) who have been bullied. Girls are slightly more likely than boys to report that bullying is related to physical appearance (6.7% versus 5.5%) or religion (6.3% versus 5.4%).

The prevalence of physical violence among boys, especially of physical fights, is very high in North Africa. The overall prevalence of physical fights, at 46.3% (range 39.7%-57.8%), is higher than the global median of 36%, and North Africa has the highest prevalence of being in a physical fight of any region. North Africa also has the highest proportion of students reporting being involved in a physical fight four or more times in the past year (13.3%). There are significant differences between the sexes, with boys reporting a much higher prevalence of physical fights (61.7%) than girls (26.8%).

The overall prevalence of physical attacks, at 38%, is also higher than the global median of 31.4%, and North Africa has the second highest prevalence of physical attacks on students of any region. Again, there are significant differences between the sexes, with boys reporting a higher prevalence of physical attacks (49.4%) than girls (24.4%).

Figure 27. Status of school violence and bullying in Middle East and North Africa



Source: Secondary analysis calculations based on HBSC data.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Globally, sub-Saharan Africa is the region reporting the highest prevalence of bullying, at 48.2% (range 26.9%-67.2%), and the highest prevalence of bullying in both boys (47.7%) and girls (50.5%). Sub-Saharan Africa also has the highest proportion of students reporting being bullied on six or more days in the previous month (11.3%). It is one of the only two regions – North America is the other – where girls report a higher prevalence of bullying than boys.

Sub-Saharan Africa has the second highest proportion of students reporting physical bullying of any region. Physical bullying is the most frequent type of bullying reported by all students who have been bullied (22.9%) and by both boys (25.4%) and girls (18.7%). Sexual bullying is the second most common type of bullying reported by boys (10%) and girls (9.1%). Psychological bullying is the third most common type of bullying reported by boys (5.2%) and girls (6.5%). The difference between the sexes in the prevalence of these types of bullying is not significant.

Overall, race, nationality or colour (14.3%) and physical appearance (13.5%) are more frequently reported as drivers of bullying than religion (8.8%). Girls (17.5%) are more likely than boys (11.7%) to report that bullying is related to their physical appearance, while boys (16%) are more likely than girls (10.8%) to report that bullying is related to their race, nationality or colour. There is not a significant difference between the sexes in bullying related to religion (9.3% in boys and 8.7% in girls).

The prevalence of physical fights in the region is 36.9% (range 19.4%-59.5%) and the prevalence of physical attacks is 36.4%. The prevalence of physical fights is similar to the global median of 36%, but the prevalence of physical attacks is higher than the global median of 31.4%. Boys in sub-Saharan Africa report a higher prevalence of physical fights (44.6%) than girls (31.9%). There is not a significant difference between the sexes in the prevalence of physical attacks (36.6% in boys and 35.8% in girls).


No country in sub-Saharan Africa has seen a decline in all three forms of violence (bullying, physical fights and physical attacks). Eswatini has seen a decline in bullying and physical

fights, Namibia has seen a decline in physical fights, and Benin has seen a decline in physical attacks.

Available data suggest that school-related sexual violence is a problem in some countries in the region. In Nigeria, 26.6% of boys said that their first experience of sexual violence was perpetrated by a classmate or schoolmate, compared to 13% of girls. The same trend was observed in Uganda, where 23.7% of boys and 13.5% of girls reported the same; and in Malawi, 19.2% of boys and 15.5% of girls (VACS). The prevalence of the first instance of forced sex perpetrated by teachers against female students in countries in Central Africa ranges from 0% to 7.1%. It is much lower in Western Africa, ranging from 0.3% to 1.9%, and in East and Southern Africa, ranging from 0% to 1.5% (DHS).

The prevalence of physical violence perpetrated by teachers also appears to be high in sub-Saharan Africa, although there is significant variation between countries. A study conducted in five countries including three countries in sub-Saharan Africa – Malawi, Nigeria and the United Republic of Tanzania – identified teachers, particularly male teachers, as among the perpetrators of physical violence experienced by children (VACS). In the Good Schools Study in Uganda, more than 75% of 9-16 year olds reported physical violence from a teacher in the past year, the most common form of violence reported by children in the study (Devries et al., 2018). However, DHS data collected between 2005 and 2017, which are for females only, show lower reported prevalence of physical violence perpetrated by teachers. Overall, among women aged over 15 years who had experienced physical violence, 6.2% in West and Central Africa and 5.1% in East and Southern Africa reported that the perpetrator was a teacher, but in West and Central Africa, prevalence ranged from 0.1% to as high as 17.9%, and in East and Southern Africa from 1.1% to as high as 19.3% (DHS). As per a recent report on corporal punishment, more than 90% of students in four countries of sub-Saharan Africa (Botswana, Cameroon, the United Republic of Tanzania and Uganda) reported experiencing corporal punishment.

Figure 28. Status of school violence and bullying in Sub-Saharan Africa



Source: Secondary analysis calculations based on HBSC data.

3. What are the characteristics of effective national responses to school violence and bullying?

As the data in Chapter 2 show, some countries made considerable progress in reducing school violence and bullying, while others have been able to maintain low levels of school violence and bullying over time.

This chapter looks at the key factors that contribute to effective national responses to school violence and bullying, based on eight case studies of countries where the prevalence of school bullying or physical violence, or both, has decreased; or where it has been low for a long period of time (Figure 29).

The selection of countries was based mostly on analysis of trend data collected through the GSHS or the HBSC. The case study countries represent a significant sample of countries where there has been a decrease in the prevalence of school violence and bullying according to these data: seven out of 35.³⁰ These countries were also selected to represent different regions, levels of socio-economic development and education systems. Country case studies were commissioned by UNESCO to collect qualitative data from selected key informants who were presented with the quantitative data on the prevalence of school violence and bullying in their respective countries, and asked to explain why this prevalence had decreased or remained low.

This report therefore analyses the effectiveness of responses to school violence and bullying from a country perspective using trend data from nationally representative samples that show impact on a national scale, measured by a decrease in the overall prevalence of school bullying and/or physical violence. The report identifies and compares factors that make national responses effective in different country contexts. This approach is original for various reasons: in the past, the analysis of successful responses to school violence and bullying was mostly based on data from evaluations of relatively small-scale interventions in selected countries; or successful national responses were described for individual countries only, e.g. Finland or Sweden, without elements of comparison with other countries, particularly in other regions.

Three additional case studies were commissioned to document the experience of countries where quantitative data do not show yet the impact of national responses in terms of reduction of the prevalence of school violence and bullying, but where innovative strategies have been put in place in key areas such as the routine monitoring of school violence and bullying by the education sector, the systematic reporting of incidents of school violence at national level, or the scaling-up of successful interventions currently implemented in a limited number of schools.³¹

In addition to success factors, this chapter presents factors that may have limited the effectiveness of national responses to school violence and bullying, which key informants were asked to identify in all 11 case study countries.


This chapter also assesses whether success factors are consistent with existing conceptual frameworks developed by the UN and partners to improve understanding of school violence and bullying, and of effective responses, including the guiding principles or key elements of a comprehensive response to school violence.

Finally, the chapter looks at school violence and bullying within the broader context of violence in society, and analyses whether there may be a relationship between the prevalence of violence in schools and the prevalence of violence in society in the eight case study countries where school violence has been low or has been reduced.

30 Eswatini, Italy, Jamaica, Lebanon, the Netherlands, Sweden and Uruguay. Only data for the Republic of Korea are data from a national survey.

31 UNESCO commissioned 13 case studies in total; it was not possible to complete case studies for Fiji and Trinidad and Tobago. In some countries, it was difficult to identify key informants able to provide a long-term perspective on the national response to school violence and bullying, including actions taken prior to or during the period for which trend data were available, or to provide an explanation for why prevalence had decreased or remained low.

Figure 29. Trends in school violence and bullying in eight case study countries³²



Data sources: GSHS and HBSC.

32 Except for the Republic of Korea, trend data were collected through the GSHS or HBSC. Both surveys use nationally-representative samples although, in some case study countries, key informants questioned whether the sample was representative of all schools, e.g. private schools, faith-based schools, schools for refugees. Trend data from the GSHS and HBSC were confirmed by data from other surveys and studies in a number of case study countries.

3.1 Success factors

The list of success factors presented in this section is based on comparative analysis of responses of key informants in all eight case study countries that have been able to reduce school violence or maintain low levels of school violence and bullying over time, on what factors have contributed to success – both within and beyond the education sector –, and which ones have had the greatest impact. Only success factors that have been identified in all eight countries or most countries are described here, assuming that factors that have proved effective in all those very diverse contexts may be also effective in other countries.

Strong political leadership and a robust legal and policy framework to address violence against children including school violence

Political leadership and commitment to preventing and responding to school violence and bullying is critical, both overall and in the education sector. For example, in Jamaica, the Prime Minister, who previously served as the Minister for Education, has provided strong leadership for proposed amendments to the Education Act to ban corporal punishment in schools and for promotion of the use of positive discipline. A related factor to this is recognition of the need to address school violence and bullying in order to ensure universal access to quality education. In Uruguay, efforts to tackle school violence have been part of wider reforms in the education sector to improve access to education, while, in Lebanon, the Policy for the Protection of Students in the School Environment (2017) reflects government commitment to SDG 4.

A supportive legal and policy framework is essential, to convey a clear message that violence and bullying are unacceptable and to provide the foundation for planning, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation of the national response. All eight case study countries have laws that address violence against children in general and education sector policies that include school violence and bullying. Sweden was the first country in the world to legally prohibit all forms of violence against children and its 2010 Education Act obliges schools to implement measures to prevent and respond to it. Similarly, in the Netherlands, the Anti-Bullying Law ensures that action to prevent bullying is on the school agenda.

Another factor that is common to many of the case study countries is an emphasis within national policies on a positive school and classroom environment, including the use of positive discipline. This is an approach that goes beyond the prevention of school violence and bullying alone, and aims to ensure that all elements that make life in school a positive experience for learners and school staff are in place.

Commitments to tackling school violence and bullying also need to be matched by allocation of resources. In Uruguay, for example, efforts to tackle school violence as part of broader reforms in the education sector have been supported by increased investment in education.

Collaboration between the education sector and a wide range of partners

Data from all eight countries show that an effective response to school violence and bullying has largely been driven and led by the education sector. However, national policies and strategies that take a multi-sector approach are found in many of the case study countries. In Eswatini, for example, there is a national multi-sector strategy to address violence against children, that builds on multi-sector efforts to address gender-based violence (GBV) as well as on data generated by the VACS in 2007, which highlighted the scale of violence against children in the country.

In some countries, specific policies and strategies to address school violence and bullying set out the roles of other sectors or reflect engagement with non-education sectors. Sweden has a comprehensive multi-sector approach and, in Lebanon, the Ministry of Education and Higher Education has worked closely with other ministries, including justice and social affairs, in policy development. In Jamaica, the Ministry of Education highlighted the importance of its collaboration with the Office of the Children's Advocate and the Jamaica Police Force in investigation of cases of school violence and bullying and in mentoring and mediation.

Countries also identified education sector collaboration with a range of non-government partners at national level as an important success factor. Partnerships with civil society organizations, academic institutions, professional associations and the media – and, in some countries, with UN and donor agencies – have strengthened advocacy, research and evidence, policy and planning, programme implementation, and monitoring and evaluation. In Italy, Lebanon, the Netherlands, the Republic of Korea and Sweden, academic institutions have played a key role in improving the availability of data and in evaluating interventions. In Eswatini, Italy, Republic of Korea and Sweden, NGOs have been central to developing supporting materials for teachers and providing care and support for students affected by school violence and bullying.

Implementing school-based programmes and interventions that are based on evidence of effectiveness

The two countries that have succeeded in both reducing and maintaining a low prevalence of school violence and

bullying – the Netherlands and Sweden – are also the two countries that have taken a clear evidence-based approach, drawing on systematic evaluation of the effectiveness of existing programmes and interventions. The Netherlands, for example, conducted a meta-analysis of the effectiveness of school-based anti-bullying programmes in 2015 to assess their impact on the prevalence of bullying and on improving the classroom environment. The meta-analysis reviewed 86 programmes and identified ten that were based on scientific evidence.

Italy, which has achieved a significant decrease in the prevalence of bullying, has also invested significantly in research and evaluation, including an analysis of a wide range of anti-bullying interventions and programmes and an evaluation of the efficacy of interventions. The evaluation showed that the two main school-based programmes, No Trap!, beginning in 2008, and KiVA beginning in 2013, which had previously been implemented in other countries, were effective in achieving sustained reductions in school violence and bullying in Italian schools.

Availability of data on school violence and bullying and systematic monitoring of responses

Routine data collection to monitor the prevalence of school violence and bullying and to monitor implementation of programmes to address it is a critical factor. In the Republic of Korea, a national survey of students' perceptions and experiences of school violence and bullying has been conducted twice a year since 2012. The Netherlands has a tool for schools to use to monitor bullying.

Sweden has a national system to monitor school safety and the implementation of preventive measures, with a strong focus on accountability through making reports available to schools and online. Jamaica has established an independent National Education Inspectorate to evaluate the performance and accountability of the education sector; one of the evaluation domains is the quality of provisions to support students' safety, health and well-being. The Republic of Korea has developed assessment tools and indices to regularly monitor and evaluate the response at the school level.

Training for teachers on school violence and bullying and positive classroom management

Training teachers to implement measures set out in national policies and plans on school violence and bullying is a factor common to all eight countries. Training has emphasised the importance of increasing teachers' understanding of school violence and bullying and ensuring that they have the skills required to prevent, identify and respond to incidents.

In a number of countries, such as Eswatini, Jamaica, Lebanon and Uruguay, there has also been a strong emphasis on improving teachers' skills in classroom management, including creating a positive classroom culture and using positive discipline. In Eswatini, teacher training has moved towards supporting teachers to use positive discipline and to create a classroom culture where children participate in setting the rules. In Uruguay, training in use of positive discipline and conflict mediation includes inviting teachers to reflect on their own practices, including classroom management, and encouraging them to take an approach that focuses on the rights of children.

Focus on a safe and positive school and classroom environment

The school environment encompasses both the physical environment, including safety and security, and the psychological environment, including the school climate, classroom management and discipline, and the relationship between teachers and students and between students. A common feature across case study countries is a policy commitment, reflected in implementation at the school level, to promoting a safe and positive school and classroom environment. For example, policies in Jamaica, the Republic of Korea, Sweden and Uruguay refer to promoting a safe learning environment and a positive school climate or culture, and policies in Eswatini, Jamaica, Lebanon and Uruguay refer specifically to promoting use of positive discipline.

In Jamaica, the School Wide Positive Behavioural Intervention and Support framework supports schools to introduce positive behaviours, such as respectfulness, safety and responsibility. In Uruguay, the Living Together in Schools programme, which aims to strengthen social integration, coexistence and sense of belonging in schools, has a broad objective of improving the school climate. In Italy, successful school-based interventions associated with a decrease in bullying include improved playground supervision, disciplinary methods, classroom rules and classroom management, and support for teachers.

In most countries, the main emphasis is on the psychological environment. However, Jamaica and the Republic of Korea also have a strong focus on strengthening school safety and security. In Jamaica, the 2015 revision of the Security and Safety Policy Guidelines included modifications to support schools on security, discipline, interventions and risk management: schools have also been encouraged to develop security and safety action plans. In the Republic of Korea, new schools are required to prevent and address violence using Criminal Prevention Through Environmental Design and all schools are required to introduce CCTV. Both Jamaica and the Republic of Korea also work closely with the police, and the latter has school police officers.

Commitment to child rights and empowerment, and student participation

Another factor common to all countries with an effective national response is a strong commitment to child rights, listening to children, and the empowerment and meaningful participation of students in initiatives to tackle school violence and bullying.

Italy, Sweden and Uruguay have an explicit policy focus on child rights. For example, interventions in Sweden focus on ensuring that children are aware of their rights, including the right to be safe and to feel secure. In Uruguay, the Living Together in Schools programme is based on the human rights and empowerment of children and the participation of students.

Eswatini, Italy, Sweden and Uruguay emphasize the importance of the empowerment and participation of children and young people. In Eswatini, the NGO Swaziland Action Group against Abuse (SWAGAA) has given high priority in its work in schools to informing and empowering children and young people to speak out against violence and abuse. In Sweden, experience has shown that the most successful interventions promote inclusive student participation in identifying and addressing problems, and take a 'children as experts' approach.

More specifically, involvement of all students, including bystanders, and use of peer approaches have been a critical success factor in countries that have made significant progress. In Italy, school-based interventions such as NoTrap! and KiVA include peer approaches that involve all children and young people in a school, including bystanders. One of the core principles of KiVA is to motivate bystanders to stand up for the victim, and to work with all students, not just victims and bullies, to ensure that they view school violence and bullying as unacceptable behaviour. NoTrap! is a peer-led peer education model that addresses bullying and cyberbullying and works with all students in a school.

Sweden also gives high priority to participation and empowerment of bystanders. In the Republic of Korea, student participation in the prevention of and response to school violence and bullying is promoted through peer counselling, peer conciliation and mediation, and 'student courts'. In Uruguay, meetings involving students from secondary, technical and vocational education are organised every year at local, regional and national levels, and these aim to foster the active participation of students in education, and to facilitate social integration, co-existence, and a sense of belonging.

Systematic approaches to involving all stakeholders in the school community

The country case studies also illustrated the importance of participation of all stakeholders in the school community, including head teachers, teachers, other school staff, parents and students, local authorities and professionals in other sectors, to enable successful implementation of programmes at the school level, especially in those that have taken a whole-school approach.

Sweden takes a holistic, systematic approach to involving students, teachers, other school staff, parents and the wider school community. Uruguay's approach involves 'participation councils' held several times a year, which bring together students, parents, teachers and other school staff elected by the school community. These councils are involved in discussions about their school or learning institution including activities to improve living together. In Lebanon, the Ministry of Education and Higher Education explicitly promotes partnerships between schools and parents.

Support and referral for students affected by school violence and bullying

Mechanisms to provide support in schools and referral to other services including health care, social protection, and law enforcement were also identified as essential components of an effective response for children and adolescents affected by school violence and bullying. Approaches to support and referral vary across case study countries, although some common themes emerged, including providing access to trained counsellors, offering care and support, and promoting mediation and conciliation, with peer approaches used for counselling and mediation in some countries.

Lebanon, for example, has recruited specialist school counsellors, Eswatini has provided counselling training for teachers, and Jamaica has trained guidance counsellors to support students in and out of school. Jamaica also provides mediation support. In the Republic of Korea, the We + Education + Emotional project offers diagnosis, treatment and counselling to victims and perpetrators of school violence and bullying; to support the project, the number of professional counsellors and teachers who have been trained in counselling has increased. The response to school violence and bullying also includes peer conciliation and mediation.

In Uruguay, inter-disciplinary support teams play a central role in addressing incidents of school violence. Schools can call upon these teams, comprised of social workers, social educators and psychologists, when incidents of violence occur to provide support to those involved in the incident. In Eswatini, support and access to justice are provided by SWAGGA through its work in schools.

3.2 Constraining factors

Implementing programmes and interventions at scale

In some case study countries, programmes and interventions only cover a proportion of schools; in others, only a limited number of teachers have been trained. The experience of Uganda, below, which is in the process of trying to scale up interventions that have been shown to make a difference, highlights some key issues and challenges.

Reporting of incidents of school violence and bullying

There are gaps in many case study countries in systems for reporting incidents of school violence and bullying. The example of Peru, below, illustrates one approach to addressing this, and also shows that the introduction of a systematic approach to reporting can result in an apparent increase in prevalence as the true scale of the problem is captured.

Box 6. Uganda: Challenges to scale up

The Government of Uganda has put in place policies to protect children against violence. In 2006, corporal punishment was banned in schools and, in 2015, the National Strategic Plan on the Elimination of Violence Against Children was launched. The Ministry of Education has developed a school-based programme, *Journeys through Uganda*, which focuses on GBV. Other partners and NGOs are also implementing programmes to prevent and respond to school violence and bullying although many of these are only being implemented in a small number of schools. One of these, The Good School Toolkit by Raising Voices, has been evaluated and shown to be one of the most effective.

The Ministry of Education and Raising Voices agree that scale-up will require using evidence-based approaches to address school violence and bullying in all schools. This implies shifting mind-sets of those teaching at and attending teacher training colleges, and of all teachers, to increase their understanding of the responsibility they have in addressing school violence and their capacity to implement programmes to prevent school violence, including the use of positive discipline. However, there are a number of challenges to implementing programmes at scale. These include:

- Providing strong national leadership to ensure that the many different partners in Uganda take a harmonized and evidence-based approach to preventing and addressing school violence and bullying; consistency is a challenge as different implementing organizations, funders and other stakeholders have varying positions on expected strategies or outcomes. There is a need to reconcile different approaches, for example, between the whole-school, holistic approach advocated by Raising Voices, and less comprehensive approaches taken by some other partners.
- Implementing a multi-sector approach at district level that brings key stakeholders together to take responsibility for the problem, and ensuring that districts and schools own and drive the process.
- Securing adequate financial resources to build the capacity of students, teachers, schools and communities.
- Integrating work on school violence and bullying with wider child protection initiatives and structures, in order to support children to gain confidence to speak out if they are victims of violence.
- Strengthening collaboration between all ministries responsible for child protection, as well as coordination between government, donors and NGOs.
- Strengthening and coordinating reporting, routine monitoring of school violence and bullying and evaluation of programmes.

Box 7. Peru: Improving reporting of and responding to school violence

The Ministry of Education in Peru launched the Specialised System against School Violence (SiseVE³³) in 2013. SiseVE is a specialised platform that aims to 'register, attend to and monitor cases of violence in schools'. SiseVE involves all levels of the education system – national, regional and local education management and school management. Schools register with SiseVE and cases of violence in the school setting can then be reported, by victims, witnesses or others. The system allows follow-up actions to be recorded as well as registration of cases and it also provides guidance on strategies to prevent and monitor school violence and bullying. The person in a school who is responsible for SiseVE must record the actions taken in each case, and the regional and local education authorities can monitor each school registry to ensure that this happens. To protect the identity of the victims, data are confidential and only accessible to specific staff in the Ministry of Education.

In 2013, when SiseVE was launched, only 907 cases of school violence and bullying were reported. The number has since increased steadily each year, reaching 5,591 cases in 2017. This reflects both the improvement in the system and, in parallel, government implementation of large-scale social media communications campaigns to increase awareness of school violence. Evaluation of one of these campaigns, "Díle alto al bullying" (Say stop to bullying), found that it had helped to reduce the acceptability of bullying. Peru's experience shows that the combination of an effective system to report cases of school violence, together with effective communication campaigns to raise awareness, can dramatically increase reporting.

33 In Spanish, "Sí se ve" means "Yes, you can see it".

Providing support and referral services

In many of the case study countries, prevention has been the main focus of school violence and bullying policies and programmes. Relatively few countries have taken a systematic approach to the establishment of support and referral mechanisms. In the Netherlands, for example, the need for better coordination between education and social care was highlighted.

Monitoring of school violence and bullying

Not all case study countries have routine systems in place to monitor school violence and bullying or the prevalence of different forms of violence; in many of these countries, data are only collected through international surveys such as the GSHS and HBSC. In Côte D'Ivoire, see below, the Ministry of National Education, Technical Education and Vocational Training has taken steps to improve collection of data on school violence and bullying through the national Education Management Information System (EMIS).

Box 8. Côte d'Ivoire: Integrating school violence and bullying indicators in the Education Management Information System

Following the publication of a national study showing high rates of violence in schools in Côte d'Ivoire, the Ministry of National Education, Technical Education and Vocational Training (MENET-FP) decided to integrate school violence and bullying indicators into the Education Management Information System (EMIS). Steps included: identification of key indicators by the education sector and UN partners; training those responsible for collecting, reporting and analysing data at all levels; developing a framework to harmonise data across different departments within the MENET-FP (e.g. strategy, planning, statistics); and establishing a working group involving all relevant ministries (e.g. education, health, child protection, social security, justice) to coordinate child protection activities in schools and promote reporting of violence in schools.

Key indicators collect data on physical, psychological and sexual violence perpetuated by peers and by teachers. Indicators include: proportion of pupils (primary, secondary) who are victims of physical violence by other pupils; proportion of pupils (primary, secondary) who are victims of psychological violence by other pupils; proportion of pupils (primary, secondary) who are victims of sexual violence by other pupils; and the same again for all three forms of violence but where the perpetrator is a teacher. Results will be disseminated via the "Pocket School Statistics" for the school year, showing the number of students who are victims of violence at primary and secondary school level, by age, form of violence, and perpetrator. It is expected that this information will raise awareness of the problem and will be used to inform national, local and school level action to address school violence and bullying.

Côte d'Ivoire is the first country in West and Central Africa to collect data on school violence through the routine annual school census, and it has provided an example for other countries in the region to follow. Experience in Côte D'Ivoire highlights the importance of national commitment and ownership, strong leadership from the education ministry, support from partners for successful integration of school violence indicators in the EMIS, and the need for capacity building at all levels to ensure that the EMIS provides reliable statistics.

Evaluating the effectiveness of programmes and interventions

Relatively few of the case study countries systematically evaluate the effectiveness of school violence and bullying programmes and interventions or the factors that contribute to reducing the prevalence of school violence and bullying.

Reaching children and young people who are at increased risk of school violence and bullying

There is limited data in case study countries on the prevalence of violence and bullying among students who may be more vulnerable. However, available evidence suggests that, even in countries with a decreasing or low prevalence of school violence and bullying overall, some sub-groups of students report a higher prevalence of victimization. These include students perceived to be gender non-conforming, including LGBT students, students with disabilities, and migrant and refugee students. In Uruguay, for example, a study in Montevideo in 2015 showed that 31.3% of children with disabilities reported being victims of bullying while the overall prevalence of bullying was 20.9%. Also in Uruguay, a survey among LGBT students in 2016 revealed that this group is much more vulnerable to bullying than other students. The Netherlands' case study noted that more research is needed on the effectiveness of anti-bullying programmes for children with additional support needs. In Lebanon, the crisis in Syrian Arab Republic has resulted in a large influx of refugees, increasing the number of refugee children in public schools. Lebanon has put in place a dual system in public schools, with some Syrian refugee children attending school in the morning together with other children who are not refugees, and others attending school in the afternoon in lessons that are only for Syrian students. There is currently no data on the respective impact of these two different approaches on the prevalence of school violence and bullying experienced by refugee students. In the Republic of Korea, informants noted that little research has been conducted among students from multi-cultural or refugee backgrounds who are perceived to be more vulnerable.

Preventing and responding to new types of bullying

Relatively few case study countries provide data on cyberbullying or strategies to address it. Only two countries, Italy and Lebanon, report teacher training on online safety and prevention and reporting of cyberbullying.

Sustaining interventions to prevent and respond to school violence and bullying

Some case study countries noted that keeping school violence and bullying on the agenda is a challenge in contexts where there is an increasing emphasis on school results and academic achievements, resulting in a focus on cognitive skills at the expense of socio-emotional skills. This is despite clear evidence to show that strengthening students' social and emotional skills can help to reduce bullying and violence and their negative impact on learning outcomes. Related to this, the extent to which school violence and bullying is integrated into pre-service teacher training and school curricula in order to ensure sustainability, also varies across case study countries.

3.3 Consistency between country success factors and global conceptual frameworks

During the last few years, the UN and partners have developed conceptual frameworks to improve understanding of school violence and bullying, and of effective responses, including what should be the guiding principles or key elements of a comprehensive response to school violence, based on existing evidence. These elements are described, for example, in the Global Guidance on School-Related Gender-Based Violence (UNESCO and UN Women, 2016), the Global Status Report on School Violence and Bullying (UNESCO, 2017), the global report on education sector responses to violence based on sexual orientation and gender identity or expression (UNESCO, 2016), or in reports published by the Office of the United Nations Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Violence Against Children (UNGA, 2016 & 2018).

A comparison of the success factors identified through the case studies commissioned for this report and of existing conceptual frameworks, reveals that success factors are broadly consistent with most key elements of an effective response already described in the frameworks that are available (Figure 30). However, the evidence from case studies also shows that some countries have managed to reduce school violence and bullying without having in place all of the elements of what has been described as a “comprehensive” response; and that each country has a slightly different combination of success factors/key elements of an effective response, depending on the socio-cultural context which influences the education sector.

Figure 30: Conceptual framework for an effective national response to school violence and bullying



Source: Adapted from UNESCO & UN Women, 2016 (Page 36).

For example, in Eswatini, success is attributed to a combination of national dialogue and commitment, based on research and data, a multi-sectoral approach that builds on earlier work on gender-based violence, a strong partnership with civil society, training for teachers, and school-based interventions to empower students and provide care and support. In Italy, success reflects robust legislation and policies, considerable investment in research and evaluation, evidence-based programming, and a focus on strengthening peer relationships and the active participation of all students.

In the Republic of Korea, progress has been achieved through multi-sector plans focused on prevention of school violence and bullying that include interventions to create safe learning environments, change the culture of schools, and respond to and refer cases of school violence and bullying, working with both the victims and the perpetrators.

Key elements in maintaining a low prevalence of school violence and bullying in Sweden have included a multi-sector strategy that has encompassed a shift from an individual approach to a more holistic, structural approach where the whole school community is responsible for addressing the problem. Sweden has a robust legal framework and a strong focus on child rights, has taken a systematic and evidence-based approach, and has a transparent national system to monitor school safety. Research has been used to identify approaches that reduce school bullying and violence, including creating a positive and inclusive classroom environment, promoting positive interaction between peers, treating children as experts, and targeting the role of bystanders in preventing bullying.

In Uruguay, the decrease in school violence and bullying is attributed to a focus on promoting a positive school climate and positive discipline, related training and support for teachers, and promotion of the participation and empowerment of students within a framework that promotes human rights in general and children's rights in particular. The fact that the Living Together in Schools programme has been implemented in all schools has also been critical. In addition, other programmes are thought to have contributed to the decrease, including programmes designed to improve the quality of education overall, including the school climate and learning outcomes, particularly in schools in disadvantaged communities. These programmes have strengthened the links between the community, families and schools and increased the ratio of teachers to pupils in primary schools.


3.4 Relationship between the prevalence of violence in society and in schools

A common assumption is that violence in schools would reflect violence in the community, as schools are not isolated from the rest of society. Based on that assumption, one could also think that it may be easier to prevent and address school violence and bullying in societies where levels of violence in society are low.

This section considers whether or not there might be a relationship between the prevalence of violence in schools and the prevalence of violence in society. In order to compare violence in schools and violence in society for the eight case study countries where school violence has been low over time or has been reduced, the section draws on the one hand on GSHS and HBSC data on the prevalence of bullying in schools, and on the other hand on two measures: the Global Burden of Disease data for homicide rates and the Global Peace Index (GPI) country ranking.

The homicide rate is one of the core indicators used to measure violence in society. Among the eight case study countries, those with the lowest prevalence of school bullying are also those with the lowest homicide rates (Italy, Lebanon, the Netherlands, Sweden and Uruguay), while those with a higher prevalence of school bullying also have a higher homicide rate (Eswatini and Jamaica) (Figure 31).

Figure 31. Victims of intentional homicide in the case study countries, 2016 (per 100,000 population)



* Data of 2010.

Data source: UNODC Statistics Online (<https://dataunodc.un.org/crime/intentional-homicide-victims>). Retrieved 15 January 2019

The GPI is a composite of 23 indicators.³⁴ Based on the most recent report, which presents the GPI ranking for 163 countries and includes 2018 findings, the eight case study countries are ranked as follows: Sweden (14), the Netherlands (23), Uruguay (37) and Italy (38) are the most peaceful; the Republic of Korea (49) and Eswatini (72) are ranked as less peaceful, and Jamaica (90) and Lebanon (147) are ranked as the least peaceful.

However, the value of the GPI in analyzing the relationship between “peace” in a country and levels of school violence should be considered in light of the indicators it uses. For example, some of the indicators negatively affect the ranking of countries like Lebanon and the Republic of Korea because of the context in their respective regions, although this does not have a direct impact on schools. For these two countries, the homicide rate is a more useful indicator, and shows that both countries have very low levels of violence in society. Taking this into consideration, the best ranked countries in the GPI - i.e., most peaceful - are also those countries that have managed to keep low levels of bullying in their schools.

Both measures therefore suggest that countries with lower levels of violence overall are also likely to have lower levels of school violence and bullying. This has informed the approach taken in Jamaica, where there has been considerable emphasis on reducing violence in wider society, and national and community anti-violence initiatives may have made an important contribution to reducing the prevalence of violence and bullying in schools.

³⁴ Number and duration of internal conflicts; Number of deaths from external organised conflicts; Number of deaths from internal organised conflicts; Number, duration, and role in external conflicts; Intensity of organized internal conflicts; Relations with neighbouring countries; Level of perceived criminality in society; Number of refugees and displaced persons as percentage of population; Political instability; Impact of terrorism; Political terror; Number of homicides per 100,000 people; Level of violent crime; Likelihood of violent demonstrations; Number of jailed persons per 100,000 people; Number of internal security officers and police per 100,000 people; Military expenditure as a percentage of gross domestic product (GDP); Number of armed-services personnel per 100,000; Volume of transfers of major conventional weapons as recipient (imports) per 100,000 people; Volume of transfers of major conventional weapons as supplier (exports) per 100,000 people; Financial contribution to UN peacekeeping missions; Nuclear and heavy weapons capability; Ease of access to small arms and light weapons.

4. Conclusions and recommendations

4.1 Conclusions

Countries that have succeeded in reducing school violence and bullying, or maintaining a low prevalence, have a number of factors in common. Key factors include:

- Strong political leadership, a robust legal and policy framework, and consistent policies on violence against children, school violence and bullying and related issues.
- Collaboration between the education sector and a wide range of partners at national level, including non-education sector ministries, research institutions and civil society organizations.
- Commitment to promoting a safe and positive school climate and classroom environment, including the use of positive discipline.
- Programmes and interventions that are based on research and evidence of effectiveness and impact on school violence and bullying.
- Strong commitment to child rights, empowerment and participation of children.
- Involvement and participation of all stakeholders in the school community.
- Training and ongoing support for teachers.
- Mechanisms to provide support and referral to other services for students affected by school violence and bullying.
- Effective systems for reporting and monitoring school violence and bullying.

The evidence from the eight case study countries about factors that contribute to success is consistent with global evidence and with global conceptual frameworks that have tried to identify the key elements of an effective and comprehensive response to school violence and bullying. The case study countries appear to share many of these elements, although it is important to note that case study countries have achieved considerable success without having every one of these elements in place, and each has a slightly different combination of factors. In addition, in the absence of rigorous evidence, it is difficult to attribute reduction in prevalence

or low prevalence of school violence and bullying to specific factors or combinations of factors.

Country case studies also highlight the importance of the context. Differences in administrative structures, the education system and types of schools will affect the extent to which factors that appear to contribute to success in one context may be feasible or effective in another. For example, the administrative structure of a country and of the education sector will influence the level at which decisions are made about issues such as curricula, training and resource allocation, and implementation of prevention and response interventions, reporting, monitoring and evaluation. Socio-cultural differences between countries will also have implications for the acceptability of interventions. For example, the introduction of CCTV and the presence of police officers are socially acceptable in the Republic of Korea, but this may not be the case in other countries. Finally, other data suggest that there may be a relationship between the prevalence of violence in wider society and the prevalence of violence in schools in some contexts, and national responses may also need to take this into account.

4.2 Recommendations

The findings of this report on the status of school violence and bullying, and the evidence from case study countries about factors that contribute to success in reducing the prevalence of school violence and bullying, reinforce the recommendations of the 2016 and 2018 Reports of the UN Secretary-General to the UN General Assembly on Protecting Children from Bullying. In line with these recommendations, there is a need to:

- ensure that legislation is in place to safeguard the rights of children and to underpin policies to prevent and respond to school violence and bullying;
- improve the availability of accurate, reliable and disaggregated data and implement evidence-based initiatives that are informed by sound research;
- train and support teachers to prevent and respond to school violence and bullying;

- promote whole-school approaches that engage the wider community, including students, teachers, other school staff, parents and local authorities;
- provide information and support to children to enable them to speak up and seek support;
- promote the meaningful participation of children in efforts to prevent and respond to school violence and bullying;
- give priority to children who are especially vulnerable, as a result of race, ethnicity, disability, gender or sexual orientation;
- establish child-sensitive reporting, complaint and counselling mechanisms and restorative approaches.

These recommendations are also reflected in the Safe to Learn Campaign's Call to Action that is being launched in tandem with this report, and which highlights the need to implement policy and legislation, strengthen prevention and response at the school level, shift social norms and change behaviour, generate and use evidence, and invest resources effectively. The Safe to Learn Campaign, which has the goal of ending all violence in schools by 2024, is an initiative of the members of the Global Partnership to End Violence Against Children. It aims to bring together existing efforts to end violence in schools and build a movement of governments, partners and communities committed to ensuring that all children are safe to learn, wherever they may live.



Annex 1.

References

- Arace, A., Scarzello, D. and Occelli, C. 2013. Pratiche educative genitoriali e orientamento alla punizione: un confronto tra italiani e immigrati. *Maltrattamento e abuso all'infanzia*, 15(1), pp. 37-57.
- Baldry, A. 2003. Bullying in schools and exposure to domestic violence. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 27(7), pp. 713-732.
- Bardi, M. and Borgoginni-Tarli, S. 2001. A survey on parent-child conflict resolution: Intrafamily violence in Italy. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 25(6), pp. 839-853.
- Bernacchi, E., Fabris, A. and Zelano, M. (2016). Multi-country study on the drivers of violence affecting children. Italian Report. Firenze, Italy: Istituto degli Innocenti.
- Bianchi D. and Moretti, E. (a cura di). 2006. *Vite in bilico: indagine retrospettiva su maltrattamenti e abusi in età infantile*. Firenze : Istituto degli Innocenti.
- Blake, J., Lund, E., Zhou, Q., Kwok, O. and Benz, M. 2012. National prevalence rates of bully victimization among students with disabilities in the United States. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 27(4), p. 210.
- Blake, J., Zhou, Q., Kwok, O. and Benz, M. 2016. Predictors of bullying behavior, victimization, and bully-victim risk among high school students with disabilities. *Remedial and Special Education*, 37(5), pp. 285-295.
- Caso, L., Vitale, F. and Boni, M. 2011. La violenza assistita intrafamiliare: uno studio qualitativo sui fattori di rischio e di protezione nei minori vittime. *Maltrattamento e a Buso All'infanzia*, 13(1) pp. 87-109.
- Devries, K., Kyegombe, N., Zuurmond, M. et al. 2014. Violence against primary school children with disabilities in Uganda: A cross-sectional study. *BMC Public Health*, 14, pp.1017.
- Devries, K., Knight, L., Petzold, M. et al. 2018. Who perpetrates violence against children? A systematic analysis of age-specific and sex-specific data. *BMJ Paediatric Open*, 2(1).
- Farmer, T., Petrin, R., Brooks, D. et al. 2012. Bullying involvement and the school adjustment of rural students with and without disabilities. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 20(1), pp. 19-37.
- Finkelhor, D., Ormrod, R. K., et al. 2005. Measuring poly-victimization using the JVQ. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 29(11), 1297-1312.
- Fry, D., Lannen, P., Vanderminden, J., et al. 2017. *Child Protection and Disability: Methodological and practical challenges for research*. Protecting Children and Young People series. Edinburgh: Dunedin Press.
- Fulu, E., Warner, X., Miedemer, S. et al. 2013. *Why do some men use violence against women and how can we prevent it? Quantitative findings from the United Nations Multi-country Study on Men and Violence in Asia and the Pacific*. Bangkok: UNDP, UNFPA, UN Women and UNV.
- Gershoff, E. 2017. *School corporal punishment in global perspective: prevalence, outcomes, and efforts at intervention*. *Psychology, Health & Medicine*, 22(Sup1), pp. 224-239.
- Global Coalition to protect Education from Attack. 2018. *Education under attack 2018*.
- Hillier, L., Jones, T., Monagle, M. et al. 2010. *The third national study on the sexual health and wellbeing of same sex attracted and gender questioning young people*. [pdf] Melbourne, Australia: Australian Research Centre in Sex, Health and Society, La Trobe University.
- Jones, S., Bombieri, L., Livingstone A. and Manstead, A. 2011. The influence of norms and social identities on children's responses to bullying. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82(2), pp. 241-256.
- Know Violence in Childhood. 2017. *Ending Violence in Childhood. Global Report 2017*. New Delhi, India: Know Violence in Childhood.
- Kann, L., Olsen, E., McManus, T., Harris, W. et al. 2016. *Sexual identity, sex of sexual contacts and health-related behaviors among students in Grades 9-12 - United States and Selected Sites, 2015. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*. (CDC) Surveillance Summaries.
- Kids Online Brazil. 2016. *ICT kids online Brazil 2015: Survey on internet use by children in Brazil*.
- Krug E., Dahlberg L., Mercy J., et al. 2002. *World Report on Violence and Health*. Geneva: WHO.

- Kuper, H., Banks, M., Kelly, S., Kyegombe, N., and Devries, K. 2016. *Protect Us! Inclusion of children with disabilities in child protection*. Woking: Plan International.
- Le, M., Holton, S., Nguyen, H. et al. 2016. Poly-victimisation and health risk behaviours, symptoms of mental health problems and suicidal thoughts and plans among adolescents in Vietnam. *International Journal of Mental Health Systems*, 10, 66.
- Livingstone, S., Haddon, L., Görzig, A., and Ólafsson, K. 2011. *Risks and safety on the internet: the perspective of European children: full findings and policy implications from the EU Kids Online survey of 9-16 year olds and their parents in 25 countries*. London: LSE, EU Kids Online.
- Mascheroni, G. and Cuman, A. 2014. Net children go mobile: Final report. *Deliverables D6.4 & D5.2*. Milano: Educatt.
- Maternowska, M., Potts, A. and Fry, D. 2016. *The multi-country study on the drivers of violence affecting children*. Florence, Italy: UNICEF Office of Research-Innocenti.
- Ncube, N. 2013. The family system as a socio-ecological determinant of bullying among urban high school adolescents in Gweru, Zimbabwe: Implications for intervention. *Asian Social Science*, 91(7).
- Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict. 2017. *Attacks on Schools and Hospitals* New York: United Nations.
- Pereznieto, P., Harper, C., Clench, B. and Coarasa, J. 2010. *The Economic Impact of School Violence: A Report for Plan International*. London: ODI/Plan International.
- Portela, M. and Pells, K. 2015. *Corporal Punishment in Schools: Longitudinal Evidence from Ethiopia, India, Peru and Viet Nam*. Florence, Italy: UNICEF Office of Research.
- Sharp, C., Aldridge, J. and Medina, J. 2004. *Delinquent youth groups and offending behaviour: findings from the 2004 Offending, Crime and Justice Survey*. Home Office Online Report 14/06.
- Sullivan, P. M. 2009. *Violence exposure among children with disabilities*. *Clinical Child & Family Psychology Review*, 12, 196-216.
- UNESCO. 2014. *Bullying targeting secondary school students who are or are perceived to be transgender or same-sex attracted: Types, prevalence, impact, motivation and preventive measures in 5 provinces of Thailand*. Bangkok: Mahidol University, Plan International Thailand, UNESCO Bangkok.
- UNESCO. 2016. *Out in the Open: Education sector responses to violence based on sexual orientation and gender identity/ expression*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO. 2017. *School violence and bullying: Global Status Report*. Paris: UNESCO
- UNESCO and UN Women. 2016. *Global guidance on addressing school-related gender based violence*. Paris: UNESCO, New York: UN Women.
- United Nations General Assembly (UNGA). 2018. *Report of the Secretary-General on protecting children from bullying*, A/73/265 30 July 2018).
- United Nations General Assembly (UNGA). 2016. *Protecting children from bullying: Report of the Secretary-General*, A/71/263 26 July 2016).
- United Nations International Children's Fund (UNICEF). 2017. *A Familiar Face: Violence in the Lives of Children and Adolescents*. New York: United Nations Children's Fund.
- United Nations Security Council (UNSC). 2017. *Children and Armed Conflict: Report of the Secretary-General* A/72/361-S/2017/821).
- United Nations (UN) Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Violence Against Children. 2016. *Protecting Children Affected by Armed Violence in the Community*. New York: UN.
- Valdebenito, S., Ttofi, M., Eisner, M. and Gaffney, H. 2017. Weapon carrying in and out of school among pure bullies, pure victims and bully-victims: A systematic review and meta-analysis of cross-sectional and longitudinal studies. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, 33, pp. 62–77
- World Health Organization (WHO). 2015. *Preventing youth violence: an overview of the evidence*. World Health Organization.

Annex 2.

Prevalence of students who reported being bullied, by sex, age and most common types and drivers of bullying, by country or territory*

Country/territory/ geographical area ^[1]	Median prevalence of students who were bullied										
	Total ^[2]	Male ^[2]	Female ^[2]	4th graders (9-10) ^[3]		11-year- olds ^[2]	13-year- olds ^[2]	8th graders (13-14) ^[3]	14-year- olds ^[2]	15-year-olds	
				PIRLS	TIMSS					GSHS/ HBSC	PISA ^[4]
Afghanistan	44.2	42.3	44.9	43.9	...	43.3	45.4	...
Albania	19.9	22.6	17.3	23.8	20	16.1	...
Algeria	51.7	48.1	55.1	53.1	...	50.4	51.6	...
Anguilla	26.1	22.2	30.2	25.1	...	32.9	20.1	...
Antigua and Barbuda	24.9	23.5	26.7	27.9	...	23	23.8	...
Argentina	24.5	24.8	24.2	26.1	...	25.3	22.4	...
Armenia	8.8	11.1	6.7	10.7	8.5	6.5	...
Australia	53	55	43	...	24.2	24.2
Austria	35.6	39.1	32.5	37	...	37.2	42.2	28.6	19.1
Azerbaijan	28
Bahamas	23.6	24.7	22	24.7	...	24.9	17.6	...
Bahrain	29.4	35.6	22.8	64	66	...	31.8	51	29.3	27	...
Bangladesh	23.6	27.1	17.3	19.6	...	24.7	26	...
Barbados	13.3	15.4	11	18.1	...	13.2	10.5	...
Belgium (Flemish)	20.1	20.2	20.1	48	53	24.7	22.1	15	...
Belgium (French)	46.7	53.7	39.8	58	...	51.6	48.2	40.2	...
Belize	30.7	30.3	31.1	29.8	...	31.3	31	...
Benin	49	47.4	51.5	52.4	...	46.5	49.5	...
Bhutan	30.1	31.2	28.9	33	...	31	27.4	...
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	30.2	31.7	28.2	28.2	...	30.2	31.5	...
Botswana	52.1	52.6	51.8	48.3	74	51	53.8	...
Brazil	17.5
British Virgin Islands	17.2	18.3	16.5	15.4	...	18.1	17.9	...
Brunei Darussalam	23.4	25.3	21.7	29.6	...	21.7	20.3	...
Bulgaria	34.2	35.5	32.8	44	46	38.2	35.1	29.6	...
Cambodia	22.4	22.5	22.2	20.8	...	22.2	23.5	...
Canada	35.4	32.6	38.2	50	47	38.7	38.5	35	...	30.6	20.3
Chile	15.1	15.8	13.9	36	40	...	15.5	22	18.1	11.6	18
China - Beijing	20.2	23	17.4	18.1	...	22.8	18.7	...
China - Hangzhou	31.8	30.7	32.9	31.5	...	31	33.3	...
China - Hong Kong	40	46	44	32.3
China - Macao	57	27.3
China - Taipei	38	42	14	10.7
China - Wuhan	33.2	34.2	31.6	33	...	34.5	30.8	...
China - Urumqi	31.9	32.5	31.2	35.7	...	33	24.3	...
Colombia - Bogota	34.2	36.4	32.4	33	...	35.5	34	...
Colombia - Bucaramanga	31.6	32.2	31	30.9	...	31.8	32.2	...
Colombia - Cali City	29	28.5	29.3	26.7	...	32.3	27.9	...
Colombia - Manizales	32.6	35.4	30.5	34.1	...	35.9	28.1	...
Colombia - Valledupar	31.4	28.2	33.5	31.5	...	30.8	31.8	...

Types of bullying ^{[2], [5]}										Drivers of bullying ^{[2], [6]}								
Physical			Psychological / social exclusion			Sexual			Physical appearance			Race, nationality or colour			Religion			
Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	
19.1	21.9	13.7	13.1	12.9	14.6	23	24.6	22.6	6.8	6.4	7.9	14.3	15.2	12.3	12.9	11.4	14.7	
...	
15.9	24.7	9.2	1.4	0.8	1.9	18.2	18.7	17.9	7.2	7.9	6.7	9.3	12.3	7	2.9	3.3	2.6	
15.1	...	8.5	5.9	...	5.7	12.6	...	9.3	19	...	25.1	14.6	...	12.4	1.9	...	3.1	
14.5	24.7	5.4	1.4	1.6	1.3	10.9	13.2	9.1	22.2	11.1	31.4	15.5	14.8	16.1	4.9	7.4	2.6	
9.6	12.5	7.1	6.1	5.4	6.9	14.3	17.8	11.5	25.5	17.9	32.1	7.6	10.1	5	3.1	3.2	2.9	
...	
...	
...	
...	
10.6	...	5.9	7.1	...	7.9	12.4	...	10.1	24.4	...	31.5	8.4	...	7.4	5.2	...	4.1	
15.4	18.9	10.1	4.2	3	6.1	15.5	19	10.3	18.2	14.2	24.4	10.5	12.1	8.2	2	2.7	0.8	
...	
16.6	2.1	13.1	21.7	9.1	3.4	
...	
...	
15	21.2	8.4	5.5	4.9	6.2	6.9	8.4	5.4	21.5	18.9	24.2	10.8	11.8	9.8	4.1	3.4	4.8	
11.8	14.3	7.6	1.5	1.5	1.5	16.5	14.8	20.1	10.2	11.4	8.4	22.3	20.2	24.6	14.8	15.8	13.6	
18	24.4	12.2	4.1	3.8	4.4	8.7	6.4	10.9	21.8	16.1	26.9	8.9	10.3	7.3	3.6	3	4.2	
12.7	18.9	6.1	7	4.2	9.7	11.1	13.2	9.4	15.5	13.2	18	9.4	10.6	7.1	6.9	7.2	6.9	
23.4	27.6	19.9	6.2	6.3	6.1	8.3	9.5	7	17.4	11.9	22.3	11.5	13	10.3	8.8	9	8.7	
...	
9.2	9	9.3	4	7.1	1.3	9.6	7.5	11	25.7	20.9	29.7	12.2	9.9	14.2	2.3	3	1.7	
8.2	12.1	4	6.1	4.8	7.5	7.7	7.5	8	23.1	22.7	23.5	9.4	11.6	7	1.9	1.2	2.7	
...	
9.6	...	6.9	12.2	...	14.9	16.1	...	16.6	20.6	...	24.9	25.8	...	19.9	4.7	...	6.1	
13.4	28.4	19.0	N/A	N/A	
8.6	6.8	18.4	32.2	7.8	4.8	
22.1	29.4	12.6	5.7	4.6	7.1	7.2	8.6	5.5	17.1	11.6	24.2	2.8	2.1	3.7	0.3	0.5	0	
15.8	19.5	12.1	9	6.1	11.5	8.9	9.3	8.5	15.1	14.4	15.8	2.9	2	3.8	1.2	1.1	1.4	
...	
...	
...	
13.1	17.8	7.6	7.3	7.4	6.6	16.2	19.7	11.8	15	9.3	22.9	2.5	0.4	4.3	0.2	0.4	0	
22.2	31.5	11.4	6.3	5.9	6.8	10.2	7.8	12.6	13.9	9.3	19.2	4.4	4.5	4.4	2	1.8	2.3	
7	9.9	4.7	9.2	9.2	9.4	11	12.4	9.9	15.8	19.5	12.7	4.3	4.9	2.8	1.1	1.4	0.9	
7.4	9	5.3	11.1	10.2	12.1	9.5	10.7	8.5	18.6	22.2	15.4	7	6.2	7.8	3.5	3.7	3.4	
6.7	10.4	3.9	9.4	4.2	13.3	11.8	10.3	12.9	13.2	14	12.6	6.4	7.9	5.3	3	4.1	2.1	
9.2	14.3	4.5	8.3	6.3	10.3	8.1	8.4	7.5	19	26.1	12.5	4	4.3	3.8	0.3	0.4	0.3	
7	9.6	5.5	10.4	6.8	12.7	9	10	8.5	22.3	22.2	21.8	5.7	5.8	5.6	2.4	3.9	1.5	

Country/territory/ geographical area ^[1]	Median prevalence of students who were bullied										
	Total ^[2]	Male ^[2]	Female ^[2]	4th graders (9-10) ^[3]		11-year- olds ^[2]	13-year- olds ^[2]	8th graders (13-14) ^[3]	14-year- olds ^[2]	15-year-olds	
				PIRLS	TIMSS					GSHS/ HBSC	PISA ^[4]
Cook Islands	30.9	29.4	31.8	47.7	...	31.9	22.5	...
Costa Rica	19	18.4	19.6	17.9	...	19	20	20.8
Croatia	17.1	17.6	16.6	...	27	16.3	20.4	14.5	17.1
Cyprus	45	18.1
Czech Republic	17.8	18.7	17	38	40	18.6	19.4	15.5	25.4
Denmark	20.2	20	20.3	33	42	26.9	19.7	14.2	20.1
Djibouti	40.9	44.3	35.8	39.4	...	36.4	44.5	...
Dominica	27.4	28.7	26	27.7	...	34.1	21.4	...
Dominican Republic	24.3	26.3	22.3	26.1	...	21.2	26	30.1
Ecuador - Guayaquil	28.5	31.8	25.3	28.8	...	28.1	28.8	...
Ecuador - Quito	27.5	29.3	25.9	22.2	...	28	34.1	...
Egypt	70	70.1	69.7	27	71.4	45	68.9	69	...
El Salvador	22.6	20.9	24.3	25.2	...	21.6	21.5	...
Estonia	38	39	36.9	48.3	38.2	26.8	20.2
Eswatini	32.1	33.1	31.2	29.6	...	34.6	31.1	...
Fiji	29.9	33.1	25.7	24.5	...	32.6	28.5	...
Finland	27.5	30.7	24.4	25	29	32.6	28.6	21.1	16.9
France	28.8	29.5	28	34	35	29.7	30.3	25.7	17.9
French Polynesia	25.1	26.2	24.1	23.9	...	26.4	25.2	...
Georgia	26	27	18
Germany	23.3	22.9	23.6	43	43	25.2	25.9	19.2	15.7
Ghana	62.4	61.3	63.9	60.6	...	61.5	64.7	...
Greece	18.3	19	17.6	15.1	23.1	16.5	16.7
Greenland	33.3	34.3	32.5	36	37.5	26.1	...
Grenada	27.2	28.6	26.1	27.7	...	27.8	25.9	...
Guatemala	22.8	26	19.6	23.1	...	20.7	24.8	...
Guyana	38.4	40.2	36.6	39.7	...	41.7	34	...
Honduras	31.6	31.5	31.6	33.1	...	32	29	...
Hungary	30.8	30.8	30.8	40	42	38	32.2	27	...	19.9	20.3
Iceland	16.6	17.8	15.3	23	18.7	8	11.9
Indonesia	21.3	23.7	19	...	57	...	22.5	...	20.6	20.5	...
Iran, Islamic Rep of	34	51	40
Iraq	27.7	32.4	21.9	31.6	...	22.8	28.7	...
Ireland	27.6	26	28.6	26	27	27.7	29.1	25	...	26.1	14.7
Israel	23.7	32.5	15.9	28.8	25.8	15.7	...
Italy	15.6	17.4	13.8	45	50	22.7	15.3	27	...	8.5	...
Jamaica	25.5	26.3	24.8	19.2	...	27.5	26.5	...
Japan	32	20	...	21.9	21.9
Jordan	41.1	45.6	37.1	37.5	36	42	41.2	...
Kazakhstan	23	25	14
Kenya	57.1	56.6	57.4	60.1	...	56.6	55.7	...
Kiribati	36.8	42.1	32.2	37.6	...	36.1	36.8	...
Korea, Republic of	24	16	11.9
Kuwait	31.7	35.8	27.7	...	53	...	32.6	40	32.9	30	...
Lao PDR	13.2	15.2	11.3	19.3	...	16.4	10.6	...
Latvia	49.7	49.1	50.2	54	...	52.5	54.4	41.3	30.6
Lebanon	17.5	23.9	11.7	19.1	48	15.6	18	...
Libya	35.3	40	30.5	35.5	...	32.3	38.5	...
Lithuania	54	54.3	53.6	40	44	57.4	54.5	28	...	49.4	16.4
Luxembourg	30.1	28.6	31.4	38.1	29.5	24	15.7
Macedonia (the former Yugoslav Republic of)	23	26.7	19.3	22.6	26.4	20.3	...

Types of bullying ^{[2], [5]}										Drivers of bullying ^{[2], [6]}								
Physical			Psychological / social exclusion			Sexual			Physical appearance			Race, nationality or colour			Religion			
Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	
14	24.1	7.4	3.9	3.9	4	16.8	8.8	20.7	16	9.3	20.8	10.1	17.3	5.4	3.3	5.3	1.9	
8.1	12.4	3.6	7.3	5	9.5	15.2	20.1	10.8	26.5	21.6	31.1	5.5	7.5	3.8	1.6	1.8	1.5	
...	
...	
...	
...	
...	
28.4	34.7	17.5	2.6	3.1	1.7	11	9.9	13	14.2	11.5	19.1	11.4	12.1	9.3	12.1	8.9	18	
21.6	31.5	10.6	3.5	4.8	2.1	12.7	9.9	15.7	19	14	24.5	8.6	11.6	5.4	3.6	3.8	3.3	
14.7	20.2	6.1	5.2	3.2	7.7	14.7	9	21.5	18.1	11.6	26.2	11	14.2	6.5	4	2.9	5.3	
13	20.5	4.5	6.6	4.9	8.4	8.2	9.5	7.2	13.7	11.8	15.8	12.4	15	8.8	3.7	3.2	4.4	
10.8	17	3.7	8.9	9.1	8.6	11.9	12.1	11.7	7.8	6.3	9.6	7.4	9	5.5	3	0.6	5.7	
26.5	34.8	18.2	4.6	4	5.3	17.1	11.6	22.5	2.5	2.3	2.7	18.2	17.2	19	6.5	6.5	6.3	
7.4	10.8	4.4	8.1	8.1	8.2	13	15.3	11.1	19	14.2	23.7	12.6	17.4	7.7	4.7	2.2	6.9	
...	
23.4	26	21.9	4	2	5.5	4.2	4.8	3.8	19.5	22.3	17.1	10.8	11.1	10.4	3.5	2.2	4.4	
19.7	23.6	15.6	5.1	4.5	5.2	9.5	9.4	9.8	12.9	11.6	13.4	15.4	16.6	14.6	5.8	7.7	2.7	
...	
...	
8.4	11.2	5.5	7.4	7.3	7.5	21.4	15.2	27.9	21.4	17	25.9	8.1	12.6	3.5	2.2	2.5	1.8	
...	
...	
32.4	33.3	31.2	5	5	5	6.7	5.6	7.8	10.1	9.3	11.1	19.1	18.4	19.5	9.5	10.4	8.7	
4.6	12.9	16.0	4.5	3.1	
...	
12.3	23	3.9	5.3	2.2	7.8	12.2	12.8	11.3	21.4	10.7	29.9	9.9	10.1	9.8	3.2	5.8	1.2	
16.4	20.1	11.4	7.5	9.4	5.1	12.6	12	13.4	17.2	10.4	26.2	13.7	11.2	16.9	1.7	2.1	1.3	
15.1	22.9	7.3	6.9	7.2	6.5	7	7.4	6.7	12.6	6.1	19.2	11.4	11.4	11.1	9.7	9.5	10.1	
8.6	13.3	4.5	10.2	9.2	11.3	14.1	18.5	10.2	16.6	8.7	22.8	8.8	9.5	8.4	5.4	5.4	5	
...	
4.7	13.9	2.5	3.3	1.9	
11.7	16.2	6.6	5.8	5.5	6.1	21.5	24.3	18.3	19.9	15.7	24.8	6.7	6.7	6.8	2.7	4.1	1.2	
...	
32.3	37.2	...	3.2	1.1	...	13.2	13.7	...	6.6	6.4	...	13.4	11.7	...	6.4	7.6	...	
...	
12.2	11.2	11.6	13.6	10.2	
...	
10.1	17.3	3.5	4.4	4.1	4.6	11.6	9.7	13.4	20.9	13.7	27.4	13.6	18	9.6	6.1	9.1	3.5	
...	
11.4	14	8.7	4.1	4.3	3.6	9.4	9.2	9.7	10.3	12.2	8.4	11	13.7	8.2	5.6	5.9	4.7	
...	
27.4	33.1	22.5	10.5	10.4	10.6	10.8	11.4	10.3	12.8	10.9	14.4	12.4	12.3	12.2	11.9	9.4	14	
27	31.6	22.4	1.8	2	1.6	30.1	23.7	36.5	9.6	7.2	12	7	9.6	4.4	15.7	16.7	14.6	
...	
17.6	20.1	14.6	2.8	2.1	3.3	9.5	12.5	5.7	22.7	23.2	21.9	13.3	16.9	8.1	6.5	9.8	2.1	
36.3	3.5	5.9	14.1	9.3	1.9	
...	
24.8	30.9	12.6	4.2	3.7	5.1	17.8	18	17.3	7.7	6.1	10.7	10.1	12.3	5.7	4.4	4.3	4.6	
...	
...	
8.1	12.6	6.4	7.2	3.6	
...	

Country/territory/ geographical area ^[1]	Median prevalence of students who were bullied										
	Total ^[2]	Male ^[2]	Female ^[2]	4th graders (9-10) ^[3]		11-year- olds ^[2]	13-year- olds ^[2]	8th graders (13-14) ^[3]	14-year- olds ^[2]	15-year-olds	
				PIRLS	TIMSS					GSHS/ HBSC	PISA ^[4]
Malawi	44.9	42.9	46.5	50.6	...	41.6	44.4	...
Malaysia	20.9	24	17.8	24.1	52	21.9	16.7	...
Maldives	30.1	30.4	29.5	25.3	...	32.2	29	...
Malta	25.7	29.8	21.3	46	...	30.3	28.4	36	...	16.5	...
Mauritania	47.2	48	46.3	46	...	45.1	48.9	...
Mauritius	35.7	42.1	29.5	33.9	...	36	37.1	...
Mexico	20.2
Mongolia	30.5	35.9	25	30.8	...	31.8	28.7	...
Montenegro	16.4
Montserrat	28.1	31.8	24.8	27.9	...	27.8	29	...
Morocco	38.2	44	31.6	43	56	...	37.6	49	38.3	38.8	...
Mozambique	45	45	46.4	47.6	...	37.4	48.6	...
Myanmar	50.1	51.4	48.7	52.1	...	49.7	47.6	...
Namibia	46.6	47.9	45.4	44.9	...	47.6	46.9	...
Nauru	38.9	39.8	37.9	35.5	...	41	40.3	...
Nepal	50.6	56.2	45.4	51.6	...	49.7	50.6	...
Netherlands	22.3	22	22.7	42	41	26.3	23.3	17.3	9.3
New Zealand	60	60	45	26.1
Niue	35.5	38.2
Norway	21.4	22.5	20.3	26	30	24.3	20.9	25	...	17.9	17.7
Oman	42.3	45.4	39.3	52	58	...	45.1	56	43.2	40.2	...
Pakistan	41.1	45.1	35.3	37.1	...	43.6	40.7	...
Palestine State - Gaza	59.5	63	55.5	59.5	...	56.4	62.8	...
Palestine State - West Bank	52.9	54.5	51.5	52.5	...	50.9	56.4	...
Paraguay	16.7	19.2	14.6	17.2	...	16	17.1	...
Peru	47.4	46.7	48.2	45.1	...	48.4	47.7	18.4
Philippines	51.2	53.3	49.3	51.9	...	52.5	49.4	...
Poland	30.3	32.1	28.5	28	27	33.8	31.1	25.9	21.1
Portugal	39	42.6	35.8	40	43	40.9	41.1	34.2	11.8
Qatar	42.1	48.8	34.8	57	57	...	39.6	39	42.4	47.6	25
Republic of Moldova	34.7	34	35.4	33.9	38	32.1	...
Rodrigues	50	44.8	54.4	54.3	...	49.4	47.1	...
Romania	33.8	36.7	31.1	32.5	39	30.3	...
Russian Federation	42.5	45.1	40.5	48	49	50.6	42.3	34	...	35.2	27.5
Saint Kitts and Nevis	22.7	24.9	20.4	24.4	...	25.3	19.1	...
Saint Lucia	25.1	25.2	25.1	29.4	...	23.7	23.1	...
Saint Vincent & the Grenadines	29.9	30.7	29.4	34.3	...	27.5	25.3	...
Samoa	74	78.6	69.4	74.1	...	74.2	73.7	...
Saudi Arabia	47	53	36
Serbia	27
Seychelles	47.4	44.5	49.9	52	...	49.1	41.2	...
Singapore	50	53	42	25.1
Slovakia	26.7	28.5	24.8	43	43	29.2	27.3	23.4	22.5
Slovenia	22.1	25.5	18.8	44	42	23.8	25.5	28	...	16.8	16.4
Solomon Islands	66.5	64.1	67.7	64.8	...	65.9	67.9	...
South Africa	78	64
Spain	15.4	18.2	12.7	46	52	19.3	16.5	10.9	14
Sri Lanka	39.4	50.2	28.8	45.2	...	38.1	35.2	...
Suriname	26.3	26.4	26	...	24	...	30.8	...	26.3	23.4	...
Sweden	12.6	11.4	13.8	29	35	15.4	14.3	26	...	8.7	17.9

Types of bullying ^{[2], [5]}										Drivers of bullying ^{[2], [6]}								
Physical			Psychological / social exclusion			Sexual			Physical appearance			Race, nationality or colour			Religion			
Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	
16.4	15.9	15.5	10.9	9.1	12.3	7.4	12	3.1	14.4	13.3	16.1	17.1	17.6	16.6	15.9	17.4	15	
14.2	18.9	8	4.2	3.1	5.7	19.6	18.5	21.1	19.7	17.7	22.3	11.4	11.4	11.4	4	4.8	3	
6.3	9.2	3.9	4.7	4.5	5.1	11	14.3	8.4	18.2	15.1	21.7	10.3	11.1	9.3	3.7	4.1	2.4	
...	
23.1	23.4	23.1	8.5	10.7	6	10.7	7.3	14.2	3.6	4	3.3	20.7	22.9	18.5	19.4	17.9	20.2	
13.2	19.1	5.5	5.6	1.8	10.7	15.1	18.8	10.3	13.8	10.3	18	11	12.6	9	4.1	4.7	2.8	
...	
20.9	28.9	10.8	22	18.2	26.9	3.3	3.3	3.4	15.4	9	23.3	3.4	3.4	3.4	1.6	2	1.1	
...	
20.9	0	8.6	14.9	14.8	1.8	
16.4	20.6	10.8	5.5	4.3	7.2	21.7	24	19	7.4	5.5	9.8	11.8	11.4	11.8	3.9	5	2.1	
48.7	44.4	55.3	1.7	2.1	1.2	10	13.4	5.5	4.2	3.2	5.7	13.6	11.4	16.7	7.3	9.6	4.3	
16.2	25	8.2	11.9	7.3	16.4	2.6	3.2	1.7	24.1	17.9	30	18.3	21.5	15	5.8	6.6	4.9	
22.5	29.5	16.7	4.9	3.4	5.8	8.1	4.7	10.9	18.1	12.1	22.9	13.3	16.6	10.7	5.3	5	5.2	
29.5	29.3	27.9	3.8	5.9	1.7	11.2	14.7	8	16.8	18.3	15.7	9.1	12.8	5.7	7.2	6.8	7.8	
13.5	15.2	10.9	3.3	3.3	3.1	10.1	10.7	9.6	7.6	6.1	9.1	8.9	9.6	7.1	8.1	9.8	6.5	
...	
...	
...	
...	
11.9	15.1	8.2	2.2	2	2.5	35.2	36.3	33.9	10.4	11.9	9.1	7.5	11.9	2.7	2	2.7	1.3	
27	24.1	33.9	2.2	2.5	1.6	7.9	8.9	5.5	9.2	9.3	8.9	15.9	18.1	10.5	5.6	7	2	
11.9	16	7	5.3	4.9	5.9	25.2	27.9	22.1	7.7	8.4	6.9	9.2	8.8	10	4.6	6.1	3	
9.5	15	4.4	5.3	4.8	6	22.4	28.6	16.3	6.9	5	8.9	8.1	9.1	7	5.3	7.5	2.9	
10.3	10	12.9	17.7	9.3	4.7	
9.9	12.9	7.2	10.5	10.8	10.3	11.2	11.6	10.8	17.6	13	21.7	6.7	8.1	5.3	4.6	3.6	5.6	
16.5	18.2	14.9	5.4	3	7.8	24.1	26.1	22.2	13.4	10.3	16.6	21.2	23.5	18.7	3.3	4.6	1.9	
9.6	16.2	10.5	14.3	N/A	
...	
17.4	16.9	16.9	5.9	5.3	7.1	15.1	17.2	11.2	6	6.6	5.2	25.4	25.4	25.7	13.5	13.6	14.1	
...	
14.8	21.1	10.8	1.7	2.3	1.3	11.3	13	10.2	21.9	18.7	23.9	12.2	15.4	10.2	3	3.6	2.6	
18.3	20.4	9.2	9.1	6.7	
...	
21.9	30.6	12.3	4.3	5.6	3	12.2	11.5	12.4	15.6	12.1	19.9	12.8	14.7	10.9	5.7	6.1	5.4	
11.8	20.2	5.1	6.5	5.8	7.1	11.3	8.5	13.6	20	15.3	24.2	5.3	5.1	5.4	5.7	10	2.3	
20.7	28.2	13.8	5	5.5	4.6	8.2	8.7	7.8	15.9	10.1	21.1	8.5	9.2	7.9	4.3	7.8	1.1	
20.5	20.4	20.9	5.3	4.6	5.6	10.6	12.3	8.7	8.5	8.6	8.8	23.9	24.7	23.4	17.2	18.6	15.7	
...	
...	
12	19	7.4	2.7	3.6	2.1	8.1	10	6.9	15.5	10.5	18.8	13.6	18	10.7	3.3	3.1	3.5	
...	
...	
...	
23.8	28.6	17.2	5.9	6.6	5.5	8.8	9.2	8	8.9	6.7	11.4	19.9	19.6	21	7.3	9.4	5.4	
...	
11.2	21.8	21.4	N/A	N/A	
9.3	11.4	5.6	9.9	10	9.4	9.3	10.4	7.2	14.4	11.7	19.1	11.3	11	12	3.3	3.7	2.8	
4.3	8.8	0	0.9	0.9	0.9	6.1	9.5	3.4	18.4	14.4	21	6.9	7.9	6.3	1.4	1.2	1.7	
...	

Country/territory/ geographical area ^[1]	Median prevalence of students who were bullied										
	Total ^[2]	Male ^[2]	Female ^[2]	4th graders (9-10) ^[3]		11-year- olds ^[2]	13-year- olds ^[2]	8th graders (13-14) ^[3]	14-year- olds ^[2]	15-year-olds	
				PIRLS	TIMSS					GSHS/ HBSC	PISA ^[4]
Switzerland	33.2	33.8	32.6	39.7	33.9	26.6	16.8
Tajikistan	7.1	7.1	7.1	8.4	...	8.2	5.4	...
Tanzania (United Republic of)	26.9	25	28.1	28.5	...	25.7	26.5	...
Thailand	33.2	38.3	27.8	38.9	67	31.1	29	27.2
The former Yugoslav Rep. of Macedonia	10.1	10.1	10.2	9.9	...	10.5	9.9	...
Timor-Leste	31.3	38.5	24.7	34.6	...	31.8	29.4	...
Tokelau	40.5	38.6	38.9
Tonga	38.1	45.5	30.5	47	...	38.6	29.3	...
Trinidad and Tobago	15.4	17.9	13	63	12.7	...	17.1	16.1	...
Tunisia	30.6	37.4	24.4	30.8	...	30	31.1	28.2
Turkey	55.5	56.8	54.1	...	43	63.9	58.9	31	...	41.3	18.6
Tuvalu	26.9	40.1	15	27.2	...	28.8	24.1	...
Uganda	45.5	50	41.1	47.3	...	44.6	45.5	...
Ukraine	37.6	38.5	36.9	42.9	38.8	32	...
United Arab Emirates	27.1	32.5	21.8	56	57	...	29.5	42	30.2	22.3	27
United Kingdom	23.9
United Kingdom - England	32.4	30.8	34	48	46	33.6	33.9	38	...	29.4	...
United Kingdom - Scotland	33.8	30.3	37.2	38.6	36.8	25.5	...
United Kingdom - Northern Ireland	41	36
United Kingdom - Wales	36.4	33.6	39.1	36.9	40	32.4	...
United States of America	27.9	28.4	27.4	44	44	33.3	29.8	36	...	20.2	18.9
Uruguay	19.1	17.7	20.4	21.3	...	19.2	17.6	16.9
Vanuatu	67.3	68	66.5	68.1	...	67.4	66.1	...
Venezuela - Barinas	34.5	38.9	30.4	33.1	...	34.4	37.7	...
Venezuela - Lara	36.1	36.7	35.6	36.8	...	35.1	36.9	...
Viet Nam	26.1	26.1	26.2	28.5	24.5	...
Wallis and Futuna	30.8	30.2	30.9	32.1	...	27.1	33.5	...
Yemen	41.5	47.3	33.4	43.8	...	41.1	40	...
Zambia	65.1	62.5	67.1	63.7	...	66	65.3	...
Zimbabwe - Bulawayo	59.9	70.2	52.5	49.7	...	65.4	59.9	...
Zimbabwe - Harare	55.3	60.2	51.1	56.6	...	57.8	52.7	...
Zimbabwe - Manicaland	67.2	65.9	68.6	68.5	...	69.4	65.4	...

* This table compiles data collected from different surveys for which the years of data collection, sample profiles and methods of measurement vary. Therefore it is not recommended to compare the data across different sources.

- [1] The names of countries, territories and geographical areas used in this table are those used by the international surveys that are the data sources for the table. These designations do not imply the expression of any opinion on the part of UNESCO concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.
- [2] The prevalence was reported using weighted data from the most recent survey cycles of GSHS (2017) and HBSC (2013/2014), supplemented with data from earlier cycles for countries that did not provide data in the most recent survey cycles. The percentages represent median prevalence of students who reported being bullied on one or more days during the 30 days before the survey, in countries/territories that participated in the GSHS (i.e., all countries/territories except those in Europe and North America), or in the past few months prior to the survey, in countries/territories that participated in the HBSC (i.e., countries/territories in Europe and North America).
- [3] The percentage represents the prevalence of students who reported being bullied about monthly or weekly, PIRLS 2016 and TIMSS 2015.
- [4] Percentage of students who reported being bullied at least a few times a month, PISA 2015.
- [5] Percentage of students who responded that they were bullied by the selected type of bullying that occurred to them most often during the 30 days before the survey (for GSHS countries/territories), or percentage of students who responded that they were bullied by the selected type of bullying that occurred to them during the past couple of months (for HBSC countries/territories).
- [6] Percentage of students who responded that they were bullied most often as a result of a specific driver during the 30 days before the survey (for GSHS countries/territories), or percentage of students who responded that they were bullied most often as a result of a specific driver during the couple of months before the survey (for HBSC countries/territories).

Types of bullying ^{[2], [5]}									Drivers of bullying ^{[2], [6]}								
Physical			Psychological / social exclusion			Sexual			Physical appearance			Race, nationality or colour			Religion		
Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
...
51.2	53.1	49.1	2.9	1.8	4.4	9.6	7.9	12	3.1	2.9	1.9	17.8	18.5	17.4	6.2	9.3	2.7
23.2	23.9	21.8	9.5	9.4	9.9	6.8	8.6	5	11.9	10.3	13.8	16.2	17.6	14.3	8.8	6.4	11.1
22.6	26.2	17.8	3.5	2.4	5	30.6	30.3	31.6	9.1	7.1	12	9.6	10.4	8	3.1	4.1	1.8
18.4	10.5	15	20.2	6.8	3.2
27.9	32.7	23.5	4.4	3.7	4.7	30.6	29.1	33.4	2.4	2.6	2.5	8.7	10	5.9	10	7.9	9.1
...
31.3	35.7	25.4	3.7	4.1	3.1	6.9	7.7	5.3	9.7	7.4	12.6	14.2	11.9	17.9	6.3	5.5	7.2
19.1	25.8	11.6	2.9	3.5	2.2	10.9	15.9	5.4	19	14.7	24.2	11.1	11.8	10.3	4.4	3.7	4.2
11.3	14.7	6.6	5.2	6.7	3.2	12.1	13.6	10.2	12.5	10.7	15.3	8.5	10	6.5	5.7	5.4	6.3
...
37.6	44.6	...	3.2	1.4	...	4.3	5.7	...	4.2	4.3	...	16.8	16.4	...	5.4	5.8	...
26.5	28.2	23.3	6	5.3	6.8	9.5	8.5	11	10.4	8.8	12.2	14.1	17.3	10.8	13.5	11.3	16.6
...
15.1	18.8	10	8.3	2.3	16.4	16.1	21.3	9.2	15.9	14.4	17.5	12.7	16.4	8.2	4.1	6.1	1.4
...
12.9	28.2	16.6	N/A	N/A
...
...
...
4	6.6	2.4	7.2	3.9	9.4	18.9	22.7	16.4	31.1	26.7	34.1	5.7	6.6	5.2	1.3	1.3	1.4
33.2	42.7	23.1	4.1	2.6	5.6	9.7	10.6	8.5	10.5	8.4	12.9	14.6	13.7	16	6.8	5.5	8.3
27.9	40.5	12.9	4.7	2.2	7.6	9.3	9.5	9.3	9.2	6.9	12	12.2	11	13.3	7.5	5.9	9.1
17.3	27.2	8.1	6.4	5.6	6.5	15.6	18	13	11.4	6.3	15.8	8.7	13.4	4.6	4.7	4.6	5.1
14.5	22.4	7.7	2.1	1	3	10.1	10.5	9.7	8.6	6.8	10.1	2.2	2.1	2.3	1.4	1.2	1.6
11.8	...	8.5	5.8	...	8.3	27.3	...	28.3	12.6	...	14.7	6.8	...	3.4	0.8	...	1.4
29.5	29.9	29.5	3.7	3.7	4.1	9.4	11.8	5.8	5	3.8	7.4	21.6	26.7	10.9	9.8	5.5	16.4
23.1	21.7	23.6	8.3	7.5	9.3	9.1	6.9	11.5	11.3	12	9.8	20	21.5	19.5	14.6	15.9	13.3
20.7	25.2	16.3	9	5.8	12.2	7	7.1	6.8	22.5	18	26.8	11.3	14	8.6	8.7	9.1	8.4
21.2	25.6	17	11	8	14	11.6	11.6	11.7	20.7	19.3	22.3	9.6	8.5	9.8	8.4	10	6.9
22.7	23.8	21.6	10.7	6.9	14.2	11.7	15.7	7.9	15	11.8	17.9	15	18.6	11.7	11.1	9.7	12.4

Annex 3.

Prevalence of students who reported being in physical fights or physically attacked during the past 12 months, by country or territory

Country/Territory/ geographical area ^[1]	Physical fights						Physical attacks					
	Total	Sex		Age			Total	Sex		Age		
		Male	Female	13	14	15		Male	Female	13	14	15
Afghanistan	40.6	47.1	31.6	42.0	41.8	38.6	34.6	40.6	26.6	29.3	36.2	36.2
Algeria	47.7	61.3	35.5	50.0	47.0	46.6	24.5	34.1	15.8	28.4	23.9	21.9
Anguilla	29.8	37.1	22.3	31.2	33.9	24.8	28.2	33.0	22.8	28.8	31.2	24.7
Antigua and Barbuda	47.5	55.1	38.4	48.7	48.2	45.5	39.9	46.5	32.7	40.7	40.2	38.7
Argentina	34.1	44.2	24.7	33.8	34.7	33.4	24.8	30.0	20.0	25.2	25.1	24.3
Bahamas	40.0	44.3	35.9	38.4	39.7	44.3	30.9	35.1	26.8	33.6	30.4	25.5
Bahrain	42.6	53.6	30.8	44.2	43.9	39.7	27.9	36.1	19.1	30.2	27.6	25.9
Bangladesh	21.1	27.1	10.2	23.5	20.0	20.5	62.5	66.5	55.1	70.8	60.0	58.3
Barbados	38.4	47.9	28.3	41.3	39.2	35.7	29.3	30.8	27.6	29.7	28.7	29.6
Belize	36.0	42.7	29.7	36.3	38.1	33.4	28.1	33.6	23.0	26.4	29.2	28.4
Benin	30.5	32.1	27.3	36.0	31.4	27.9	25.4	27.8	20.5	26.4	28.1	23.3
Bhutan	42.5	51.7	34.4	43.8	43.6	40.6	40.7	48.5	34.0	44.1	42.7	36.8
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	33.0	45.3	20.8	33.9	32.4	33.0	34.7	38.8	30.3	34.3	33.4	36.2
Botswana	47.7	54.4	41.7	45.3	45.6	49.7	55.7	56.9	54.7	52.1	54.1	57.8
British Virgin Islands	35.0	45.0	26.3	32.5	34.9	37.5	31.3	38.5	24.8	27.0	32.0	34.6
Brunei Darussalam	24.4	31.9	17.1	26.2	26.2	20.7	27.5	32.1	23.3	29.7	25.9	27.6
Cambodia	13.8	15.3	12.2	16.4	12.9	12.9	20.6	24.0	17.4	22.3	21.4	18.8
Chile	28.5	38.2	19.0	32.2	27.9	25.6	21.1	25.1	16.7	22.3	22.1	19.1
China - Beijing	15.8	25.5	6.3	14.1	15.7	17.9
China - Hangzhou	17.9	29.3	5.7	17.8	17.2	19.1
China - Wuhan	20.1	30.4	8.1	18.4	21.4	21.9
China - Urumqi	22.0	34.7	8.3	22.4	22.4	21.0
Colombia - Bogota	39.4	55.4	27.0	36.5	40.7	40.7	30.5	38.8	24.0	32.1	31.1	28.4
Colombia - Bucaramanga	34.1	48.4	21.3	34.7	34.7	32.8	28.3	35.6	21.8	26.9	30.1	27.6
Colombia - Cali City	30.3	43.0	20.3	27.1	29.2	35.2	23.0	30.4	17.3	22.4	22.1	24.6
Colombia - Manizales	31.3	45.2	20.4	34.9	30.6	29.0	25.6	34.1	18.8	27.7	26.1	23.2
Colombia - Valledupar	29.8	41.8	21.0	34.4	28.4	27.3	23.5	26.1	21.5	23.0	25.8	21.7
Cook Islands	30.5	34.6	25.9	34.8	30.6	28.4	38.5	40.2	36.9	38.9	40.8	35.8
Costa Rica	22.1	32.3	12.1	20.4	22.8	23.0	13.8	16.0	11.8	13.4	13.6	14.5
Djibouti	59.5	68.1	46.6	64.0	54.2	61.9	56.2	63.8	44.6	53.0	53.5	58.8
Dominica	39.1	47.7	29.8	35.7	43.5	38.5	37.8	43.3	31.7	33.4	42.0	38.2
Dominican Republic	25.9	32.4	19.2	29.0	27.5	23.8	24.2	26.4	22.3	26.3	24.4	23.5
Ecuador - Guayaquil	36.0	50.8	22.9	35.9	37.4	34.0	34.8	38.5	31.1	34.9	31.1	40.5
Ecuador - Quito	37.3	53.4	21.3	33.6	37.6	41.9	36.2	38.7	33.8	36.0	36.7	35.8
Egypt	45.1	62.0	28.9	43.2	48.2	44.2	55.5	63.8	47.7	57.9	55.6	50.2
El Salvador	25.6	33.9	16.9	26.6	23.8	26.8	18.9	20.6	16.9	16.6	20.4	19.0
Eswatini	19.4	27.4	14.3	27.9	18.8	15.6	32.0	36.0	29.3	31.2	32.1	32.2
Fiji	33.6	43.1	24.2	29.5	35.7	32.5	34.2	39.3	28.5	40.3	34.7	32.7
French Polynesia	31.7	38.5	24.7	36.1	31.7	27.1	16.4	19.8	13.0	18.2	18.3	12.5
Ghana	52.5	57.8	47.4	57.8	47.5	53.6	49.5	49.7	49.4	48.8	48.2	51.4
Grenada	38.2	52.7	26.9	34.5	36.8	43.2	41.0	55.2	30.0	37.2	42.6	42.9
Guatemala	22.8	31.2	14.1	23.7	20.7	24.3	24.0	28.5	19.3	26.6	20.2	25.9
Guyana	37.9	51.3	25.0	36.2	42.9	34.0	39.1	44.4	33.8	38.3	41.2	37.6
Honduras	28.0	36.4	20.5	32.2	26.9	23.8	20.5	21.7	19.1	23.8	18.1	19.4
Indonesia	24.6	35.9	13.1	25.8	25.0	22.0	33.9	43.2	24.5	37.2	32.2	31.4
Iraq	37.1	49.5	22.4	37.2	34.7	39.3	31.0	38.4	21.9	34.7	28.3	30.4

Country/Territory/ geographical area ^[1]	Physical fights						Physical attacks					
	Total	Sex		Age			Total	Sex		Age		
		Male	Female	13	14	15		Male	Female	13	14	15
Jamaica	34.5	44.3	25.4	29.9	36.0	35.3	26.9	34.7	19.6	23.2	25.1	30.2
Jordan	46.5	65.1	29.9	45.0	46.4	47.0	38.2	51.1	26.3	37.8	38.6	38.0
Kenya	48.2	50.5	46.1	53.1	47.1	45.8
Kiribati	35.3	43.3	28.5	35.6	36.7	33.7	10.0	14.9	5.9	10.9	10.0	9.3
Kuwait	42.8	56.0	30.0	41.3	46.3	40.8	29.2	38.0	20.7	30.3	32.0	26.0
Lao PDR	10.2	12.0	8.7	10.7	12.1	9.2	19.5	23.1	16.2	18.8	23.9	17.5
Lebanon	40.2	57.3	24.4	39.3	40.5	40.7	20.9	26.7	15.6	24.0	19.9	18.8
Libya	39.8	55.7	23.0	38.6	38.4	43.0	29.5	42.4	16.0	28.8	28.0	32.1
Malawi	23.0	23.7	20.8	22.4	22.7	24.0	36.8	35.9	37.6	40.0	36.1	34.9
Malaysia	30.1	38.5	21.9	32.6	31.3	26.3	29.2	33.6	24.7	30.9	29.6	27.0
Maldives	31.7	41.1	22.8	35.7	34.9	28.4	31.1	38.9	23.4	35.5	33.6	28.4
Mauritania	57.8	66.1	48.3	61.4	57.2	57.0	52.7	56.3	48.8	50.4	51.9	54.1
Mauritius	35.5	49.2	22.2	28.2	35.8	42.3	23.3	30.5	16.2	18.2	21.7	29.9
Mongolia	43.8	64.6	23.0	43.1	45.9	42.4	30.0	38.0	21.8	29.9	30.9	29.1
Montserrat	39.0	49.8	28.8	42.0	37.7	37.2	33.6	43.6	24.6	30.3	29.5	42.4
Morocco	39.7	53.1	24.6	39.2	39.9	40.1	24.1	28.7	18.6	22.2	25.4	24.7
Mozambique	39.8	42.2	36.8	36.0	38.6	42.3	36.0	37.2	34.6	33.9	35.8	37.1
Myanmar	24.1	31.1	17.4	28.5	21.4	21.9	32.8	40.5	25.9	37.9	31.5	27.5
Namibia	35.8	44.0	29.2	36.1	34.3	36.7	41.5	47.1	37.0	41.3	37.9	44.4
Nauru	45.2	48.5	42.2	46.6	44.2	44.8	55.1	59.5	51.4	66.6	46.8	51.1
Nepal	39.9	45.2	35.1	38.9	41.0	39.6	44.9	51.0	39.1	47.9	45.9	40.8
Niue	32.9	47.1	41.0	27.8
Oman	47.8	55.6	41.3	49.8	50.4	44.7	29.6	36.1	24.1	31.5	31.9	26.9
Pakistan	37.3	46.9	22.5	34.2	37.9	38.4	33.8	38.7	26.3	32.8	33.4	34.9
Palestine State - Gaza	41.9	49.9	32.8	40.9	40.4	44.6	46.7	53.1	39.5	51.0	43.4	46.2
Palestine State - West Bank	46.0	66.2	24.6	45.0	47.8	44.4	36.7	48.9	23.6	42.8	33.4	34.0
Paraguay	20.2	26.1	14.5	20.2	18.6	21.8	16.2	18.7	13.7	21.1	12.8	15.9
Peru	36.9	52.4	21.5	37.1	38.8	35.0	37.2	42.2	32.2	33.5	39.5	37.1
Philippines	38.7	43.7	34.0	42.5	40.1	34.2	38.6	42.3	35.0	37.0	40.1	38.3
Qatar	50.6	62.5	38.0	47.0	52.4	54.7	40.4	50.6	29.6	38.0	40.8	44.7
Rodrigues	34.5	40.6	29.2	40.7	32.8	31.2	31.8	34.1	29.8	34.3	33.4	28.2
Saint Kitts and Nevis	37.8	44.2	31.2	41.5	38.0	35.5	34.9	42.2	27.6	38.6	33.9	34.0
Saint Lucia	40.7	52.4	31.1	49.1	41.3	33.5	34.0	41.7	27.7	40.4	33.1	29.8
Saint Vincent & the Grenadines	46.0	55.5	37.1	52.6	41.2	40.9	38.9	45.8	32.7	42.8	35.9	35.9
Samoa	67.7	73.3	62.1	70.0	66.8	67.3	71.0	73.2	68.3	68.7	72.3	70.7
Seychelles	34.1	41.4	27.4	39.0	33.8	29.7	28.0	35.0	21.5	29.3	25.2	29.4
Solomon Islands	52.7	53.5	50.7	55.5	50.9	52.7	56.0	56.2	53.4	51.3	56.1	58.4
Sri Lanka	46.3	56.7	36.1	51.9	46.2	40.9	38.2	47.4	28.7	43.2	39.5	31.8
Suriname	20.5	30.4	12.3	21.3	19.0	21.5	23.3	28.2	19.2	25.0	21.2	24.0
Tajikistan	21.8	29.5	12.5	25.5	22.4	19.3	24.8	27.0	21.4	28.0	26.3	21.5
Tanzania (United Republic of)	30.9	33.2	28.2	38.1	30.4	23.9	54.6	56.1	53.2	53.2	54.1	56.6
Thailand	29.0	37.0	20.5	33.1	27.2	26.2	29.8	39.2	19.7	35.4	28.8	24.2
The former Yugoslav Rep. of Macedonia	30.1	40.7	18.4	30.4	27.4	32.6	19.5	24.6	13.8	19.2	17.8	21.8
Timor-Leste	33.7	39.8	26.9	37.1	32.4	33.4	41.6	44.0	38.6	50.7	39.9	39.2
Tokelau	75.1	88.4	60.1	57.4	49.0	65.4
Tonga	38.1	49.9	25.3	41.7	38.9	33.9	48.4	54.1	42.3	49.8	47.5	48.1
Trinidad and Tobago	35.9	44.6	27.2	32.3	37.8	37.2	34.3	42.0	26.5	31.0	35.9	35.7
Tunisia	47.4	70.7	24.3	47.9	48.0	45.9	46.4	62.8	30.1	44.6	47.8	46.4
Tuvalu	71.1	76.5	65.8	73.2	72.7	66.1	62.7	73.1	53.3	65.8	58.9	62.9
Uganda	35.5	39.3	32.2	37.5	32.3	37.3
United Arab Emirates	41.2	54.3	28.8	42.9	44.0	37.2	27.8	36.7	19.2	34.0	29.9	21.2
Uruguay	25.9	38.0	15.4	21.8	27.0	27.7	14.9	17.0	12.9	12.1	16.6	15.2

Country/Territory/ geographical area ^[1]	Physical fights						Physical attacks					
	Total	Sex		Age			Total	Sex		Age		
		Male	Female	13	14	15		Male	Female	13	14	15
Vanuatu	50.5	59.9	41.8	55.8	49.7	43.4	54.0	55.8	51.4	57.3	54.2	48.6
Venezuela - Barinas	31.1	46.4	16.6	31.5	30.2	31.8
Venezuela - Lara	28.2	45.4	11.8	29.4	28.3	23.3
Viet Nam	21.8	33.4	11.8	...	23.5	20.3	28.0	35.8	21.3	...	30.7	25.5
Wallis and Futuna	35.0	48.7	22.9	33.8	34.4	36.5	16.0	19.8	12.4	17.8	19.2	11.7
Yemen	44.3	56.9	27.5	45.3	51.4	36.6	40.1	48.4	28.4	40.9	43.4	36.1
Zambia	53.0	50.3	55.9	58.1	54.6	48.3
Zimbabwe - Bulawayo	38.8	47.1	32.7	34.0	42.3	37.9
Zimbabwe - Harare	37.9	45.2	30.7	40.0	39.1	35.9
Zimbabwe - Manicaland	47.3	49.2	45.5	48.5	46.2	47.8

Source: GSHS.

- [1] The names of countries, territories and geographical areas used in this table are those used by the international surveys that are the data sources for the table. These designations do not imply the expression of any opinion on the part of UNESCO concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

Education
Sector

Behind the numbers:

Ending school violence

and bullying

School-related violence in all its forms, including bullying, is an infringement of children's and adolescents' rights to education and health and well-being. No country can achieve inclusive and equitable quality education for all if learners experience violence in school.

This report provides an overview of the most up-to-date evidence on school violence and bullying. It includes global and regional prevalence and trends, factors that influence vulnerability to school violence and bullying, and consequences. The publication brings together for the first time in one place a wealth of quantitative data from two large-scale international surveys: the Global School-based Student Health Survey (GSHS) and the Health Behaviour in School-aged Children (HBSC) study. The surveys cover 144 countries and territories in all regions of the world, and from a wide range of other global and regional surveys. The publication also includes an analysis of factors that contribute to effective national responses, based on a series of case studies commissioned by UNESCO of countries that have succeeded in reducing the prevalence of school violence and bullying or have maintained low levels of school violence over time.

Stay in touch

UNESCO

7, place de Fontenoy
75352 Paris France



<https://en.unesco.org/themes/school-violence-and-bullying>



@UNESCO



@UNESCO

