

Student-Reported Bullying and Interpersonal Experiences in Madrasah Tsanawiyah in Pidie Regency: Implications for Child-Friendly Schools

Armia

Madrasah Aliyah Negeri 8 Pidie, Aceh, Indonesia

Email: armiathaleb@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Understanding students' experiences of bullying and negative interpersonal interactions is essential for strengthening child-friendly educational environments. General victim self-identification and behavior-specific reports offer complementary perspectives on these experiences. This study examined self-identified bullying victimization, reported perpetrator categories, negative interpersonal experiences, and behavioral responses among survey respondents in madrasah tsanawiyah in Pidie Regency, Indonesia, with particular attention to the correspondence between victim self-identification and experience reports. A descriptive quantitative analysis was conducted using 221 digital survey records collected October 22–25, 2022. Frequencies, percentages, and cross-tabulation were used to examine general victim self-identification, 12 negative interpersonal experience items, and 12 behavioral and social-response items. Of 221 respondents, 101 (45.7%) self-identified as bullying victims, with classmates being the most frequently reported perpetrator category (54.5%). Mockery or teasing was reported by 89 respondents (40.3%), while 57 (25.8%) endorsed at least one physical experience. Frequent use of derogatory nicknames for friends was reported by 113 respondents (51.1%). Overall, 146 respondents (66.1%) endorsed at least one negative interpersonal experience. Among respondents who did not identify themselves as bullying victims, 56 nevertheless reported at least one such experience, while 11 self-identified victims endorsed none of the listed experiences. General victim self-identification and behavior-specific reports captured partially different patterns of student experiences. These findings demonstrate the value of examining multiple forms of student reporting and provide empirical insights for strengthening confidential reporting, counseling support, adult-led student protection, and respectful communication within child-friendly madrasah practices.

Keywords: *self-reported bullying; interpersonal experiences; madrasah tsanawiyah; child-friendly schools; school counseling*

A. INTRODUCTION

A child-friendly educational environment requires attention to students' experiences of harm as well as to formal rules. Research on bullying prevention emphasizes sustained implementation and coordination rather than isolated activities (Bradshaw, 2015). In a study of sixth-grade students and school personnel in the United States, Espelage et al. (2014) examined associations between perceptions of the school environment and student-reported aggression, victimization, and willingness to intervene.

This emphasis on student experience provides a starting point for examining protection needs within the distinct educational and institutional contexts of Indonesian madrasahs.

Conceptual clarity is essential when interpreting student reports. Bullying is commonly distinguished from other negative interactions by repetition and an imbalance of power, rather than by the presence of an unpleasant act alone (Olweus, 1993; Rigby, 2002). Cornell and Limber (2015) discuss the implications of these definitional challenges for school policy. In Indonesia, Ayuningbudi and Hanami (2023), in interviews with four sixth-grade children in Bandung, found that not all participants explicitly included repetition in their explanations of bullying. Borualogo and Gumilang's (2019) West Java survey of 22,616 children in the 8-, 10-, and 12-year-old age groups used behavior-specific school-victimization questions with a one-month recall period. These approaches underscore the distinction between students' recognition of the term bullying and their reports of particular experiences. However, endorsement of an unpleasant experience does not, by itself, establish repetition or a power imbalance. The correspondence between these two reporting formats should therefore be examined without treating either as a criterion-based measure of bullying victimization.

The social context of harmful interactions also deserves attention. Coloroso (2003) considers the roles of those who engage in bullying, those targeted, and bystanders, while Salmivalli (2010) examines bullying as a peer-group phenomenon. Thornberg's (2018) field study in Swedish primary schools illustrates how processes of fitting in and being excluded can inform understanding of bullying. Halimah et al. (2015) studied 48 junior high school students in Makassar who reported bullying perpetration and found a positive association between perpetrators' perceptions of bystanders and bullying-intensity scores. In interviews with six Indonesian junior high school students, Adiananda and Lestari (2025) described peer support that included listening, encouragement, practical assistance, and reporting to teachers. Together, these studies direct attention to peer relationships as contexts for both harmful conduct and support. Relationship categories are therefore relevant to assessment, alongside questions about social standing, group responses, and relative power.

Studies in Indonesian Islamic educational settings provide further context. Malahati et al. (2022) reported verbal and physical bullying-related behavior in a study of 17 sixth-grade pupils in a madrasah ibtidaiyah. At the junior high school level, Iqbal and Hamifah (2024) conducted a descriptive qualitative study in a madrasah tsanawiyah in West Aceh, reporting derogatory name-calling, ridicule, social exclusion, threats by older students toward younger students, and physical incidents. The two studies concern different educational levels and cannot provide directly comparable prevalence estimates, but both identify interpersonal experiences relevant to student protection. Khotimah et al. (2026), in their synthesis of school climate and bullying prevention research, emphasized that most included studies were correlational and not conducted specifically in madrasahs. These studies support the need for context-sensitive assessment and local evaluation of proposed protection practices. They also motivate a narrower descriptive question in the present dataset: how students' general self-identification as bullying victims corresponds

to their reports of specific negative interpersonal experiences. This comparison documents patterns of reporting rather than establishing which respondents meet established definitional criteria for bullying victimization.

The present study examines 221 existing digital survey records concerning madrasah tsanawiyah, or Islamic junior high schools, in Pidie Regency, Indonesia. It describes self-identified bullying victimization, reported perpetrator categories, negative interpersonal experiences, and behavioral and social-response items. By examining these reporting formats within the same survey, the study provides empirical insights into how students identify bullying victimization and report negative interpersonal experiences in madrasah settings. Context-sensitive leadership provides a perspective for considering possible institutional responses rather than an outcome directly measured by the survey (Hallinger, 2018; Leithwood et al., 2020).

The analysis addresses four descriptive research questions: (1) What proportion of submitted responses indicates self-identified bullying victimization? (2) Which perpetrator categories are reported by respondents who identify themselves as victims? (3) How are negative interpersonal experiences and behavioral and social-response items distributed across the submitted responses? (4) How does general victim self-identification correspond to endorsement of at least one negative interpersonal experience? The findings are discussed in relation to Madrasah Ramah Anak (MRA), or child-friendly madrasah, practices, particularly guidance and counseling, student protection, and respectful communication. These implications are proposed considerations for institutional practice rather than evidence of the implementation or effectiveness of particular interventions.

B. METHODS

Design, setting, and analytical sample

The study used descriptive quantitative analysis of an existing digital survey to summarize responses without experimental manipulation (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Fraenkel et al., 2019). The dataset contained 221 response records timestamped October 22–25, 2022. The survey concerned madrasah tsanawiyah in Pidie Regency, Aceh, Indonesia. Individual school identities are withheld, and the analysis reports aggregate rather than school-level results.

All 221 submitted records were retained for descriptive analysis. Free-text school affiliations included incomplete or inconsistent entries, including one unresolved educational-level discrepancy. Accordingly, the analytical sample is described as a set of submitted survey responses concerning madrasah tsanawiyah rather than an independently verified roster of eligible students. Recruitment procedures, a sampling frame, and the number of invitations were not documented in the available survey materials. Consequently, sampling probabilities, the response rate, and the representativeness of the sample could not be established. The reported percentages therefore describe the submitted records and should not be generalized to all madrasah tsanawiyah students in Pidie Regency.

Questionnaire and operational definitions

The Indonesian-language questionnaire asked whether respondents had ever been bullying victims at the madrasah and who had bullied them. A “Ya” (Yes) answer to the general question was operationalized as self-identified bullying victimization. This classification reflects respondents’ self-identification and does not independently establish whether their reported experiences involved repetition or a power imbalance, the defining characteristics commonly used to distinguish bullying from other negative interpersonal interactions. The recorded perpetrator categories were classmates, students from other classes, students in higher grades, and students in lower grades. The category “students from other classes” did not specify grade level.

A separate Yes/No inventory asked about five verbal, four physical, and three social experiences while at the madrasah. These comprised being yelled at, verbally abused, insulted, mocked or teased, humiliated, slapped, hit, kicked, punched, excluded by friends, treated differently, and ignored. The questionnaire did not record a fixed recall period, the number of occurrences, perceived power imbalance, or the actor associated with each reported experience. Therefore, affirmative responses to these items were operationalized as reports of negative interpersonal experiences rather than verified instances of bullying. Each experience item was analyzed descriptively and separately from general victim self-identification.

The questionnaire also included 12 Yes/No items on behavior and social responses, such as derogatory nicknaming, hostility, rule breaking, and reactions to someone being hurt, embarrassed, or threatened. Several statements used “often,” “always,” or “sometimes,” without numerical frequency thresholds. Their scope varied: some referred to friends, others to people generally or to adults.

Unlike the aggression-focused 11-item scale developed by Orpinas and Frankowski (2001), the questionnaire combined heterogeneous behavioral and social-response items. Psychometric validation evidence and an established composite scoring procedure were unavailable. Each item was therefore analyzed separately, without calculating total aggression, empathy, or school-climate scores.

Data preparation

The analyzed survey fields contained no blank cells. Two responses in different records contained the combined answer “Ya, Tidak” (Yes, No): one for being hit and one for being verbally abused. These answers were classified as invalid only for the affected items. All other answers in the two records were retained, and no entire record was excluded on this basis.

Descriptive analysis

Frequencies and percentages were calculated for each response category. Experience and behavioral items used all 221 submitted records as the denominator, with invalid responses reported separately. Responses to the perpetrator-category question were recorded for all 221 survey records, including those indicating no self-identified victimization. To restrict the analysis to respondents who identified themselves as

bullying victims, perpetrator-category frequencies were calculated using only the 101 records with a “Ya” (Yes) answer to the general victimization question. These frequencies describe reported perpetrator categories within this subgroup and should not be interpreted as counts of unique perpetrators or bullying incidents. Percentages were rounded to one decimal place, and rounded category percentages may not sum to exactly 100.0%.

A descriptive cross-tabulation compared general victim self-identification with endorsement of at least one of the 12 experience items. Combined indicators were also calculated for the four physical items and for the subset comprising slapping, kicking, or punching. Each indicator was based on at least one unambiguous Yes within a record, rather than the sum of item frequencies. Both records containing contradictory answers had another affirmative experience response. The record with a contradictory physical-item answer also contained a Yes on another physical item, permitting classification of the combined physical indicators. Because the experience inventory did not assess repetition or power imbalance, endorsement of at least one negative experience was not treated as an alternative criterion for identifying bullying victims.

Confidentiality and ethical considerations

Student names were recorded in the original survey but excluded from the analytical dataset. Findings are presented in aggregate form without disclosing student or school identities. Individual-level records are not publicly shared. Documentation of the original informed consent procedures and ethics-review decision was not available in the materials examined.

C. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Results

1) Self-identified bullying victimization and reported perpetrator categories

Of the 221 respondents, 101 (45.7%) answered Yes to the general question about having been a bullying victim at the madrasah, while 120 (54.3%) answered No. Table 1 reports perpetrator categories only for the 101 respondents identifying themselves as victims.

Table 1.
Perpetrator categories selected by respondents who self-identified as bullying victims (n = 101)

Reported category	n	%
Classmates	55	54.5
Students from other classes	31	30.7
Students in higher grades	15	14.9
Students in lower grades	0	0.0
Total	101	100.0

Source: Author’s analysis of the October 2022 survey data

Classmates were the most frequently selected perpetrator category among respondents who self-identified as bullying victims (54.5%), followed by students from other classes (30.7%) and students in higher grades (14.9%). No respondent in this subgroup selected students in lower grades. These findings describe the categories selected by respondents rather than the number of individual perpetrators or incidents. The categories do not establish the relative power of those involved.

2) Negative interpersonal experiences

Table 2 presents the distributions of negative interpersonal experiences for all 221 respondents, regardless of their answer to the general victim-status question.

Table 2.

Reported negative interpersonal experiences at the madrasah (N = 221)

Dimension / experience	Yes, n (%)	No, n (%)	Invalid, n (%)
Verbal experiences			
Mocked or teased	89 (40.3)	132 (59.7)	0 (0.0)
Humiliated or embarrassed	55 (24.9)	166 (75.1)	0 (0.0)
Insulted	54 (24.4)	167 (75.6)	0 (0.0)
Yelled at	51 (23.1)	170 (76.9)	0 (0.0)
Cursed at / verbally abused	26 (11.8)	194 (87.8)	1 (0.5)
Social experiences			
Ignored	58 (26.2)	163 (73.8)	0 (0.0)
Treated differently	41 (18.6)	180 (81.4)	0 (0.0)
Excluded by friends	31 (14.0)	190 (86.0)	0 (0.0)
Physical experiences			
Hit	47 (21.3)	173 (78.3)	1 (0.5)
Slapped	21 (9.5)	200 (90.5)	0 (0.0)
Kicked	20 (9.0)	201 (91.0)	0 (0.0)
Punched	18 (8.1)	203 (91.9)	0 (0.0)

Source: Author's analysis of the October 2022 survey data.

Being mocked or teased was the most frequently endorsed experience (40.3%). Being ignored was reported by 26.2%, humiliation or embarrassment by 24.9%, insults by 24.4%, and being yelled at by 23.1%. Physical experiences included being hit (21.3%), slapped (9.5%), kicked (9.0%), and punched (8.1%).

At the respondent level, 57 individuals (25.8%) endorsed at least one of the four physical items. For the subset of slapping, kicking, and punching, 36 respondents (16.3%) endorsed at least one item. These combined percentages account for overlap between individual experiences.

3) Behavioral and social-response items

Table 3 presents the distributions of the 12 behavioral and social-response items.

Table 3.

Endorsement of behavioral and social-response items (N = 221)

Behavioral or social-response item	Yes, n (%)	No, n (%)
I often call my friends by derogatory nicknames.	113 (51.1)	108 (48.9)
I laugh when someone is hurt or embarrassed.	58 (26.2)	163 (73.8)
I often break rules.	56 (25.3)	165 (74.7)
I laugh when others are threatened or frightened.	39 (17.6)	182 (82.4)
I get angry when things do not go the way I want.	34 (15.4)	187 (84.6)
I often behave defiantly or with hostility toward others.	26 (11.8)	195 (88.2)
I do not care about other people's feelings.	25 (11.3)	196 (88.7)
I am often rough with others, for example by pushing or fighting.	20 (9.0)	201 (91.0)
Borrowing things without returning them.	19 (8.6)	202 (91.4)
I often force people to do things they do not want to do.	18 (8.1)	203 (91.9)
I am sometimes harsh toward adults, such as parents and teachers.	17 (7.7)	204 (92.3)
I always want to control other people.	12 (5.4)	209 (94.6)

Source: Author's analysis of the October 2022 survey data.

The most frequently endorsed statement concerned often calling friends by derogatory nicknames (51.1%). Laughing when someone was hurt or embarrassed was endorsed by 26.2%, and often breaking rules by 25.3%. Laughing when others were threatened or frightened was reported by 17.6%. The remaining statements each received affirmative responses from fewer than 16% of respondents. Because these items addressed heterogeneous behaviors and social responses, their endorsement should not be interpreted as a direct measure of bullying perpetration or a validated behavioral construct.

4) Correspondence between self-identification and the experience inventory

Endorsement of the experience inventory did not fully coincide with answers to the general bullying question (Table 4). Across all records, 146 respondents (66.1%) endorsed at least one listed experience, while 75 (33.9%) endorsed none.

Table 4.

General victim self-identification and endorsement of at least one experience item

General bullying question	At least one Yes	No Yes responses	Total
Yes	90	11	101
No	56	64	120

Total	146	75	221
-------	-----	----	-----

Source: Author's analysis of the October 2022 survey data.

Among the 101 respondents who self-identified as bullying victims, 90 endorsed at least one listed negative interpersonal experience, whereas 11 endorsed none. Conversely, among the 120 respondents who did not identify themselves as bullying victims, 56 endorsed at least one experience and 64 endorsed none. Thus, general victim self-identification (45.7%) and endorsement of at least one experience item (66.1%) yielded different response distributions. In particular, endorsement of a negative experience was not confined to respondents who identified themselves as bullying victims, while self-identification as a victim did not invariably coincide with endorsement of an experience item.

2. Discussion

Among respondents who self-identified as bullying victims, classmates and students from other classes were the most frequently selected perpetrator categories. These findings locate the reported experiences within peer relationships, although the categories do not reveal the circumstances or power dynamics of individual incidents. Salmivalli's (2010) peer-group perspective and Thornberg's (2018) contextual analysis provide frameworks for considering how social standing, group expectations, and exclusion may shape harmful peer interactions. These findings reinforce the relevance of peer relationships as an important consideration in developing student protection practices within madrasah settings.

Verbal interactions were prominent in two different parts of the survey. Being mocked or teased was reported by 89 respondents (40.3%), while 113 respondents (51.1%) endorsed often using derogatory nicknames for friends. Although these findings point to the relevance of everyday communication, they represent different questionnaire items and cannot establish whether the reported behaviors occurred within the same relationships or incidents. Bourdieu's (1991) account of language and symbolic power offers a conceptual perspective on how naming practices may express social distinctions and unequal relationships. Nevertheless, the survey did not examine the meanings of particular nicknames, the intentions of those using them, or the responses of those targeted. Qualitative investigation would therefore be needed to determine how such communication practices operate within the madrasah setting.

Reports of laughter when someone was hurt, embarrassed, threatened, or frightened draw attention to reactions surrounding harmful interactions. Salmivalli's (2014) participant-role framework distinguishes encouragement of harmful conduct from defending a targeted person or remaining uninvolved. The present questions referred broadly to "someone" or "others" and did not link responses to a specific bullying episode. Their interpretation therefore concerns reported social responses, rather than assignment to particular bystander roles.

Erikson's (1968) account of identity development and Bandura's (2002) analysis of moral disengagement offer possible perspectives for examining peer acceptance and

the justification of harmful conduct. However, the present survey did not assess identity-development processes, moral disengagement, or respondents' motivations. The reported behavioral and social-response items therefore cannot establish why students endorsed particular statements or whether these responses reflected specific psychological mechanisms. Future research incorporating interviews and construct-specific measures could examine how students interpret others' distress, respond to peer expectations, and justify harmful interactions.

A central finding of this study is the incomplete correspondence between general self-identification as a bullying victim and endorsement of specific negative interpersonal experiences. Among respondents who did not identify themselves as bullying victims, 56 nevertheless endorsed at least one listed experience. Conversely, 11 respondents who identified themselves as victims endorsed none of the listed experiences. These patterns demonstrate that the two reporting formats do not consistently classify respondents in the same way. Several explanations are possible, including differences in how respondents understand the term bullying, experiences not covered by the inventory, and distinctions between isolated negative interactions and repeated targeting. However, the survey did not measure these explanations directly, and the observed discrepancies cannot establish whether respondents misunderstood bullying or whether either reporting format was more accurate. The findings therefore support examining self-identification and behavior-specific reports as distinct descriptive measures rather than combining them into a single estimate of bullying prevalence.

From a measurement perspective, these findings underscore the importance of distinguishing students' self-identification from their reports of specific experiences. Future assessments should incorporate questions about repetition, relative power, and the circumstances of reported incidents, consistent with established conceptual distinctions in bullying research (Cornell & Limber, 2015; Olweus, 1993). A defined recall period and identification of the actor associated with each experience would also support more precise interpretation. The physical-experience findings further illustrate the importance of respondent-level aggregation: although individual physical items had relatively lower endorsement frequencies, 57 respondents (25.8%) endorsed at least one of the four physical experiences. This finding indicates that physical safety deserves attention alongside verbal interactions and social inclusion. However, the survey did not establish the severity, frequency, or circumstances of individual physical incidents.

The reported negative interpersonal experiences suggest several areas for consideration in developing child-friendly madrasah practices, including accessible reporting mechanisms, coordinated adult follow-up, counseling support, and respectful communication. Bradshaw (2015) emphasizes implementation quality and sustainability in bullying prevention, while Rigby (2014) compares different approaches to responding to bullying cases. These perspectives provide a basis for considering institutional responses appropriate to the circumstances of reported incidents. However, the present study did not examine existing protection policies, intervention implementation, or institutional outcomes in the surveyed madrasahs. Accordingly, these recommendations

should be understood as proposed areas for institutional attention rather than empirically tested interventions or demonstrated effects of child-friendly madrasah programs.

Confidential reporting could enable students to describe harmful experiences without public identification or pressure to confront another student. Guidance and Counseling (Bimbingan dan Konseling, BK) personnel could coordinate assessment, supportive conversations, referral where needed, and follow-up with responsible staff. Corey's (2017) counseling framework and Morrison's (2007) whole-school restorative orientation provide complementary resources for developing these arrangements. Counseling should operate alongside clear rules and accountability, with student protection as the shared objective.

Student participation can focus on safe reporting and support for targeted peers, consistent with the intervention implications of the participant-role approach (Salmivalli, 2014). This supportive role differs from investigating allegations or resolving cases involving unequal power. Sellman's (2011) study examines the organizational conditions of peer mediation for interpersonal conflict, a context that needs to be distinguished from bullying case management. In the practices proposed here, safeguarding and case-management responsibilities remain with adults, and direct victim-perpetrator peer mediation is not the default response.

Developing such practices would also require consideration of institutional capacity and leadership responsibilities. Hallinger (2018) and Leithwood et al. (2020) emphasize the importance of context in educational leadership, suggesting the relevance of designated reporting contacts, clearly assigned staff responsibilities, and systematic follow-up procedures. However, the present survey did not collect institutional data on leadership practices, reporting systems, or implementation capacity. Khotimah et al. (2026) similarly highlight the need to examine school-climate frameworks within madrasah contexts. Future institutional assessments and prospective evaluations could therefore investigate how proposed protection practices are implemented and whether they are associated with changes in student-reported experiences, using clearly defined indicators.

Respectful communication can be connected to the prohibition of ridicule and offensive name-calling in Qur'an 49:11 and its discussion in *Tafsir Al-Mishbah* (Shihab, 2002). This ethical foundation supports an educational emphasis on *kalam thayyibah* through classroom discussion and everyday staff practice. Activities could address why demeaning language is harmful, how students can respond to it, and when adult assistance is needed. Such an approach brings moral instruction into dialogue with concrete protection and reporting arrangements; its effects would need to be evaluated in practice.

Malahati et al. (2022) reported both verbal and physical behaviors among madrasah ibtidaiyah pupils, providing a contextual comparison for the range of experiences described here. Differences in educational level, participants, and instruments limit direct numerical comparison. Nevertheless, attention to communication should be accompanied by attention to physical safety, social inclusion, and the practical accessibility of support within Islamic educational settings.

The findings are subject to several limitations. First, the survey records date from October 2022 and describe responses collected during that period rather than current conditions in the madrasahs. Second, recruitment procedures, the sampling frame, and invitation counts were unavailable, preventing assessment of sampling probabilities, response rates, and population representativeness. Incomplete institutional entries and one unresolved educational-level discrepancy further limit independent confirmation of eligibility for every submitted response. Age, gender, and grade-level information were not recorded, restricting demographic description and subgroup analysis. In addition, the perpetrator-category question was answered by respondents regardless of their self-identified victim status, while the available description does not establish whether the item required a response or permitted single or multiple selections. These limitations restrict interpretation of the survey response process and the generalizability of the findings. All 221 submitted records were retained for descriptive analysis, and no comparisons between schools were made.

D. CONCLUSION

Among the 221 submitted survey responses concerning madrasah tsanawiyah in Pidie Regency, 101 (45.7%) indicated self-identified bullying victimization. Classmates were the most frequently selected perpetrator category, followed by students from other classes and students in higher grades. Mockery or teasing was the most frequently reported negative interpersonal experience (89 respondents; 40.3%), while 113 respondents (51.1%) endorsed often calling friends by derogatory nicknames. In addition, 57 respondents (25.8%) endorsed at least one of the four physical-experience items.

The principal finding is the incomplete correspondence between general victim self-identification and endorsement of specific negative interpersonal experiences. Among respondents who did not identify themselves as bullying victims, 56 nevertheless endorsed at least one listed experience, while 11 respondents who identified themselves as victims endorsed none. These differences should not be interpreted as evidence that either reporting format accurately identifies bullying victimization, because the survey did not establish repetition or power imbalance. These findings contribute to understanding student-reported interpersonal experiences in madrasah settings and provide an empirical basis for strengthening attention to student protection, supportive school relationships, and respectful communication in child-friendly madrasah practices.

REFERENCES

- Adiananda, K., & Lestari, S. (2025). Peer support for bullying victims in junior high school. *INSPIRA: Indonesian Journal of Psychological Research*, 6(2), 119–130. <https://doi.org/10.32505/inspira.v6i2.13794>
- Ayuningbudi, F. H. W., & Hanami, Y. (2023). Bullying and social support in elementary school students: A qualitative study. *Psymphathic: Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi*, 10(2), 137–146. <https://doi.org/10.15575/psy.v10i2.29451>

- Bandura, A. (2002). Selective moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency. *Journal of Moral Education*, 31(2), 101–119. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0305724022014322>
- Borualogo, I. S., & Gumilang, E. (2019). Kasus perundungan anak di Jawa Barat: Temuan awal Children's Worlds Survey di Indonesia. *Psymphatic: Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi*, 6(1), 15–30. <https://doi.org/10.15575/psy.v6i1.4439>
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power* (J. B. Thompson, Ed.; G. Raymond & M. Adamson, Trans.). Harvard University Press.
- Bradshaw, C. P. (2015). Translating research to practice in bullying prevention. *American Psychologist*, 70(4), 322–332. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039114>
- Coloroso, B. (2003). *The bully, the bullied, and the bystander: From preschool to high school—how parents and teachers can help break the cycle of violence*. HarperResource.
- Corey, G. (2017). *Theory and practice of counseling and psychotherapy* (10th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Cornell, D., & Limber, S. P. (2015). Law and policy on the concept of bullying at school. *American Psychologist*, 70(4), 333–343. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038558>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Espelage, D. L., Polanin, J. R., & Low, S. K. (2014). Teacher and staff perceptions of school environment as predictors of student aggression, victimization, and willingness to intervene in bullying situations. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 29(3), 287–305. <https://doi.org/10.1037/spq0000072>
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2019). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (10th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Halimah, A., Khumas, A., & Zainuddin, K. (2015). Persepsi pada bystander terhadap intensitas bullying pada siswa SMP. *Jurnal Psikologi*, 42(2), 129–140. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jpsi.7168>
- Hallinger, P. (2018). Bringing context out of the shadows of leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 46(1), 5–24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143216670652>
- Iqbal, M., & Hamifah, U. (2024). Peran guru akidah akhlak dalam mengatasi perilaku bullying di MTsS Nurul Falah Kabupaten Aceh Barat. *Wathan: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Humaniora*, 1(2), 189–203. <https://doi.org/10.71153/wathan.v1i2.76>
- Khotimah, S. H., Dulyapit, A., Khotimah, H., Hamid, A. R. T., & Khasanah. (2026). School climate and bullying prevention in inclusive education: Implications for inclusive madrasahs. *TARBIYA: Journal of Education in Muslim Society*, 13(1), 41–56. <https://doi.org/10.15408/tjems.v13i1.50620>
- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(1), 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077>

- Malahati, F., Maemonah, M., & Jannati, P. (2022). Analisis aspek perilaku bullying peserta didik kelas VI Madrasah Ibtidaiyah menggunakan perspektif filsafat behaviorisme. *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan*, 22(3), 302–312. <https://doi.org/10.17509/jpp.v22i3.52845>
- Morrison, B. (2007). *Restoring safe school communities: A whole school response to bullying, violence and alienation*. Federation Press.
- Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do*. Blackwell.
- Orpinas, P., & Frankowski, R. (2001). The Aggression Scale: A self-report measure of aggressive behavior for young adolescents. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 21(1), 50–67. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431601021001003>
- Rigby, K. (2002). *New perspectives on bullying*. Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Rigby, K. (2014). How teachers address cases of bullying in schools: A comparison of five reactive approaches. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 30(4), 409–419. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02667363.2014.949629>
- Salmivalli, C. (2010). Bullying and the peer group: A review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 15(2), 112–120. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2009.08.007>
- Salmivalli, C. (2014). Participant roles in bullying: How can peer bystanders be utilized in interventions? *Theory Into Practice*, 53(4), 286–292. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2014.947222>
- Sellman, E. (2011). Peer mediation services for conflict resolution in schools: What transformations in activity characterise successful implementation? *British Educational Research Journal*, 37(1), 45–60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01411920903419992>
- Shihab, M. Q. (2002). *Tafsir Al-Mishbah: Pesan, kesan dan keserasian Al-Qur'an* (Vol. 13). Lentera Hati.
- Thornberg, R. (2018). School bullying and fitting into the peer landscape: A grounded theory field study. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 39(1), 144–158. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2017.1330680>