

Bullying, Aggression, and Human Development

SAMUEL E. EHRENREICH and MARION K. UNDERWOOD

Abstract

Children who are the victim of peer harassment are at increased risk for psychological maladjustment. Electronic forms of harassment via text messaging, the Internet, and social networking sites, often termed *cyberbullying*, have become increasingly common during the past several years. This essay presents current research that describes the predictors and outcomes of cyberbullying. Two features of electronic communication—permanence and anonymity—that present unique challenges when trying to understand and assess cyberbullying are discussed, and finally, recommendations are made for how to best examine how traditional forms of bullying and cyberbullying may be related to each other.

OVERVIEW

Children who engage in aggression and bullying are at risk for maladjustment: peer rejection, delinquency, substance abuse, and dropping out of school (Dodge, Coie, & Lynam, 2006). Being the target of peer aggression and bullying is correlated with internalizing symptoms including depression, anxiety, reduced self-worth (Hawker & Boulton, 2000), and academic failure (Nishna, Juvonen, & Witkow, 2005). Aggression and bullying may take the form of physical violence and may also include verbal or social aggression, behaviors that harm relationships, and social status (Underwood, 2003). In this digital age, aggression and bullying behaviors have moved beyond playgrounds and neighborhoods and now unfold in electronic communication and social media, a phenomenon often termed *cyberbullying*. This essay examines recent advances in our understanding of cyberbullying, future directions for research, and the challenges that cyberbullying poses for both the individuals involved in it and the researchers attempting to study it.

FOUNDATIONAL RESEARCH

Aggression is defined as behavior that is intended to injure or otherwise harm another person or persons (Dodge *et al.*, 2006). This is not only limited to physical harm but can also include behaviors intended to cause emotional or psychological distress, disrupt an individual's relationship and social status, or destroy their property. Bullying refers to a specific subset of aggressive behaviors that are (a) chronic and repetitive and (b) involve an imbalance of power between the aggressor and the target (Olweus, 1993; Pepler, Craig, Connolly, McMaster, & Jiang, 2006). A power differential between the aggressor and the victim is not limited to physical strength but can also occur through other characteristics that may make the victim less able to defend themselves or retaliate, such as lower social capital or popularity (Smith, Mahdavi, Carvalho, Fisher, Russell, & Tippett, 2008). Both of these features must be present for aggression to be considered bullying. Thus, neither a single instance of aggression nor aggressive acts exchanged between two individuals of equivalent strength or status would be considered bullying. Estimates of involvement in bullying as the perpetrator or victim range from 10% to 30% (Nansel *et al.*, 2001; Solberg & Olweus, 2003).

The term *cyberbullying* refers to bullying behaviors that are carried out over electronic forms of communication and media, such as email, cell phones and text messaging, web sites, or social networking sites (Smith *et al.*, 2008). Despite its fairly recent advent, cyberbullying has negative correlates and consequences for children. Being the victim of cyberbullying is correlated with reduced academic performance and concentration (Beran & Li, 2007), depression (Ybarra, 2004), and skipping school, detention, and bringing weapons to school (Ybarra, Diener-West, & Leaf, 2007). Youth report that cyberbullying is as painful and distressing as more traditional forms of bullying (Smith *et al.*, 2008). Indeed, several distinct features of cyberbullying may make cyberbullying even more distressing than traditional bullying (Mishna, Saini, & Solomon, 2009). One of the critical aspects of cyberbullying is how it extends aggressors reach beyond the schoolyard into victims' own homes. Although victims of traditional forms of bullying may seek refuge when the school day ends, children and adolescents may be subjected to cyberbullying day and night through email, text messages, and social networking sites. Furthermore, because it is nearly impossible to truly remove something once it has been posted on the Internet, children may be continuously subjected to the pain of a particular incident of cyberbullying far longer than in a more traditional, face-to-face encounter with an aggressor (Mishna *et al.*, 2009).

CUTTING-EDGE RESEARCH

Current studies examining prevalence rates of cyberbullying have varied greatly, ranging from 9% (Wolak, Mitchell, & Finkelhor, 2006) to as high as 72% (Juvonen & Gross, 2008). These discrepant findings are likely a result of unique definitions of cyberbullying, different methods of assessing it, and the different electronic media that are included when participants report their involvement as the perpetrator or victim of cyberbullying. Although specific prevalence rates vary greatly, there is growing evidence that involvement in cyberbullying (as either the perpetrator or victim) is more common than involvement with traditional forms of bullying and that a greater number of youth are involved as both the bully and the victim in electronic media than in traditional forms (Mishna *et al.*, 2012). Interestingly, although boys are more likely to be involved as the perpetrator or victim of traditional forms of bullying (Kumpulainen, Rasanen, & Henttonen, 1999), gender differences in boys' and girls' cyberbullying experiences have been mixed, with some studies reporting cyberbullying being more common among males (Li, 2006), whereas others have reported that cyberbullying is more often experienced by females (Mishna *et al.*, 2012).

Cyberbullying seems to be related to more traditional forms of bullying— as either victim or perpetrator. One study examining harassment on the social networking site Facebook found that bullying behavior at school was a significant predictor of bullying on Facebook ($\beta = 0.37, p < 0.01$), and being the victim of bullying at school also predicted victimization on Facebook ($\beta = 0.44, p < 0.01$; Kwan & Skoric, 2012). A large study of 4531 middle- and high-school students' involvement in both traditional and cyberbullying found that traditional bullying perpetration and victimization were moderate predictors of cyberbullying perpetration and victimization (respectively; Kowalski, Morgan, & Limber, 2012).

Finally, numerous studies have examined the negative outcomes associated with being the target of electronic forms of harassment. Several negative academic outcomes of cyberbullying have been identified, including decreases in grades (Beran & Li, 2007), as well as attendance and discipline problems (Ybarra *et al.*, 2007). Furthermore, being the victim of electronic harassment has been shown to be correlated with psychosocial problems, including depression (Didden *et al.*, 2009) and social anxiety (Juvonen & Gross, 2008), suggesting that the negative outcomes associated with cyberbullying are similar to those of traditional forms of bullying (Tokunaga, 2010). Although these foundational studies have increased our understanding of this rapidly developing phenomenon, several key questions have yet to be answered. Understanding the relationship dynamics through which cyberbullying

unfolds will require researchers to address conceptual questions and employ more sophisticated methodologies.

ISSUES ARISING OUT OF CURRENT RESEARCH AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Perhaps the most challenging issue for investigators of cyberbullying is identifying exactly how it corresponds to traditional bullying. The difficulty in drawing a connection between traditional bullying and cyberbullying is largely definitional. The challenge lies in the fact that bullying is distinguished from aggressive behavior in general when it is (a) chronic or repetitive and (b) involves an imbalance of power. Translating these two features into virtual environments has proved to be conceptually difficult owing to the general permanence of electronic communication and the role of anonymity. The very nature of electronic communication facilitates a level of permanence that is not present in traditional bullying. A verbal or physical confrontation in a school hallway would need to be repeated over time to qualify as chronic and be labeled bullying. In contrast a denigrating picture or comment posted on the Internet, a single time can remain permanently. Furthermore, because electronic communication involves such a vast audience and digital content can be so easily stored by third parties, even if a post is taken down the target can never be sure that the harassment is finished completely. The fact that negative content may remain indefinitely challenges the traditional concept of recurrent and repetitive.

Perhaps even more disturbing than the fact that aggression posted or sent electronically cannot be easily removed is the notion that there may be nowhere for a child to escape this harassment. With the increasing popularity of cell phones and smartphones (Lenhart, 2012), adolescents and even younger children are rarely able to effectively restrict their tormentor's access to them. The ability to attack someone throughout the school day, and also during their job, after-school activities or at home provides a new meaning for the "chronic" nature of bullying (Mishna *et al.*, 2009). The inherent permanence and extensive reach of digital harassment is recognized by children themselves; one young adolescent called it *nonstop bullying* (Mishna *et al.*, 2009, p. 1224).

Another feature of traditional bullying that is difficult to extend into virtual forms of harassment is the imbalance of power. When research on bullying was generally restricted to physical and overt forms of aggression (e.g., Olweus, 1993), the concept of a power imbalance generally referred to physical strength. As new forms of aggression entered the research field (e.g., social and indirect), the notion of a power imbalance expanded to include a variety of forms of power, such as popularity, social competence, or wealth.

However, in a virtual world, the most powerful asset may be anonymity, an asset that is equally available to nearly any cyber-attacker. Not knowing who is harassing an individual increases the sense of powerlessness that they may feel (Vandenbosch & Van Cleemput, 2008). The role of anonymity in electronic forms of harassment has been somewhat paradoxical. Although many studies have reported that victims often do not know who their attacker is (Raskauskas & Stoltz, 2007; Smith *et al.*, 2008), some qualitative studies have reported that children will report that not knowing who is the attacker can be one of the more distressing aspects of cyberbullying, while at the same time claiming to generally know who the individuals are (Mishna *et al.*, 2009). Given how easily individuals can operate anonymously in the virtual world, essentially anyone on the Internet has access to a position of elevated power to harass others and simultaneously a diminished ability to defend themselves. Even when children do know who their attacker is, they often feel there is little that they can do to defend themselves. One of the primary reasons identified for not telling adults when cyberbullying occurs is the belief that nothing can be done to stop a cyberbully (Mishna *et al.*, 2009).

Given the chronic nature of virtual harassment due to the inherent permanence of electronic communication and inability for victims to defend themselves (even in the instances that they know whom the attacker is), it stands to reason that nearly any aggressive act expressed electronically could be classified as cyberbullying. This poses the question of whether cyberbullying is indeed a unique form of bullying or has cyberbullying inadvertently subsumed a vast portion of all aggression exchanged via electronic communication? Is a single aggressive post or message enough to warrant cyberbullying based solely on the fact that it is anonymous and can remain in the virtual environment indefinitely? How cyberbullying is conceptually related to the traditional construct of bullying—and how it is unique from it—will likely remain a key issue going forward for future research. Recent examinations have attempted to assess children's own perceptions of how cyberbullying and traditional forms of bullying may be related with mixed results. A series of confirmatory and exploratory factor analyses examining adolescents' involvement in social, verbal, physical, and cyber-types of bullying found that although adolescents did distinguish whether they were the bully or victim, they did not distinguish the type of bullying that was reported (Law, Shapka, Hymel, Olson, & Waterhouse, 2012). This may be due to the fact that some of the types of bullying presented to participants in this study could indeed overlap (e.g., the same behavior could be classified as social aggression and cyberbullying). To reduce any overlap between constructs, Ybarra, Boyd, Korchmaros, and Oppenheim (2012) propose examining cyberbullying as a unique mode of bullying, instead of a distinct type. Instead of attempting to distinguish cyberbullying from other types of

bullying behaviors (e.g., social aggression, verbal aggression), researchers should view cyberbullying and traditional bullying as two distinct modes (i.e., online vs in-person) in which any of these types of aggressive behavior can occur. Future research that examines cyberbullying as a mode for expressing a variety of types of aggression will enhance our understanding of how aggression is manifested in virtual environments and at the same time improve prevalence estimates by ensuring that the same behaviors are not double counted (Ybarra *et al.*, 2012).

It is also important to remember that at its core, bullying is a dysfunctional relationship characterized by ongoing harassment from a more powerful individual toward a less powerful target. In this way, bullying is an inherently dyadic experience (Pepler *et al.*, 2006). Although current research has found that involvement in traditional bullying correlates with involvement in cyberbullying (Beran & Li, 2007; Kowalski *et al.*, 2012; Kwan & Skoric, 2012), future research must examine cyberbullying nested within relationships that may exist in both the physical and virtual world. Is it the case that children and adolescents' tormenters from school or the playground are following them into the virtual environment and continuing their harassment in this new venue, or perhaps the characteristics that may make children targets for face-to-face bullying and aggression are somehow being translated into their electronic interactions? Few studies have specifically examined if on- and offline harassment is being perpetrated by the same individual toward the same target. One of the few studies that has looked at this found that youth were more likely to be distressed by electronic harassment when it was perpetrated by the same individual who was bullying them at school (Ybarra *et al.*, 2007). Answering these questions will require investigating how children and adolescents' specific experiences with face-to-face bullying and aggression are related to their involvement as both the perpetrator and the victim in cyberbullying episodes.

The studies presented earlier provide evidence that on- and offline harassment are related; however, explaining the dynamics of this relation will require more rigorous methods, such as longitudinal and observational designs. The development of increasingly stringent methods for studying traditional bullying over the past several decades should provide a roadmap for how to proceed in virtual environments. Despite the previously established risk of underestimation when asking children and adolescents about their own perpetration of traditional bullying (Espelage & Swearer, 2003; Ladd & Kochenderfer-Ladd, 2002), every study mentioned in this essay relied exclusively on self-reported measures of cyberbullying. Just as naturalistic observation was critically important in establishing a more complete understanding of the dynamics of traditional bullying (Craig & Pepler, 1998; Olweus, 1993), direct observation of online aggression and how

it relates to offline relationships and adjustment will allow researchers to better understand how youth's on- and offline experiences are related. The call to directly observe youth's electronic aggression and tie these interactions to their real-world relationships is not made lightly. The anonymity that makes electronic forms of communication so ideal for children and adolescence to harass their peers with impunity makes researchers' efforts to observe these behaviors all the more challenging. Furthermore, youths' ever-changing consumption habits for electronic forms of communication make this task even more daunting, as the preferred electronic media adapt to technological advances. Although observing the overlap between the physical world and the virtual world is a difficult endeavor, promising research designs attempting to accomplish this have been developed (e.g., Underwood, Rosen, More, Ehrenreich, & Gentsch, 2012).

CONCLUSION

Substantial evidence suggests that similar to traditional forms of face-to-face aggression and bullying, involvement in aggression via electronic forms of communication is associated with academic and psychosocial maladjustment (Tokunaga, 2010; Ybarra *et al.*, 2007). Children's electronic interactions are largely grounded within a real-world context, and ignoring this fact risks presenting cyberbullying as an isolated and overly simplistic phenomena. More fully understanding the mechanisms and interconnections between traditional and cyberbullying is a critical next step in understanding how these behaviors develop and creating effective intervention strategies to reduce them.

REFERENCES

- Beran, T., & Li, Q. (2007). The relationship between cyberbullying and school bullying. *Journal of Student Wellbeing, 1*, 15–33.
- Craig, W. M., & Pepler, D. J. (1998). Observation of bullying and victimization in the school yard. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology, 13*, 41–59.
- Didden, R., Scholte, R. H. J., Korzilius, H., De Moor, J. M. H., Vermeulen, A., O'Reilly, M., ... , Lancioni, G. E. (2009). Cyberbullying among students with intellectual and developmental disability in special education settings. *Developmental Neurorehabilitation, 12*, 146–151.
- Dodge, K. A., Coie, J. D., & Lynam, D. (2006). Aggression and antisocial behavior in youth. In W. Damon, R. M. Lerner & N. Eisenberg (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology, vol. 3: Social, emotional, and personality development* (6th ed., pp. 719–788). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

- Espelage, D. L., & Swearer, S. M. (2003). Research on school bullying and victimization: What have we learned and where do we go from here? *School Psychology Review, 32*, 365–383.
- Hawker, D. S. J., & Boulton, M. J. (2000). Twenty years' research on peer victimization and psychosocial maladjustment: A meta-analytic review of cross-sectional studies. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 41*, 441–455.
- Juvonen, J., & Gross, E. F. (2008). Extending the school playgrounds?—Bullying experiences in cyberspace. *Journal of School Health, 78*, 496–505.
- Kowalski, R. M., Morgan, C. A., & Limber, S. P. (2012). Traditional bullying as a potential warning sign of cyberbullying. *School Psychology International, 33*, 505–519. doi:10.1177/0143034312445244
- Kumpulainen, L., Rasanen, E., & Henttonen, I. (1999). Children involved in bullying: Psychological disturbance and the persistence of the involvement. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 23*, 1253–1262.
- Kwan, G. C. E. & Skoric, M. M. (2012). Facebook bullying: An extension of battles in school. *Computers in Human Behavior, 29*, doi:10.1016/j.chb.2012.07.014
- Ladd, G. W., & Kochenderfer-Ladd, B. (2002). Identifying victims of peer aggression from early to middle childhood: Analysis of cross-informant data for concordance, estimation of relational adjustment, prevalence of victimization, and characteristics of identified victims. *Psychological Assessment, 14*, 74–96.
- Law, D. M., Shapka, J. D., Hymel, S., Olson, B. F., & Waterhouse, T. (2012). The changing face of bullying: An empirical comparison between traditional and internet bullying and victimization. *Computers in Human Behavior, 28*, 226–232. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2011.09.004
- Lenhart, A. (2012). *Teens, Smartphones & Texting*. <http://pewinternet.org/Reports/2012/Teens-and-smartphones.aspx> (accessed 10 July 2012).
- Li, Q. (2006). Cyberbullying in schools: A research of gender differences. *School Psychology International, 27*, 157–170.
- Mishna, F., Khoury-Kassabri, M., Gadalla, T., & Daciuk, J. (2012). Risk factors for involvement in cyber bullying: Victims, bullies and bully-victims. *Children and Youth Services Review, 34*, 63–70. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2011.08.032
- Mishna, F., Saini, M., & Solomon, S. (2009). Ongoing and online: Children and youth's perceptions of cyber bullying. *Children and Youth Services Review, 31*, 1222–1228. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2009.05.004
- Nansel, T. R., Overpeck, M., Pilla, R. S., Ruan, J., Simons-Morton, B., & Scheidt, P. (2001). Bullying behaviors among U.S. youth: Prevalence and association with psychosocial adjustment. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 285*, 2094–2100.
- Nishna, A., Juvonen, J., & Witkow, M. R. (2005). Sticks and stones may break my bones, but names will make me feel sick: the psychosocial, somatic, and scholastic consequences of peer harassment. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 34*, 37–48.
- Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

- Pepler, D. J., Craig, W. M., Connolly, J. A., McMaster, L., & Jiang, D. (2006). A developmental perspective on bullying. *Aggressive Behavior, 32*, 376–384. doi:10.1002/ab.20136
- Raskauskas, J., & Stoltz, A. D. (2007). Involvement in traditional and electronic bullying among adolescents. *Developmental Psychology, 43*, 564–575. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.43.3.564
- Smith, P. K., Mahdavi, J., Carvalho, M., Fisher, S., Russell, S. & Tippett, N. (2008). Cyberbullying: its nature and impact in secondary school pupils. *The Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 49*, 346–385. doi:10.1111/j.1469-7610.2007.01846.x
- Solberg, M. E., & Olweus, D. (2003). Prevalence estimation of school bullying with the Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire. *Aggressive Behavior, 29*, 239–268.
- Tokunaga, R. S. (2010). Following you home from school: A critical review and synthesis of research on cyberbullying victimization. *Computers in Human Behavior, 26*, 277–287. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2009.11.014
- Underwood, M. K. (2003). *Social aggression among girls*. New York, NY: Guilford.
- Underwood, M. K., Rosen, L. H., More, D., Ehrenreich, S. E., & Gentsch, J. K. (2012). The BlackBerry project: Capturing the content of adolescents' text messaging. *Developmental Psychology, 48*, 295–302.
- Vandenbosch, H., & Van Cleemput, K. (2008). Defining cyberbullying: A qualitative research into the perceptions of youngsters. *CyberPsychology & Behavior, 11*, 499–503. doi:10.1089/cpb.2007.0042
- Wolak, J., Mitchell, K. J., & Finkelhor, D. (2006). *Online victimization of youth: 5 years later*. Alexandria, VA: National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.
- Ybarra, M. L. (2004). Linkages between depressive symptomatology and Internet harassment among young regular Internet users. *CyberPsychology & Behavior, 7*, 247–257.
- Ybarra, M. J., boyd, d., Korchmaros, J. D., & Oppenheim, J. (2012). Defining and measuring cyberbullying within the larger context of bullying victimization. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 51*, 53–58. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2011.12.031
- Ybarra, M. L., Diener-West, M., & Leaf, P. J. (2007). Examining the overlap in Internet harassment and school bullying: implications for school intervention. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 41*, S42–S50. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2007.09.004

FURTHER READING

- Kowalski, R. M., Morgan, C. A., & Limber, S. P. (2012). Traditional bullying as a potential warning sign of cyberbullying. *School Psychology International, 33*, 505–519. doi:10.1177/0143034312445244
- Mishna, F., Khoury-Kassabri, M., Gadalla, T., & Daciuk, J. (2012). Risk factors for involvement in cyber bullying: Victims, bullies and bully-victims. *Children and Youth Services Review, 34*, 63–70. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2011.08.032
- Ybarra, M. J., boyd, d., Korchmaros, J. D., & Oppenheim, J. (2012). Defining and measuring cyberbullying within the larger context of bullying victimization. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 51*, 53–58. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2011.12.031

SAMUEL E. EHRENREICH SHORT BIOGRAPHY

Samuel E. Ehrenreich earned his PhD from The University of Texas at Dallas in 2012 and he is currently a postdoctoral research fellow examining how peer interaction relates to involvement with antisocial behavior. Dr Ehrenreich is particularly interested in how adolescent and young adults' communication with peers via text messaging and Facebook reinforces antisocial behavior.

MARION K. UNDERWOOD SHORT BIOGRAPHY

Marion K. Underwood is an Ashbel Smith Professor of Psychological Sciences in the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences at the University of Texas at Dallas. She earned her undergraduate degree from Wellesley College and her doctoral degree in clinical psychology from Duke University in 1991. She began her faculty career at Reed College in Portland, Oregon, and moved to the University of Texas at Dallas in 1998. Dr Underwood's research examines anger, aggression, and gender, with special attention to the development of social aggression. Dr Underwood's work has been published in numerous scientific journals and her research program has been supported by the National Institutes of Health since 1995. In 2003, she authored a book, *Social Aggression among Girls*. She and her research group have been conducting a longitudinal study of origins and outcomes of social aggression and before participants began their ninth grade year, all were given BlackBerry devices configured to capture the content of their electronic communication to a secure archive: text messaging, instant messaging, and email.

RELATED ESSAYS

Political Conflict and Youth: A Long-Term View (*Psychology*), Brian K. Barber
 Aggression and Victimization (*Psychology*), Sheri Bauman and Aryn Taylor
 A Social Psychological Approach to Racializing Wealth Inequality (*Sociology*), Joey Brown

Sibling Relationships and Development (*Psychology*), Nicole Campione-Barr and Sarah Killoren

Stereotype Content (*Sociology*), Beatrice H. Capetany and Lasana T. Harris
 Restoring Racial Justice (*Psychology*), Fania E. Davis *et al.*

Diversity in Groups (*Sociology*), Catarina R. Fernandes and Jeffrey T. Polzer
 Micro-Cultures (*Sociology*), Gary Alan Fine

Cognitive Processes Involved in Stereotyping (*Psychology*), Susan T. Fiske and Cydney H. Dupree

Empathy Gaps between Helpers and Help-Seekers: Implications for Cooperation (*Psychology*), Vanessa K. Bohns and Francis J. Flynn

- Controlling the Influence of Stereotypes on One's Thoughts (*Psychology*),
Patrick S. Forscher and Patricia G. Devine
- Ethnic Enclaves (*Sociology*), Steven J. Gold
- The Development of Social Trust (*Psychology*), Vikram K. Jaswal and Marissa
B. Drell
- Reconciliation and Peace-Making: Insights from Studies on Nonhuman
Animals (*Anthropology*), Sonja E. Koski
- Immigration and the Changing Status of Asian Americans (*Sociology*),
Jennifer Lee
- Emotion and Intergroup Relations (*Psychology*), Diane M. Mackie *et al.*
- Immigrant Sociocultural Adaptation, Identification, and Belonging (*Sociol-
ogy*), Sarah J. Mahler
- Latinos and the Color Line (*Sociology*), Clara E. Rodríguez *et al.*
- Regulation of Emotions Under Stress (*Psychology*), Amanda J. Shallcross
et al.
- Bringing the Study of Street Gangs Back into the Mainstream (*Sociology*),
James F. Short, Jr. and Lorine A. Hughes
- Emotion Regulation (*Psychology*), Páree Zarolia *et al.*