

“Everyday” Violence

Some types of interpersonal violence, including both verbal and psychological violence, are so pervasive that we have learned to tolerate, even accept, them to such a degree that we are almost habituated to their presence. Thus, some types of violence have in effect become part of our everyday lives. Sabo et al. (2014) use the term “everyday violence” in the context of acts of violence which have become normalised in the lives of those who are exposed to and experience such acts. This “everyday” violence, or *low-level aggression* to use Goldstein’s (2002) terminology, may take the form of interpersonal violence and will be discussed here in the context of bullying, road rage, violence and sport, violence towards animals, and corporal punishment of children.

It should be stated emphatically at the outset that the terms “low-level” and “everyday” are not used here in a pejorative sense, as if seeking to minimise the harm which such behaviour can cause. Indeed, as Jay (2009) notes with reference to verbal aggression, “Harms experienced by victims of hateful speech . . . include psychological and physiological symptoms similar to post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD): panic, fear, anxiety, nightmares, intrusive thoughts of intimidation and denigration” (p. 83).

We begin consideration of everyday violence by looking at bullying in its various forms and the settings in which it can take place.

Bullying

The behaviour of the group in preying on an individual is by no means exclusive to humans. In the wider animal kingdom there is the phenomenon of *mobbing*, as described by Lorenz (1966), which is a behaviour which occurs when large

The Psychology of Interpersonal Violence, First Edition. Clive R. Hollin.
© 2016 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. Published 2016 by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

numbers of a species group together, or *mob*, to target an individual animal. For example, mobbing is seen when large numbers of birds incessantly harry a predator in order to protect their young. This behaviour may be highly specialised to the extent that some birds, such as gulls and crows which breed in colonies, have specific mobbing calls which carry over long distances to summon assistance when a predator has been observed. It is arguable from an evolutionary perspective that bullying is a human form of mobbing and, indeed, the term is sometimes used in this context within the bullying literature (e.g., Shallcross, Sheehan, & Ramsay, 2008). In keeping with this perspective, Salmivalli (2010) suggests that human bullying is a group activity, involving a group of people, such as a peer group or a school class, ill-treating an individual.

There is a substantial literature given to the topic of bullying in humans, ranging through issues of definition, theoretical understanding, psychological factors, and prevention (Hansen, Steenberg, Palic, & Elklit, 2012; Olweus, 2013; Smith & Jones, 2012). The types of behaviour that are generally classed as bullying fall into several broad categories. The distinction has been drawn between direct and indirect forms of bullying (Carbone-Lopez, Esbensen, & Brick, 2010; Card, Stucky, Sawalani, & Little, 2008). *Direct bullying* is characterised by physical and verbal violence, typically pushing and hitting, name-calling, and threats of physical violence. On the other hand, *indirect bullying* is psychological rather than physical in nature: the aim is often to set the victim apart from their peers, typically by spreading stories and starting rumours, so souring their social relationships. Indirect bullying is also referred to as *relational bullying*, a contemporary form of which has become known as *cyberbullying* (Campbell, 2005).

No matter what form it takes, there is a general consensus regarding the defining characteristics of bullying. First, there is intent, such that the aggressor means to inflict harm on another person through their actions. Second, the aggressive behaviour is not an isolated event but occurs repetitively over a period of weeks, months, or even longer. Third, the bullying is directed against a vulnerable individual who is unable to defend him or herself against the aggressor's actions.

The obvious place for bullying to take place is where substantial numbers of people consistently gather for reasonably long periods of time. In the case of children and adolescents this place is likely to be their school, while for adults it may be their workplace.

Bullying at School

Hopkins, Taylor, Bowen, and Wood (2013) have shown that the defining features of bullying as described above are clearly understood by children. Hopkins et al. asked a sample of male and female school pupils, aged from 11 to 17 years, about their understanding of terms such as aggression, bullying, and violence. They found that the pupils understood the terms in the same way as they are used in the research literature. This finding indicates a good level of correspondence between the

research literature and pupils' experiences: this suggests, in turn, that the research has a reasonable level of validity. The diversity of the research into bullying very much suggests that it is an issue with no respect for international boundaries (e.g., Mlisa, Ward, Flisher, & Lombard, 2008; Olweus, 2011; Wang, Iannotti, Tonja, & Nansel, 2009; Wolke, Woods, Bloomfield, & Karstadt, 2000). This point is reinforced by the findings of Due et al. (2005), who conducted a large-scale survey of the prevalence of bullying, with a sample averaging over 4,000 11–15-year-old school pupils per country, across 28 Western industrialised countries. They found that 18% of the boys and 15% of the girls reported being bullied during their current school term.

It is evident that levels of bullying vary from school to school and over time within the same school and may occur in various contexts, including school sports (Steinfeldt, Vaughan, LaFollette, & Steinfeldt, 2012). This naturally occurring pattern may be a result of the changes in pupils, both individually and in terms of school entrants and leavers, that occur over time. Alternatively, it may be that there is something about the qualities of a school at a given time that make bullying more or less likely to occur. What are the qualities of the individual pupil and the school environment that are instrumental in bringing about bullying?

School bullies

It is tempting to think in terms of a dichotomy, categorising children as either bullies or victims. In fact there are three types of children with regard to bullying: (1) children who are bullies; (2) children who are victimised by bullies; (3) children who are both bullies and victims. This three-way divide is clearly seen in a study of bullying in a large sample of primary school children (aged 6–9 years) reported by Wolke et al. (2000). They reported that 4.3% of the children were bullies, 39.8% were victims of bullying, and 10.2% were frequently both bullied and victimised.

Wang et al. (2009) noted some gender variations in patterns of bullying. The boys in their study were more likely to be involved in direct physical or verbal bullying, while the girls were more likely to take part in relational bullying. This finding is in keeping with the general finding that boys are more involved in direct bullying, while girls are more likely to be involved in indirect bullying (Bjorkqvist, 1994; Crapanzano, Frick, & Terranova, 2010; Pepler, Craig, Yuile, & Connolly, 2004). Wang et al. also noted that the pupils' level of social behaviour was associated with bullying. Those pupils who had a high number of friends were more likely to be involved in bullying and correspondingly less likely to be victimised. A combination of individual characteristics, such as low levels of depression and high self-esteem, alongside engagement at school and an emotionally supportive family, may increase a child's resilience to bullying (Sapouna & Wolke, 2013; Ttofi, Bowes, Farrington, & Lösel, 2014).

The question of what rewards bullying has been addressed in several studies, leading to the identification of three main goals: (1) to be accepted by the wider social group; (2) as a means of gaining social status; (3) as a means of countering

perceived provocation from the victims (Wilton & Campbell, 2011). It is apparent that these reasons for bullying all have a social dimension, in keeping with the view that school bullying is essentially a group activity (e.g., Goldstein, 2002). Further, bullies may seize on some characteristic of the victim, such as their race, sexuality, or a chronic health problem, which defines them as a member of a minority group within the school (Rivers, 2001; Scherr & Lawson, 2010; Sentenac et al., 2011; Swearer, Turner, Givens, & Pollock, 2008). The act of bullying may therefore be seen as a complex social act involving not only the bullies and their victims but also other members of the social group who may variously act as bystanders, facilitators, challengers of the bullying, or supporters of the victim.

The psychology of the bully

Farrington and Baldry (2010) have reviewed a range of risk factors for school bullying encompassing behavioural, individual, family, and socio-economic factors. They reported several risk factors, as variously noted by peers, teachers, the children's mothers, direct measurement, and archival records (in some cases these sources were combined to identify a risk factor), that distinguished bullies and non-bullies at ages 8–10 years. In terms of behavioural differences the bullies showed higher levels of troublesome and antisocial behaviour than their non-bullying peers. Farrington and Baldry note that alongside low empathy, hyperactivity, low verbal IQ, and low school attainment, some bullies also have low self-esteem. However, perhaps contrary to stereotype, the smaller boys were the more aggressive so that male bullies were physically shorter and weighed less than non-bullies. Farrington and Baldry also noted that a convicted parent was a family factor which distinguished bullies from non-bullies. Lereya, Samara, and Wolke (2013) found that for children involved in bullying, including children who bully, victims of bullying and bully/victims were more likely to be experience negative parenting including both abuse and neglect.

The evidence on the popularity of bullies is mixed, with some studies suggesting that bullies are popular with their peers (although not their victims) while other studies find that bullies are unpopular. This discrepancy may, in part at least, be explicable in terms of methodology: self-report studies tend to find that bullies perceive themselves as popular, while studies employing peer ratings of popularity tend to suggest that bullies are unpopular. However, not all bullies enjoy high levels of psychological adjustment, as seen by their adverse levels of self-esteem and enjoyment of life and heightened feelings of stress (Estévez, Murgui, & Musitu, 2009).

As with the aetiology of aggression and violence generally, there are interactions between individual and social factors that culminate specifically in bullying. It is not surprising therefore that there is considerable overlap between the factors that predict violence and bullying. While bullying is widespread it is not equally distributed across schools. There are some schools where there is a high frequency of bullying and other schools which are free from bullying. It is possible that this

variation may be explained by variations in pupils across schools, but it may also be explicable by considering environmental variables. A body of research has therefore looked at whether there are any characteristics common to those schools where bullying takes place.

Bullying schools

In seeking to understand the role of the school environment with regard to the risk of bullying the notion of *school climate* has received attention (Stewart, 2003). However, as Steffgen, Recchia, and Viechtbauer (2013) point out, the term "school climate" is difficult to define and in practice may encompass a wide range of factors. Thus, school climate may relate among others to the level and type of interpersonal relationships between teachers and students, the degree of students' positive or negative attachment to the school and their perceptions of threat and feelings of fear, and to school security and management.

Steffgen, Recchia, and Viechtbauer (2013) conducted a meta-analysis of 36 studies investigating the relationship between perception of school climate and actual levels of school violence. They reported a moderate and negative effect size ($r = -.26$) indicating that as one variable changes so the other tends to shift in the opposite direction. The important question is: What moderates this effect? What are the characteristics of the pupils and the schools which are associated with the degree of bullying? Steffgen et al. found that their analyses were unable to provide an exact answer to this question: they suggest that the diversity of measures of both school climate and violence worked against their finding strong conclusions.

An American study reported by Zaykowski and Gunter (2012) utilised data from the Delaware School Survey to investigate the relationship between school climate and incidents involving serious violence such as those involving weapons, and minor acts of violence including verbal abuse, threats, and bullying. For the less serious incidents, the overall probability of victimisation varied across schools, with greater explanatory power accorded to the individual rather than the school variables. However, Zaykowski and Gunter reported that racial minorities were at a greater risk of victimisation compared to white non-Hispanic students and that rates of victimisation were higher overall in schools where the pupils were mainly white. School climate variables did not impact at the level of minor victimisation.

Atria, Strohmeier, and Spiel (2007) make the point that when looking at rates of school bullying the unit of analysis is typically at the level of the whole school. This approach, they suggest, neglects the possibility that bullying may vary significantly across classes *within* the same school. If bullying is seen in terms of group behaviour then it not unreasonable to assume that classroom dynamics will vary across the same school and so the prevalence of classroom bullying will vary accordingly. Atria et al. investigated this possibility by asking pupils of different ages attending a range of schools in Austria to report any instances of bullying which they had experienced.

When the data were considered at school level, Atria et al. found rates of bullying which ranged between 5.4% and 12.8% for physical bullying, from 4.4% to 26.4% for verbal bullying, and from 6.2% to 11.7% for bullying as globally defined. As Atria et al. note, these figures for the whole school are what would be anticipated when set against the extant literature. However, when the unit of analysis shifted to the classroom a high variability of bullying became apparent, ranging from no bullying in some classes to 54.5% in the highest instance.

It is not clear why this variability across classes occurs, although there is a variety of potential explanations. At the group level, taking the classroom as the group, there may be variations in group cohesion or competitiveness which, in turn, may depend upon the pupil mix within the classroom. The behaviour of the teachers with regard to bullying is also potentially important both with regard to classroom management and teachers’ relationships with parents. Indeed, an American study reported by Brown, Aalsma, and Ott (2013) found that when parents approached schools with concerns about their child being bullied they were on occasions met with resistance from the school. Brown et al. make the comment that “Our data suggest that all but one parent believed their child’s victimization would continue even though they followed through in reporting bullying to their youth’s school officials” (p. 513).

Bullying in the Workplace

The same types of bullying as found in schools—i.e., direct bullying, indirect (including relational) bullying, and cyberbullying—are evident in the workplace. Similarly, workplace bullying is also characterised by *intent*, *repetition*, and a *power imbalance* between the aggressor and their vulnerable victim. As with bullying in the classroom, it is impossible to say with any degree of certainty just how frequently workplace bullying occurs. There is ample evidence from surveys, however, to suggest that this manifestation of bullying is common across a range of professions and types of organisation (e.g., Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf, & Cooper, 2003; Sanner-Stiehr & Ward-Smith, 2103; Zapf, Einarsen, Hoel, & Vartia, 2003).

Samnani and Singh (2012) offer a succinct summary of the behaviours that constitute workplace bullying:

These behaviors range from subtle acts such as gossip, personal jokes, withholding critical information, and ostracism (i.e., giving the silent treatment) to overt acts, such as insults, being told to quit one’s job, and violence. The behaviors also range from work-related acts such as excessive workloads, criticism of work, and excessive monitoring of work to person-related forms such as belittling, personal jokes, and aggression. (p. 582)

Lutgen-Sandvik and Tracy (2012) are in agreement with Samnani and Singh and suggest that bullying in this context has multiple victims: “Workplace bullying is a toxic combination of unrelenting emotional abuse, social ostracism, interactional

Box 2.1 Categories of Workplace Bullying

- 1 Open "*calling out*" of the target because they are in some way different to the majority, or not part of the in-group because of previous instances of bullying.
- 2 "*Scapegoating*" to draw attention to the target, and sometimes away from the bully, to account for a failure: this behaviour may pose a threat to the scapegoat's professional standing.
- 3 *Sexual harassment* by an individual with greater power or a higher position in the organisational hierarchy (this form of bullying may be either within or between genders).
- 4 *Increasing work pressure and workload* by imposing, for example, impossible deadlines for completion of tasks and overloading with work compared to others in the workplace with accompanying threats if the work is not completed on time.
- 5 *Isolating* the targeted by denying them access to opportunities for advancement, or withholding the information necessary for doing a good job, or physically moving them away from other workers.
- 6 "*Destabilisation*" by not giving credit when earned, setting the target up to fail at impossible tasks and then continually reminding them of their failures.
- 7 *Verbal and physical aggression* towards the target.

Source: After Harvey et al., 2006.

terrorizing, and other destructive communication that erodes organizational health and damages employee well-being" (p. 5). As shown in Box 2.1, Harvey, Heames, Richey, and Leonard (2006) add more detail in classifying the bullying acts found in the workplace into seven types.

The different bullying tactics shown in Box 2.1 may be carried out in combination so that the victim experiences two or more types of bullying. Harvey et al. (2006) address the issue of whether workplace bullies graduate from the schoolyard to the boardroom. They note that there are many similarities between bullying in these two different environments—in relation to the characteristics of the organisation, the bully, and the victim—all of which suggests a continuum of behaviour across settings. If aggression is a stable aspect of an individual's behaviour which is likely to emerge given appropriate environmental conditions this proposal makes perfect sense. As discussed below, there are several empirical longer-term investigations which provide support for the temporal continuity of the aggressive behaviours that constitute bullying.

Sexual harassment in the workplace is bullying which uses sex-related behaviours. This sexualised bullying is typically carried out by the victim's supervisor or a co-worker (although the bully may be an individual such as a customer) which is

viewed by the victim as unwanted and threatening. Fitzgerald, Gelfand, and Drasgow (1995) suggest that sexual harassment may occur in one of three forms: (1) *gender harassment*, which encompasses behaviours, both verbal and nonverbal, such as sexual taunting, insults and gestures, and comments about appearance, alongside the overt display of pornography, which may be hostile as well as insulting and degrading; (2) *unwanted sexual attention*, which may be intended to initiate sexual co-operation and take the form of unwanted physical contact or persistent requests for a date; (3) *sexual coercion*, which occurs when the harassment and attention are combined with threats or bribes associated with workplace performance and rewards such as promotion.

In their review of the research literature on workplace bullying, Samnani and Singh (2012) distinguish four levels at which bullying may occur: these four are (1) individual level; (2) group level; (3) organisational level; and (4) societal level. This approach to organising the literature is helpful in considering what is known about both bullies and victims.

Individual

As with the majority of instances of aggressive and violent behaviour, most bullying, including workplace bullying, is carried out by men. Women may be more likely to be the victims of bullying (Salin, 2003) particularly sexual harassment (McLaughlin, Uggen, & Blackstone, 2012). Those members of the workforce who are in the minority, typically a racial minority, are also at an increased risk of victimisation: a state of affairs that appears to be as likely in locations as diverse as South Wales (Lewis & Gunn, 2007) and Illinois (Fox & Stallworth, 2005).

Are there any personality characteristics which are particularly related to bullying? A Canadian study reported by Linton and Power (2013) found an overlap between the personalities of bullies and victims, “The majority of bully-typifying traits (Machiavellianism, narcissism, psychoticism, and the aggression measures) were associated with being a victim” (p. 741). This finding reinforces the point that regardless of context it is often difficult to separate aggressors and victims into neat categories. Parenthetically, in hierarchical organisations bullying may pass up and down the managerial chain of command. Thus, individual employees may be bullied by those in higher positions of authority while they, in turn, bully individuals below them in the managerial pecking order. Yet further, those individuals who work at a high rate, so called *workaholics*, may be more likely to become involved in interpersonal conflicts that escalate into aggressive encounters with colleagues and with supervisees (Balducci, Cecchin, Fraccaroli, & Schaufeli, 2012).

An Australian study reported by Jenkins, Zapf, Winefield, and Sarris (2012) carried out interviews (telephone and face-to-face) with 24 managers from a range of types of organisation all of whom had been accused of bullying those they were responsible for managing. In keeping with the blurring of the division between bully and victim, Jenkins et al. note that two-thirds of the managers said that they were

themselves being bullied. This managerial bullying came from either their own manager or, as "upward bullying", from the employees they managed. In accounting for the allegations against them, the managers described how the work environment contributed by placing them in positions for which they were not trained or by having to cope with staff shortages. The dynamic, interactive nature of bullying is seen in the managers' view that sometimes their own behaviour was labelled as bullying when, as they saw it, they were managing conflict in an acceptable manner as the situation demanded. Thus, the managers said that such times it was the staff who were acting as bullies towards them (upward bullying) rather than vice versa: although, doubtless, the staff would have expressed a contrary view.

Group

Samnani and Singh identify several factors associated with bullying at the level of the group: these factors are the *group norms* which govern the behaviour of members of the group; *status inconsistency*, where an employee differs on the basis of age, race, or gender from other members of the group; and *situational factors* that produce stress and insecurity such as disagreements over how to complete a particular task.

It is true of any group of people engaged in a common task that over time behavioural norms will develop. These norms may be explicit, as when they are written down in the form of a code of conduct, or implicit, as seen in a shared understanding among members of the group of what is and is not acceptable behaviour. It is possible for a group to have bullying as a norm so that its occurrence is accepted simply as the way life functions. It is also true that group norms may be broken by members of the group, leading to group disharmony, conflict, and bullying. The types of situation that can produce such a breakdown in group norms are when there is a complex task to complete, pressure to meet tight deadlines, or an organisational restructuring which threatens group members.

Organisation

As we move from the individual to the group and to the organisation, so the complexity of the factors involved in bullying increases accordingly. Thus, at an organisational level, as with "bullying schools", the factors associated with bullying are as diverse as the organisational culture, the management ethos, and how that translates into leadership and management practice functioning alongside policies which clearly delineate acceptable and unacceptable behaviour (Baillien, De Cuyper, & De Witte, 2011). A Swedish study reported by Oxenstierna, Elofsson, Gjerde, Hanson, and Theorell (2012) found that the risk of bullying increased during periods of organisational change and when conflicting demands were made on employees. Such difficult situations can be eased by good managerial decision-making or made worse by dictatorial leadership and an organisational attitude that staff are expendable.

Society

Does the individual's or the group's behaviour at work in some way mirror the national culture? This is a difficult question to answer and may invoke dubious national stereotypes, such as the highly industrious Germans and the super-efficient Japanese. However, different countries do have different employment laws which may impact upon the levels and types of bullying in the workplace.

As several prescient writers have noted, the speed of change in the world in which we live is so rapid that we are left dazzled and bemused by the continual need to reappraise our everyday lives (e.g., Kurzweil, 2005; Toffler, 1970). Sparks, Faragher, and Cooper (2001) reflect on the rapidly changing nature of the workplace in the twenty-first century. They point to the transforming power of information technology in the workplace, the force of globalisation in precipitating changes in work time, and the shifting nature of the workforce, with more women workers, dual-earner couples, and older workers (the latter particularly so as the age of retirement is no longer set in stone as in years gone by).

Whether at school or in the workplace, it is self-evident that bullying occurs when the environment is one that allows such behaviour to take place. However, not all bullying takes place in a physical environment: as technology advances so there are new arenas in which the bully can operate.

Cyberbullying

The phenomenon of cyberbullying, which may have both children and adults as victims, can take place in several ways as shown in Box 2.2. A related form of online activity, known as *trolling* or *cyber-trolling*, involves acting in a deceitful, negative, or troublesome way for no apparent purpose. Nonetheless, while not intended as bullying this type of activity has the potential to be perceived as bullying by those on the receiving end (Hardaker, 2010).

The cyberbully may make direct contact with their victim, typically through email or texting on a mobile phone, or make more publicly accessible contacts via social media, such as Facebook or MySpace, or through posts to blogs (Kowalski & Limber, 2007; Marsh, McGee, Nada-Raja, & Williams, 2010). The cyberbully has a range of strategies at their disposal to discomfort their victim: for example, they can pretend online to be another person to trick the victim into revealing personal information, either in text or photographs, which they then make public.

As with research into the interaction between technology, technological advances, and antisocial and criminal behaviour generally, the study of cyberbullying has passed through several stages to reach the point where it is now viewed as a significant form of bullying alongside the traditional types (Calvete, Orue, Estévez, Villardón, & Padilla, 2010; Patchin & Hinduja, 2006). As with most antisocial and criminal behaviour, it is impossible to state exactly the extent to which cyberbullying takes place. However, surveys conducted in several countries can give an estimate of the extent of the issue.

Box 2.2 Manifestations of Cyberbullying

Cyberstalking: continued online harassment and threatening messages.

Denigration: sending untrue or harmful statements.

Flaming: distributing offensive messages.

Online harassment: repeated distribution of offensive messages.

Outing: distributing sensitive or private information which the individual would prefer to keep private.

Impersonation: pretending to be someone else for malicious purposes.

Trickery: fooling someone into revealing personal information which is then distributed.

An American survey of 3,767 students reported by Kowalski, Limber, and Agatston (2008) noted that 1 in 4 girls and over 1 in 10 boys said they had been bullied via an electronic medium at least once over the past two months. In a study carried out in Canada with a sample of 264 school pupils aged 12 to 13 years, Li (2006) found that the rate of victimisation of cyberbullying was highly similar for males (25%) and females (25.6%).

Rivers and Noret (2010) carried out a survey of bullying among 11–13-year-old pupils in 13 secondary schools in the north of England. This survey, conducted annually between 2002 and 2006, was concerned specifically with bullying via text and email. Rivers and Noret found that over the five years spanned by the research, the use of text and email to send nasty or threatening messages was a real and increasing problem in the schools. This form of bullying particularly affected girls, twice as many of whom—20.8% compared to 10.3%—received bullying messages at least once a school term compared to the boys. Rivers and Noret also found gender differences in the patterns and content of bullying. The males who received the bullying texts and email messages were more likely than the females also to be a victim of direct physical bullying. However, although they were not directly bullied, girls who received the bullying messages were unpopular with their peers. Rivers and Noret state that the males were more likely to receive hate-related messages such as "I h 8 u" and "You fucking clown-faced bastard"; while the females experienced a great deal of name-calling, "I hate you, you fucking bitch" and "You're a slag".

The initial studies of cyberbullying, as may be expected, were focused on describing and understanding this new manifestation of aggressive behaviour. This exploratory research has been followed by more detailed investigations of the perpetrators of the cyberbullying and its effects on victims (Dooley, Pyzalski, & Cross, 2009; Hinduja & Patchin, 2008; Schenk, Fremouw, & Keelan, 2013). Thus, as with traditional forms of bullying, boys were more likely to be cyberbullies, while girls were more likely to be cyber-victims (Wang et al., 2009). An American study reported by Marcum, Higgins, Freiburger, and Ricketts (2012) looked at male and female patterns of cyberbullying. As with traditional forms of bullying in which

females are more likely to engage in non-confrontational forms of bullying that aims to hurt emotionally and psychologically, so the female cyberbullies more frequently posted online messages containing both true and false hurtful gossip.

Predicting cyberbullying

A focus of more contemporary research has been to search for any specific risk factors or predictors of cyberbullying. A large-scale Finnish study of cyberbullying reported by Sourander et al. (2010) was carried out with 2,214 Finnish male (1,046) and female (1,078) adolescents aged from 13 to 16 years. The percentages falling into the traditional three bullying categories were reported as: 4.8% were cyber-victims (6.0% female and 3.5% male); 7.4% were cyberbullies (5.6% female and 9.3% male); and 5.4% were cyberbully-victims (4.6% female and 5.8% male).

The social and psychological factors associated with cyberbullying revealed a high degree of overlap across these three groupings. The adolescents in the cyber-victims grouping were more likely to live in a family that did not contain two biological parents, they reported high levels of emotional and peer problems, physical ailments such as headaches, recurrent abdominal pain and sleeping difficulties, and said that they did not feel safe while at school. The adolescents in the cyberbully grouping had a more antisocial profile, as indicated by conduct problems, low prosocial behaviour, and frequent smoking and drunkenness, alongside difficulties associated with hyperactivity and frequent headaches. These adolescents also said that they did not feel safe at school. The final grouping, cyberbully-victims, showed all of the risk factors evident in the other two groupings.

As research in this area has matured so some thinking has moved in the direction of seeing cyberbullying as simply a new form of an old behaviour (Campbell, 2005; Olweus, 2012). This is not to say that the consequences of cyberbullying are any the less serious, rather that, in the same way that the availability of pornography on the Internet does not change the issues surrounding the production and effects of pornographic material, cyberbullying is simply bullying in a new guise. This point extends to the theoretical understanding of cyberbullying: an American study by Barlett and Gentile (2012) suggested that the practice of cyberbullying stems from positive attitudes towards cyberbullying, in turn related to attitudes that support bullying and aggression generally. However, Barlett and Gentile point to two distinctive features of cyberbullying which merit further attention. The first feature lies in the anonymity afforded to the cyberbully by their technological cloak; the second lies in the removal of the variations in physical and psychological strength that mediate real-world bullying.

The issue of anonymity has several correlates. The bully may not see the victim's distress and so not appreciate the pain their actions cause. Further, as the message is devoid of any interpersonal nuances of tone, expression, and other nonverbal cues so the chances of misperception are increased. A message intended as a joke may be read by the victim and others as sarcastic or insulting, with painful consequences for the victim, particularly if others join in with the bullying.

There are physical and psychological differences between individuals that play a role in defining their place in the social order. Some individuals are perceived as strong, physically and socially, others are afforded social status on the basis of the personal strengths. However, given the skills and the right equipment, anyone can anonymously and safely cyberbully another person, so even physically weak or lower- status children can put aside the real-world strength imbalance and set out to harm their peers.

The Effects of Bullying

Children

The effects of childhood bullying are evident across the lifespan (Ttofi & Farrington, 2008). It is a fundamental feature of human behaviour that we will avoid environments which causes pain and distress. Thus, students bullied at school will opt to spend their time elsewhere. A survey of school absenteeism in England was conducted by Brown, Clery, and Ferguson (2011) in which the distinction was made between bullying as the *primary* reason for absenteeism and bullying as one of a constellation of reasons for absence. The report estimates that "16,493 young people aged 11–15 are absent from state school, where bullying is the main reason for absence . . . We estimate 77,950 young people aged 11–15 are absent from state school, where bullying is a reason given for absence" (p. 5). Thus, substantial numbers of young people are absent from school at least in part because of bullying. As school absenteeism is itself a risk factor for further psychological and social difficulties in later life, including educational failure, this is patently a serious state of affairs for those involved.

The immediate effects of childhood bullying are seen in several adverse consequences such as lowered self-esteem, emotional problems, feelings of insecurity and personal threat at school (Wolke et al., 2000). In some instances the problems experienced by both female and male victims of bullying become even more serious, as seen with depression and suicide ideation (Turner, Exum, Brame, & Holt, 2013), self-harm (Lereya et al., 2013), and post-traumatic stress disorder symptomatology (Idsoe, Dyregrov, & Idsoe, 2012).

The association between bullying and aggression was considered by Thomas et al. (2006). They found that the development of aggressive behaviour in children was related to the experience of aggression in the classroom. Thomas et al. further reported that the degree of developmental impact of the exposure to aggression was related to the length and severity of the exposure. In extremis, bullying has been held to be an explanatory factor in school shootings such as that at Columbine High School in Colorado, USA (Hong, Lee, Park, & Faller, 2011).

The immediate consequences of bullying play out over the medium term with effects that include lowered educational attainment and an increased likelihood of involvement in both delinquency and drug use in both childhood and adolescence

(Lösel & Bender, 2011). The increased likelihood of delinquency among bullies appears to be the case for both males and females (Barker, Arseneault, Brendgen, Fontaine, & Maughan, 2008). In the longer term, the effects of bullying may reach into adulthood as, for example, with adverse effects on mental health, particularly a heightened risk of anxiety and depression, and difficulties in forming and maintaining relationships. With regard to violence, bullying is strongly associated with an elevated risk of violent conduct in later life. Ttofi, Farrington, and Lösel (2012) carried out a systematic review and meta-analyses of the evidence concerning the role of school bullying, both perpetration and victimisation, in predicting later aggression and violence. They found that carrying out bullying at school significantly increased the risk of violence six years later by approximately two-thirds. The effect of being a victim of bullying on later perpetration of violence was less—increasing the risk of later violence by approximately one-third—than for being a bully although it was still highly significant. It is possible that these adverse effects of bullying could persist into adulthood, although the evidence for this possibility is limited (Piquero, Piquero, Craig, & Clipper, 2013).

Workplace

As with school bullying, the victim of workplace bullying may experience psychological and physical reactions. These adverse reactions typically include anxiety and depression, which may escalate into panic attacks and suicidal thoughts, stress-related symptomatology such as feelings of a loss of control and being powerless, disturbed sleep, fluctuations in appetite, and angry outbursts, alongside physical health problems such as high blood pressure, chronic headaches, and stomach ailments. There is also a social dimension to victimisation, as evident in withdrawal from social contact with colleagues and a growing mistrust of managers and supervisors. Social contact is a two-way process in which colleagues may become distant, weakening the victim's support network, or where the victim may find themselves out of favour in professional circles. The glare of the spotlight is bound to attract attention, so that those on the periphery of the bullying become aware of the situation and the victim becomes the object of increasing public scrutiny and gossip.

The effects of bullying may spill over into the victim's home life, affecting their relationships with family and friends, so producing another set of problems. If the bullying has a sexual dimension then this may exacerbate the victim's reaction (Dionisi, Barling, & Dupré, 2012). The psychological and physical reactions noted above may be accompanied by feelings of personal and social violation alongside shame, guilt, and humiliation. A loss of sexual appetite may also impact on intimate relationships, so affecting home, social, or family life.

The effects of bullying are not cost-free: an unhappy employee is unlikely to be a productive employee. The effects of victimisation on work performance will, obviously, depend on the type of organisation: the bullied nurse may make mistakes

that impact on patients' well-being, the bullied accountant makes financial mistakes affecting profits, the teaching and research of the bullied academic (oh the stories I could tell!) suffer in quality (Oravec, 2012). The individual's level of absenteeism may rise, so affecting their chances of promotion, or even leading to disciplinary actions and loss of employment with all the attendant effects on finance, family, career, and so on.

It may be the case that colleagues see what is happening to the victim, even reporting it to managers, but do not wish to be drawn personally into the conflict. Thus, a sense of distrust may spread within the workplace where people fear that they could be the next victim and, should that happen, do not trust the organisation to act on their behalf. In such an unpalatable climate people may feel that it is time to move on and, of course, the most able individuals will find it easiest to leave, so reducing the strength of the workforce.

Aggressive Driving

There are few road-users who have not witnessed or been involved in incidents of aggressive driving or what has colloquially become known as *road rage*, particularly when highly aggressive driving results in collisions and injury. As Harris and Houston (2010) point out, aggressive driving can take several forms, ranging from offensive hand gestures, excessive use of the horn, flashing headlights, tailgating, to even deliberately causing a collision. The actions of aggressive drivers are a cause of concern in many countries, including Australia (Lennon & Watson, 2011), Israel (Shamoa-Nir & Koslowsky, 2010), Pakistan (Shaikh, Shaikh, & Siddiqui, 2012), Romania (Săucan, Micle, Popa, & Oancea, 2012), the UK (Lajunen, Parker, & Stradling, 1998), and the USA (Mann et al., 2007).

Aggressive driving can cause both minor and major accidents, sometimes involving cars not directly involved in the initial incident, leading Houston, Harris, and Norman (2003) to define aggressive driving as "A dysfunctional pattern of social behaviors that constitutes a serious threat to public safety" (p. 269). The use of the term *road rage* to describe aggressive driving stems from the perception that the aggressive driver is reacting angrily to some misdemeanour, real or imagined, by a another driver. While this view is correct in some cases, Shamoa-Nir and Koslowsky (2010) note that sometimes the driver's aggressive behaviour is better described as instrumental rather than hostile aggression. Aggressive driving for instrumental purposes may, for example, have the aim of reaching one's destination as fast as possible despite hazards and obstacles on the road: this style of driving includes hazardous overtaking, weaving and cutting across lanes at traffic queues, and jumping traffic lights.

The motivations of aggressive drivers were considered in an Australian study reported by Lennon and Watson (2011), who interviewed 30 drivers, aged 18–49 years, about their experiences with aggressive driving. Analysis revealed that a key theme underpinning aggressive driving was the intention to manage or to change the

other driver's behaviour. Within this overall intention there were two subthemes: the first was where the interviewee said that their aggressive driving was to display their disapproval of the other driver's actions; the second was to teach the other driver a retaliatory lesson so that they (the other driver) could become a better driver. Needless to say, such actions can have a far from didactic effect and may escalate the exchanges as the other driver responds to the aggressive driver.

A study conducted in Israel by Ruvio and Shoham (2011) looked at a wide range of variables associated with aggressive driving (AD): they concluded that "General aggression, compulsivity, risk attraction, impulsivity, negative attitudes about AD, viewing the car as an extension of the self, hedonic perceptions about driving, time pressures, and materialism were related to AD tendencies" (p. 1105).

As Ruvio and Shoham suggest, while the behaviour is context-specific, the individual, cognitive, and emotional factors inherent in aggressive driving are the same as in any other form of aggression. Thus, as with aggression generally, age and gender are involved in aggressive driving, with younger males most likely to drive aggressively, overestimating their driving ability while underestimating the risks (Balkmar & Joelsson, 2012; Roberts & Indermaur, 2005; Shinar & Compton, 2004). In addition, aggressive driving may be associated with psychological and behavioural problems (Malta, Blanchard, & Freidenberg, 2005; Sansone & Sansone, 2010; Sansone, Lam, & Wiederman, 2010), including the use of drugs and alcohol (Butters, Mann, & Smart, 2006; Mann, Smart, Stoduto, Adlaf, & Ialomiteanu, 2004).

Lennon, Watson, Arlidge, and Fraine (2011) pointed to the role of attributions in aggressive driving and in particular the difference between attributions about our own and others driving. When we are on the receiving end of bad driving we tend to make negative attributions about the other driver—"What an idiot", "They need to learn to some manners"—while we attribute our own bad driving to momentary errors of judgement or transitory states—"Whoops missed that sign there", "Gosh, I'm feeling tired"—rather than to stable aspects of our personality. The cognitive processes of aggressive drivers, not surprisingly, may be characterised by high levels of hostility towards other road-users (Deffenbacher, White, & Lynch, 2004).

As implied by the term "road rage", anger is readily associated with aggressive driving. There is evidence to suggest that aggressive drivers have a high propensity to anger (Galovski, Malta, & Blanchard, 2006), although not all instances of aggressive driving can be ascribed to anger given that situational factors or other aspects of driver cognition may be of the most importance in a given incident (Ellison-Potter, Bell, & Deffenbacher, 2001). Nonetheless, as discussed in Chapter 1, anger can play an important role in aggression so that for the angry driver it increases the likelihood of perceiving the driving of others as aggressive, biases decision-making towards responding in type, and affects performance.

As shown in Box 2.3, Harris and Houston (2010) draw together the evidence to suggest that a range of situational and individual factors may overlap and interact to produce aggressive driving.

Box 2.3 Classification of Factors in Aggressive Driving

Environmental Aspects

- Type of road
- Traffic density
- Weather conditions

Psychological Factors

- Hostility
- Sensation-seeking
- Competitiveness
- Gender

Social Factors

- Passengers in driver's vehicle
- Target vehicle has passengers
- Target age and gender
- Target status (inexpensive or expensive vehicle)

Temporal Factors

- Time pressure
- Time of day

Source: After Harris & Houston, 2010.

Overall, as is the case with aggression generally, aggressive driving is likely to be the outcome of a range of factors.

While aggressive driving may be a relatively recent manifestation of aggressive and violent behaviour, the exact opposite is true of the next form of everyday violence.

Violence Towards Animals

A characteristic of bullying is that the bully selects a vulnerable target to intimidate and to harm. The same is often true of another type of target, the animals with which, in one way or another, we share our lives. We humans are not the kindest of creatures when it comes to our fellow animals. There are many ways in which we inflict harm on a range of types of animal: we conduct scientific experiments in which animals suffer, we hunt for pleasure, we exploit animals as a resource, and we destroy the natural habitat of many animals for our own gain. Closer to home, we are cruel to the many types of domesticated animals with which we share our everyday lives. In considering the issue of cruelty to animals there are two broad areas of concern: first, the nature of this specific form of violence; second, the strength of the association between animal cruelty and interpersonal violence.

Cruelty to animals

In many parts of the world humans depend on domestic animals—we farm cows, pigs, and sheep for various products and many of us have animals as household pets—and we have a positive relationship with those animals. There are many affirmative aspects to pet ownership for both children and adults. For the developing child, Robin and ten Benseel (1985) suggest, the companionship of a pet can play an important role in socialisation. Robin and ten Benseel note that a pet gives a child a constant companion providing unconditional affection with which to share growing up. The child, perhaps guided by their parents, must learn to take responsibility for the well-being of their pet, to understand their pet's likes and dislikes, and eventually to cope with and understand the death of a pet. I know this all to be true from personal experience: my family has had a range of pets—including lizards, geckos, mice, guinea pigs, freshwater and tropical fish, dogs, and horses (do horses qualify as pets?)—which have given us all a great deal of pleasure and some tears.

The benefits of pets extend beyond children, and many adults have a close relationship with their cat or dog, and horse-owners may well develop a very close affiliation with their steed. Animals also contribute to our well-being and safety: for example, there are guide dogs for the blind and partially sighted, sniffer dogs that search out contraband, bombs, people trapped in buildings after earthquakes, and climbers and skiers lost in avalanches. Yet further, dogs help farmers round up sheep and, together with horses, form part of Her Majesty's Constabulary; animals are used in therapy, as seen with equine psychotherapy (Bachi, 2012). The list could go on and on; given these benefits, it is understandable that there is both public and academic (e.g., Beirne, 2009; Nurse, 2013) concern about cruelty towards animals.

However, there is nothing at all contemporary regarding concern about the way animals are treated. The extract below is taken from a letter in *The British Medical Journal* published on 6 February 1875.

In addition to the forcible instances of cruelty to animals which you give in your article in last week's JOURNAL, permit me to jot down the following.

- 1 There is the one of the bearing-rein, which has been so much condemned in the daily press of late.
- 2 The practice of nicking and docking horses' tails, which is continually done. These operations are done to the manifest improvement of the appearance and carriage of the horse; still they cause pain, and are done to please fashion.
- 3 The practice of rounding foxhounds' ears, which means cutting off a considerable amount of the ears, so as to made the pack look uniform and light; it is, I am told, done in most kennels.
- 4 The practice of dubbing gamecocks. This consists of removing the skin and wattles from the throat, cheeks, and face of the birds, and the large comb on the head. This leaves a large surface which has to cicatrise. I am informed that no gamecock is

exhibited without having been "dubbed". Now, as cock-fighting is not permitted, surely this must be a most unnecessary act of cruelty, and is simply done at the behests of fashion.

Yours obediently,
Fishguard, February 2nd, 1875. J. HANCOCKE NWATHEN
(p. 191)

This nineteenth-century description of animal cruelty is as accurate today as it was when written. A survey of animal abuse in the state of Massachusetts over the period 1975–1996 (Arluke & Luke, 1997) found that the abuse, mainly perpetrated by young men, took the form of shooting, beating, stabbing, or throwing animals at solid objects. Dogs were the most frequently abused animal and they, together with cats, accounted for the large majority of abusive incidents. In the UK, the Annual Report from the Prosecutions Department of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA) makes harrowing reading (RSPCA, 2012).

The report states that in 2012 there were over 1 million calls to the RSPCA 24-hour cruelty line and over 4,000 convictions for offences against animals, with dogs the most abused animals. The cruelty took many forms, including hitting and beating, neglect, hoarding, and organising animal fights. The phenomenon of *hoarding* refers to the practice of keeping large numbers of animals in highly unsuitable conditions. The RSPCA report describes a case of a couple living with five children in their four-bedroom house along with 56 large dogs and a collection of cats, birds, and chinchillas: following a successful prosecution, the animals were rehomed and the children taken into the care of social services. The juxtaposition of cruelty to animals and to children is discussed below.

The RSPCA report notes that practice of bringing animals together to fight as a sport is far from extinct and may in fact be increasing in prevalence:

Many people believe the barbaric activities involved in animal fighting were consigned to the history books bearing in mind that the first piece of animal fighting legislation was passed in 1835. Unfortunately, many aspects of animal fighting still take place today and in recent years these activities appear to have grown in popularity. The core activities we are seeing include organised dog fighting, cockfighting and badger baiting. Dog fighting that is less organised also takes place with participants meeting in quiet parks and on rough land. (2012, p. 28)

The use of animals to provide entertainment and sport, legal and illegal, has a history as long as mankind. There are zoos and circuses where animals perform for the audience's amusement, there are waterparks where seals and dolphins and other aquatic mammals act out their incongruous and unnatural repertoires, and we watch television commercials in which chimpanzees dressed as humans advertise various products. There are moral arguments against this use of animals and, although animals still feature in many sporting activities, there have been some positive changes: for example, many circuses now no longer have performing animals.

Animals in sport

There are two broad types of sport involving animals. The first type is where the sport is regulated, of limited cruelty, and where the risk of harm to the animal is minimised. In the second type it is the harm to the animals that constitutes the “sport”. Thus, in the first type there are sports such as horse racing and greyhound racing where the welfare of the animals is protected. This is not to say that animals do not suffer injuries and fatalities, of course they do, but that such harm is the exception rather than the rule. However, the fate of many animals once their sporting prowess has waned and they have no economic value is another matter altogether.

In the second type the “sport” involves two categories: in the first, the animals inflict harm on other animals; in the second it is people who hurt and kill the animals. In the first category there are activities such as cockfighting, dogfighting, and bearbaiting (where the bear is trapped in a pit and is attacked by dogs). Depending on where they take place, these animal fights, typically arranged for the purposes of betting as well as the pleasure of the onlookers, may be illegal. The second category involves a range of activities that may be subsumed under the generic heading of hunting.

Hunting

It is probably the case that the survival of mankind, as well as that of other species such as chimpanzees (Boesch & Boesch, 1989), has at times depended upon hunting animals for food and other resources. In the modern world there are very few people who must hunt to survive, yet the practice of hunting persists with a range of animals stalked and killed for recreation. There is some hunting (not always legal) for commercial reasons, as seen in the hunting of whales and elephants, but most meat for human consumption is produced through farming. The practice of commercial hunting for fur—where the traditional quarries include beaver, bobcat, coyote, lynx, mink, marten, muskrat, opossum, otter, raccoon, skunk, and weasel—continues in many countries, albeit on a diminishing scale as animals are bred in captivity for their pelts.

In many countries the practice of hunting for recreation involves killing smaller mammals, such as deer, foxes, hares, and rabbits, as well as birds including ducks, grouse, pheasants, and even songbirds. There is some debate as to whether fishing is hunting: it is easier to think of catching large fish, such as marlin, shark, and tuna, in terms of hunting, although morally there is no difference between catching and killing large and small fish. There are several familiar forms of hunting, some involving the use of other animals, such as dogs and birds of prey, while others rely on equipment such as guns, traps, and fishing rods. As technology progresses so the equipment used in hunting becomes increasingly sophisticated. A new form of hunting, variously known as *internet hunting*, *cyber-hunting*, and *remote control hunting*, exploits the Internet as a vehicle for hunting. Internet hunting involves logging on to a website (the first of which was called Live-Shot.com) which allows

access to a site that facilitates access to online webcams showing penned animals and to remotely controlled firearms. Thus, from the comfort of their own home and with their own computer, the "hunter" uses their mouse or joystick to shoot at and maim and kill the captive animals. An argument in support of this type of hunting is that it enables disabled people to hunt. However, Internet hunting is opposed not only by anti-hunting groups but also by hunters, who argue that this form of killing is not hunting as there is no fair chase in which the animal has the chance to escape.

Understanding cruelty to animals

The study of cruelty to animals is a topic that historically has been rather neglected by social scientists, although the situation is changing (Ascione & Lockwood, 2001), as is the complexity of the explanatory models (Dadds, Turner & McAloon, 2002; Flynn, 2001; Gullone, 2011). Indeed, there is ample evidence that the study of hunting alone would be instructive from both psychological and sociological standpoints. There are social rituals associated with hunting, such as "blooding" in fox-hunting where the new hunter, sometimes a child, is initiated into the hunt by having blood from the kill smeared on their face. There is also the phenomenon of gathering hunting trophies where the hunter takes a part of the animal's body—usually the head, although antlers, tusks, or even elephant's feet hollowed out to make an umbrella stand—as evidence of their prowess.

Kalof and Fitzgerald (2003) conducted an analysis of visual representations of dead animals in popular American hunting magazines. They noted that the vast majority of hunters shown in the photographs were men: "The 803 humans featured with the trophy animals were overwhelmingly white men. Children were present in about 4% of the images, and most were young males of about 10 posed with an animal that they had presumably killed themselves. About 16% of these young hunters were girls" (p. 116). Kalof and Fitzgerald observe that the animals are arranged for the camera in life-like poses, wounds carefully concealed. There is juxtaposition, they suggest, between the dead animals and the hunter's "Taken-for-granted stories of love and affection for nature, wildlife and magnificent animals" and the trophies contrary portrayal of the "Extreme objectification of animal bodies, with severed deer heads and cut-off antlers representative examples of the contradiction in the love-of-nature hunting stereotype" (p. 119). Kalof and Fitzgerald reach the conclusion that rather than a fun family day out, hunting and the collection and showing of trophy animals are rooted in an ideology driven by domination, colonialism, and patriarchy (see also Kalof, Fitzgerald, & Baralt, 2004). Indeed, it is clear that hunting has a long history as an activity through which the hunter can make statements about their own social class. There is nothing new about any of this commentary: thus, Baker (1983) notes that fox-hunting became especially popular in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century England "As a badge of class distinction on the one hand, and a convivial mingling of the classes on the other" (p. 56).

Does the widespread incidence of cruelty to animals, both now and across centuries past, tell us anything about interpersonal violence?

From animals to people?

There are many different reasons, with varying levels of moral defensibility, why we harm animals. Kellert and Felthous (1985) interviewed a sample of imprisoned criminals and, as shown in Box 2.4, suggested that there are nine motivations that drive animal cruelty. They note, however, that multiple motivations may accompany any single act of cruelty.

Hensley and Tallichet (2005a) gave questionnaires asking about childhood cruelty to animals to a sample of 261 prisoners serving custodial sentences in three American prisons. The motivations for their cruelty which the prisoners most frequently expressed were: first, "out of anger"; second, "for fun"; and joint third, "dislike for the animal" and "to control the animal".

Box 2.4 Motivations for Animal Cruelty

- 1 To control an animal: e.g., kicking a dog when it does not obey a command.
- 2 Retaliation for "wrong behaviour": e.g., hitting a cat for scratching a chair.
- 3 Satisfaction of a prejudice against a species or breed: e.g., hurting a rodent because rodents are bad and deserve it.
- 4 The expression of aggression through an animal: e.g., training dogs to attack other animals or people.
- 5 Enhancement of one's own aggression: e.g., using cruelty to practice aggressive forms of behaviour or to impress others with a willingness to be violent.
- 6 To shock and amuse peers: e.g., setting fire to cats and watching them run in an enclosed space.
- 7 Retaliation against others by harming their pets.
- 8 Displacement of hostility from a person to an animal following child abuse: e.g., aggression against an animal in connection with a feared figure of authority as revenge for previous suffering.
- 9 Non-specific sadism refers to the wish to injure and cause suffering or death in the absence of provocation or feelings of hostility towards the animal. The motivation is to take pleasure derived from the animal's pain and suffering perhaps as an exercise of power and control or to compensate for feelings of weakness or vulnerability: e.g., breaking an animal's bones "for laughs".

Source: After Kellert & Felthous, 1985.

In their review of the literature Petersen and Farrington (2007) note that cruelty to animals is often mentioned as a feature of the childhood histories of violent offenders. Petersen and Farrington also note the possibility that cruelty to animals may be associated with interpersonal violence, including experience of child abuse. A body of work has looked at the development of attitudes towards animal cruelty and progression to interpersonal violence.

The development during childhood of cruel behaviour directed towards animals has been seen as a significant indicator of other childhood problems such as conduct disorder and acts of aggression (Dadds et al., 2002). Indeed, based on Freudian theory, cruelty to animals was once thought to be part of a triad of childhood behaviour problems, with the others being enuresis and firesetting, which was predictive of violence in later life (Hellman & Blackman, 1966). However, more recent research strongly suggests that childhood cruelty to animals is associated with antisocial personality disorder and poly-substance abuse (Gleyzer, Felthous, & Holzer, 2002).

As in many other aspects of life, childhood is an important period in the development of an individual's world-view. Why does some children's developing behaviour encompass cruelty to animals, particularly domestic pets? There are several practical issues to resolve before beginning to answer that question. In particular, as Dadds et al. (2002) note, in order to consider cruelty to animals researchers need an agreed definition and a means of measuring cruelty. Thus, Dadds et al. arrive at a suitable definition: "Cruelty to animals refers to repetitive and proactive behaviour (or pattern of behaviour) intended to cause harm to sentient creatures" (p. 365). This definition encompasses two important components, first that the cruelty is *repetitive* behaviour and second that it is *intentional* in nature.

The measurement of cruelty can be undertaken by direct observation, with the obvious attendant difficulties, or through the use of protocols such as the Cruelty to Animals Inventory (Dadds et al., 2004). The use of measures such as the Cruelty to Animals Inventory (see Box 2.5) allows researchers to estimate a range of variables including frequency and types of cruelty, animals targeted, and the social context in which the cruelty takes place. However, like any other self-report measure, the quality of the data such measures produce is dependent upon the truthfulness of the respondents. The Cruelty to Animals Inventory is a reasonably reliable measure: Dadds et al. reported a good level of agreement between parents' reports of their children's behaviour and the child's responses.

The process of learning through observation followed by behavioural imitation is a fundamental aspect of the human development. It follows that childhood observation of cruelty towards animals may play a role in an individual's similar behaviour, with the home as one of the most likely settings within which the child may witness violence towards animals. Thus, following the principles of social learning theory and social information-processing as discussed in Chapter 1, the child first observes violence to animals by role models, say, parents or siblings. The child then develops the view that violence to animals is permissible, while their aggressive acts against household pets and other animals may be socially reinforced. The individual learns that violence towards animals is an acceptable form of behaviour.

Box 2.5 Sample Items and Responses from the Cruelty to Animals Inventory

Have you ever hurt an animal on purpose?

Never : Hardly ever : A few times : Several times : Frequently

How many times have you hurt an animal on purpose?

What types of animals have you hurt in the past? (tick as many as needed):

None : Wild animals : Stray animals : Farm animals : Pet animals

Do you treat animals cruelly in front of others or by yourself?

I have never hurt an animal : In front of others : Alone

If you purposely hurt an animal, do you feel very sorry for it and feel sad that you hurt it?

I have never been cruel to an animal : Yes, I feel very sad for the animal : Sometimes I feel bad, not always : No, I do not feel bad for the animal

Source: Dadds et al., 2004.

Flynn (1999a) conducted a survey about animal abuse and attitudes and experiences of family violence with a sample of 267 students attending an American university. Flynn report that over one-sixth of the sample said that as a child or an adolescent they had perpetrated some form of animal abuse, ranging from killing and inflicting pain to sexual activity, on domestic pets or on wild or stray animals. The attitudes towards other forms of violence of those students who admitted animal abuse were compared with those of their non-abusing peers. The multivariate analysis controlled four sets of variables—the frequency of physical punishment experienced at 13 years of age, the respondent’s age and their race, and a belief that the Bible is literally true—and found that the students who committed animal abuse had more favourable attitudes towards spanking children and were more likely to approve of a husband slapping his wife. Thus, Flynn concludes that: “Committing animal abuse during childhood is related to later approval of interpersonal violence against children and women in families” (p. 169). A conclusion which, as Flynn notes, includes animals within the finding that early experience of aggression towards people is related to adult approval of interpersonal violence (e.g., Owens & Straus, 1975).

Given this pattern of findings, it is reasonable to suggest that within a household where the child can observe violence or perpetrate acts of violence towards animals it is unlikely that the animals are the only victims (Felthous & Kellert, 1986). Ascione (1998) asked a sample of women who had experienced high levels of domestic violence about violence to household pets. Almost three-quarters of the women said that their abusive partner had threatened, hurt, or killed their pet. Over one-half of the women had children, some of whom were reported also to have abused animals.

A great many acts of violence, including animal abuse, are perpetrated by men, although there is an overlap between the genders with regard to views about animals and animal welfare (Herzog, 2007). Baldry (2003) carried out a study with a sample of 1,392 Italian young people aged 9 to 17 years looking at the relationship between exposure to violence between parents and perpetration of animal abuse. Baldry found that approximately one-half of the sample, with males more prevalent than females, had committed some type of animal abuse at least once: of the young people admitting to abusing animals "Almost all reported a higher level of exposure to domestic and animal violence" (p. 270). Currie (2006) similarly found that children who witnessed domestic violence were significantly more likely to commit acts of animal cruelty than children who had not been exposed to violence.

The association between childhood experience of physical punishment and animal cruelty is evident in a study reported by Flynn (1999b). With a sample of 267 undergraduate students, Flynn looked at the relationship between corporal punishment administered by parents and animal abuse. It was found that those students who admitted committing acts of animal cruelty in their childhood or adolescence had been more frequently physically punished by their fathers than had those who did not abuse animals. McEwen, Moffitt, and Arseneault (2014) conducted a large-scale UK study with 2,232 children aged between 5 and 12 years. They found that based on mothers' reports those children who were known to be cruel to animals were twice as likely to have been physically maltreated as those children who were not cruel to animals. However, acts of cruelty were quite rare overall, reported in approximately 9% of the sample, mostly by younger children.

It is plain that animal abuse does not stand apart from the social developmental processes involved in the acquisition of aggressive and violent behaviour (Gullone, 2011). Further, if it is true that one type of behaviour predicts yet more similar behaviour, then a close relationship may be envisaged between cruelty to animals and other forms of delinquency, including interpersonal violence (Felthous & Kellert, 1986).

There is some evidence to support the hypothesis of an association between animal cruelty and minor acts of delinquency as demonstrated by studies with undergraduate students (e.g., Henry, 2004). A study reported by Lucia and Killias (2011) used data drawn from the Swiss National Self-Reported Delinquency Study involving over 3,600 school pupils to investigate the relationship between animal cruelty and delinquency. Lucia and Killias found that 12% of the sample admitted to hurting animals and that the occurrence of animal cruelty was correlated to offending: there was a greater chance of *serious* violence, not including minor property offences and shoplifting, amongst those who abused animals.

Where the association exists between animal cruelty and delinquency it is evident that other predictors of delinquency, such as conduct disorder and substance abuse, are likely also to be present (Miller, 2001; Vaughn et al., 2009).

If the experience of animal cruelty is associated with interpersonal violence then, it follows, this relationship should be evident in offender populations. There are several studies, conducted with a range of different types of offender, held in varying

types of institution, which show a preponderance of witnessing cruelty to animals in the childhood of offender populations (e.g., Hensley, Tallichet, & Dutkiewicz, 2012; Merz-Perez & Heide, 2004; Ressler, Burgess, Hartman, Douglas, & McCormack, 1998). In a typical study, Hensley and Tallichet (2005b) gave questionnaires to a sample of 261 male prisoners serving custodial sentences for a range of violent and non-violent crimes. They reported several findings: (1) it was more likely that those prisoners who had personal experience of animal cruelty at a younger age had persistently perpetrated animal cruelty at a young age; (2) prisoners who had seen a friend abuse animals were more likely frequently to abuse animals.

While it is undoubtedly the case that many people abuse animals, it is less certain which of these individuals will graduate to interpersonal violence. The nature of the psychological and emotional features and processes that may link cruelty to animals and violence towards people also remain uncertain (McPhedran, 2009; Patterson-Kane & Piper, 2009; Tallichet & Hensley, 2009). A meta-analysis reported by Walters (2013) included 14 studies of cruelty to animals by violent and non-violent offenders. As may be predicted, the violent offenders were significantly more likely than the non-violent group to have a history of animal cruelty. However, a second meta-analysis based on five different studies showed that animal cruelty was associated equally well with both non-violent *and* violent offending. Walters concludes that for male offenders the relationship between animal cruelty and offending is broader than just violent offending. It is possible that the link between animal cruelty and violent offending is part of a wider pattern of antisocial behaviour.

The overall position, as Petersen and Farrington (2007) suggest, is that more sophisticated research is needed, using large samples and prospective experimental designs, in order to gain a full understanding of the exact nature of the association between cruelty to animals and interpersonal violence.

It is clear that the vulnerable and the powerless are high up the list of likely victims of violence. This situation is evident in both bullying and cruelty to animals and it is also the case with the next type of everyday violence, the corporal punishment of children.

Corporal Punishment of Children

There are three topics associated with crime on which everyone has a strong opinion and which are guaranteed to start an argument: the first is whether we should have the death penalty for criminals; the second is whether hunting is a defensible activity; and the third is whether it is right or wrong to hit children (see Benjet & Kazdin, 2003).

The topic of hitting children requires some clarification. Those in favour of hitting children are not in the main advocating the use of excessive and abusive physical force: although exactly what is and what is not acceptable in the corporal punishment of children is a moot point. There are various terms used to describe corporal punishment, such as *smacking* and *spanking*, while *paddling* and *whupping* are also

in use in the United States (Knox, 2010). The act of hitting the child may take place through use of an open hand, i.e., smacking using the palm, or by use of an instrument. In the USA a spanking paddle may be used: a paddle looks rather like a small cricket bat, in that it has a handle and a wooden blade, and is held in one hand to strike the child's buttocks. At one time the cane, widely used in schools, was the British equivalent of the paddle. I know from personal experience that the cane (or a leather strap) was variously applied by schoolteachers to outstretched palms and to buttocks alike. (At my school one or two of the masters were not averse to the wholehearted application of gym shoe to buttock or to administering a sharp rap on one's cranium with their knuckles.)

With regard to hitting children, Knox (2010) makes a telling observation:

In contrast to the growing disapproval of violence against women, social sanctions for violence against children still remain strong in the United States. In the United States, it is against the law to hit prisoners, criminals, or other adults. Ironically, the only humans it is still legal to hit are the most vulnerable members of our society—those we are charged to protect—children. (p. 103)

Why is it thought acceptable to hit children?

There are various arguments put forward in favour of corporal punishment: from a cursory search of the term "smacking" on the Internet (a salutary experience and, hint for today, avoid the term "spanking"!) the following justifications could be gleaned: "It never did *me* any harm"; "It is down to parents not governments/social workers/the politically correct to discipline their children as they see fit and proper"; "Physical chastisement teaches children respect"; while as for the fine line between corporal punishment and abuse, "Any fit parent knows the difference between smacking and child abuse"; and finally with an appeal to historical precedent "It has been an accepted practice for hundreds of years".

There are many obvious problems with these justifications. For example, the view that "it never did me any harm" may not be strictly accurate: it is highly unlikely that many people are prepared to admit that the problems in their private life, interpersonal or otherwise, stem from their painful childhood experiences. Nonetheless, it is the case that those who experienced physical punishment as children are likely to endorse its use (Deater-Deckard, Lansford, Dodge, Pettit, & Bates, 2003; Dietz, 2000).

In the UK there is some support for the physical punishment of children, although perhaps not as pronounced as in the USA (Bunting, Webb, & Healy, 2010). With reference to the USA, Flynn (1999a) makes the comment that "The physical punishment of children enjoys strong normative support in this country. In 1986, 84% of Americans agreed that 'it is sometimes necessary to discipline a child with a good, hard spanking'" (p. 162).

As Flynn suggests, while the number of people in favour of the corporal punishment of children may have fallen slightly in more recent times, nonetheless there are

specific individual characteristics associated with favouring the physical chastisement of children: "Race, religion, and region have been important variables related to spanking attitudes" (p. 162). Thus, the American groups Flynn cites as most likely to support hitting children are African Americans, conservative Protestants and other religious groups who take the Bible to be the literal word of God, and those from the Southern states. Indeed, Gershoff (2010) makes a similar point: "Corporal punishment also persists because it is a practice with strong ties to religion, particularly to Christianity" (p. 32). Gershoff suggests that the close association between religion and the corporal punishment of children is a function of the view that the child's spiritual well-being is dependent upon strong discipline.

This list of demographic variables points to the importance of culture and associated economic and social conditions in the formulation and maintenance of attitudes towards the corporal punishment of children (Dietz, 2000; Gershoff et al., 2010; Lansford, 2010; Maldonado, 2004). Litzow and Silverstein (2008) have made the point that as corporal punishment is widely used as a means of discipline in many countries and cultures, it follows that the varying levels of acceptance are related to local cultural values. Litzow and Silverstein give examples such as south-west Ethiopia, Jamaica, and, specifically, Hong Kong Chinese families as settings where the corporal punishment of children is commonplace. In agreement with Flynn, Litzow and Silverstein also note that variations in the acceptability of corporal punishment may be positively associated with the role and prominence accorded to religion within a given culture. Thus, research is increasingly looking outside North America and the UK in order to take a wider perspective on the issue (e.g., Ma, Han, Grogan-Kaylorb, Delvab, & Castillo 2012).

Another aspect of corporal punishment lies in the parents' understanding of their child's behaviour and the nature of their interactions. An American study by Combs-Orme and Cain (2008) looked at mothers who spanked their children during the first 13 months after birth. They found that spanking was at its most prevalent among those young mothers who reported high levels of life stress, who saw fewer alternatives to corporal punishment, and who saw their infant as problematic.

The child's view

Not surprisingly, children have their own views about smacking. A UK study asked children a range of questions about their understanding of and views on smacking (Crowley & Vulliamy, 2002). The children said that they feared the emotional distress and humiliation of being smacked more than the physical pain. The children perceived the situations in which they were smacked as sometimes those where the adult, usually but not always a parent, had become angry. With a display of wisdom beyond their years, the children said that there were disciplinary methods, such as doing chores like "cleaning the bathroom" or restricting their access to television and toys, which would be more effective than smacking because they were longer-lasting

and more aversive. A similar American study also reported that children had clear views on the utility of physical chastisement (Vittrup & Holden, 2010).

There are two core issues at the heart of the debate about the use of corporal punishment with children. First, is corporal punishment an effective method of facilitating the child's development? Second, is the use of corporal punishment with children morally defensible?

Developmental help or hindrance?

The question of the effectiveness of corporal punishment and its effect on child development lends itself to empirical investigation and, indeed, there is a large body of work given to this issue (Fuller, 2011; Gershoff, 2010; Knox, 2010).

In typical study Aucoin, Frick, and Bodin (2006) compared the emotional and behavioural functioning of a sample of 12-year-old American schoolchildren. Over a two-week period some of the children had received no corporal punishment, some had received mild levels of corporal punishment (defined as one or two punishments), and some had received high levels (three or more). It was found that corporal punishment was associated with problems in both emotional and behavioural adjustment, with the strongest relationship evident in children who had experienced high levels of punishment. In addition, the deleterious effect of punishment was most marked for impulsive children and for those children without a supportive family.

Gershoff (2002) reported a meta-analysis of 88 studies which investigated the positive and negative effects of corporal punishment on children. A positive effect was evident in that corporal punishment acted to increase the child's immediate compliance with parental commands. On the negative side Gershoff reported both short- and long-term detrimental effects of corporal punishment. The short-term effects during childhood were evident in a lowering of the child's moral internalisation, an increase in aggression, antisocial and delinquent behaviour, a decrease in the quality of the parent-child relationship, lower levels of mental health, and an increase in the risk of being a victim of physical abuse. The long-term effects seen in adulthood included increased aggression, antisocial and criminal behaviour, decreased mental health, and an increase in the risk of perpetrating abuse of one's own child or spouse. These negative effects of corporal punishment were also found by Ferguson (2013) in a tightly controlled meta-analysis of 45 studies.

Research has continued to highlight the damaging effects of corporal punishment on the child's development—as seen, for example, in studies of later aggression (Lee, Taylor, Altschu, & Rice, 2013), attitudes to hitting other children (Simons & Wurtele, 2010) and externalising behaviours (Lansford, Wager, Bates, Pettit, & Dodge, 2012; MacKenzie, Nicklas, Waldfoegel, & Brooks-Gunn, 2012)—as well as emphasising the sometimes fine line between corporal punishment and child abuse (Lee, Grogan-Kaylor, & Berger, 2014; Straus, 2000; Zolotor, Theodore, Chang, Berkoff, & Runyan, 2008).

Moral defensibility?

The question of whether corporal punishment is morally defensible—i.e., regardless of intention, is it right that parents, caregivers, or teachers may inflict physical pain upon a child?—has been debated at length in many countries and jurisdictions (Gershoff & Bitensky, 2007). In 1989 this moral issue was addressed by Article 19 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, which gave children throughout the world the right to be raised without violence. As can be seen from Box 2.6, several European countries followed Sweden’s lead in 1979 by bringing into force legal bans of all corporal punishment of children before publication of the UN Convention. Since 1989, as may also be seen from Box 2.6, a number of other European countries have similarly introduced bans on all corporal punishment of children.

In some countries, including the UK, the ban on corporal punishment does not cover all settings, so that it is permissible for parents to hit their children but it is illegal for children to be hit in state schools.

The global statistics for countries with varying degrees of prohibition of the corporal punishment of children continually shift and change: the websites of organisations such as the Center for Effective Discipline and the Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment monitor the international picture.

The global movement towards prohibition has allowed studies to be conducted that compare the national effects of banning corporal punishment of children. Bussmann, Erthal, and Schroth (2011) compared five European countries—Austria, France, Germany, Spain, and Sweden—which have introduced legislation banning the corporal punishment of children. This type of research faces a myriad of practical problems, despite which Bussmann et al. were able to compile an extensive report. They reached the conclusion that prohibition does lead to a decline in violence

Box 2.6 European Countries Banning Corporal Punishment

1979	Sweden	2004	Ukraine
1983	Finland	2005	Rumania
1987	Norway		Hungary
1989	Austria		Greece
1994	Cyprus	2007	Netherlands
1997	Denmark		Portugal
1998	Latvia		Spain
1999	Croatia	2008	Luxembourg
2000	Germany		Lichtenstein
2003	Iceland	2010	Poland
	Bulgaria		Albania
		2011	Estonia

Copyright © 2015, John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated. All rights reserved.

against children. Bussmann et al. also considered the long-term effects of experiencing corporal punishment during childhood. Those parents who as children had experienced severe corporal punishment used higher levels of punishment with their own children.

Much ado about not very much?

We have arrived at the position where statements regarding the adverse effects of hitting children are assertively made in professional journals: for example, Durrant (2012) states: "The growing weight of evidence and the recognition of children's rights have brought us to a historical point. Physicians familiar with the research can now confidently encourage parents to adopt constructive approaches to discipline and can comfortably use their unique influence to guide other aspects of children's health development" (p. 1373). Lee, Grogan-Kaylor, and Berger (2014) make a similar point: "It is important to educate professionals who come into contact with new parents regarding research showing that spanking is harmful to children and to encourage communication of this information to parents" (p. 288).

However, contrary to the positive messages that flow from the moral debate, research, and legislation, there are voices asking whether banning the corporal punishment of children is taking the issue far too far. The side of the debate in favour of corporal punishment has two broad concerns: (1) the validity of the empirical research pointing to the adverse effects of hitting; (2) the robustness of the moral case against corporal punishment of children.

It is true that in research into child development it can be very difficult to make exact predictions about specific events. There are so many influences over the course of a child's development—cultural stimuli, social and economic conditions, parental style, family functioning, school—that it seems improbable that any one event has the profound and consistent adverse effects claimed by opponents of corporal punishment. Thus, there have been challenges to the validity of the research showing a detrimental effect of corporal punishment (Fuller, 2009; Larzelere & Baumrind, 2010). Larzelere and Baumrind build their case on four conditions which they claim must be fulfilled before the evidence is convincing: (1) to defend removing from parents the option of hitting their children, spanking prohibitionists first must provide causal evidence that spanking is harmful when "It is considered most appropriate by parents, children, and psychologists" (p. 58); (2) the effects of spanking must be compared with the effects of alternative disciplinary strategies which parents may use in the same instances where discipline is required; (3) there must be evidence that parenting improves when parents are prevented from hitting; (4) it must be established that the detrimental effects of hitting are independent of potentially confounding variables including child temperament and socioeconomic status.

This particular challenge asks for an exceptionally high, perhaps impossibly high, standard of empirical evidence: for example, how would a consensus be reached on when hitting is "most appropriate", or that "parenting improves", and how can *all*

potentially confounding variables be controlled? The solution would necessitate a large-scale longitudinal study lasting decades and conducted across a range of cultures, socioeconomic groups, and so on. Such a study may produce overwhelming evidence one way or the other, but it would not answer the moral question of whether it is right to hit children. In conclusion, it is sobering to reflect on the words of Knox (2010) as quoted above: "Ironically, the only humans it is still legal to hit are the most vulnerable members of our society—those we are charged to protect—children" (p. 103).

Violence as Entertainment

It is a feature of the twenty-first century that we are surrounded by a barrage of information and images from a range of media: there is radio, television, videos and DVDs, and the cinema; there are several forms of printed media; and there are the Internet-based social media such as Twitter and YouTube. It is inevitable that some of the media content will be, to varying degrees, violent in nature. This violence may on occasion come with a sprinkling of sexual content in the form of a television programme, a computer game, or even advertising (Ferguson, Cruz, Martinez, Rueda, & Ferguson, 2010).

The question of the effects of the media on violent behaviour has generated a large body of empirical research literature, not all American (e.g., Möller & Krahé, 2009), in turn generating several meta-analyses (e.g., Anderson et al., 2010; Ferguson & Kilburn, 2009; Savage & Yancey, 2008). The primary studies together with the meta-analyses strongly suggest that persistent viewing of violence, particularly violent video and computer games, in childhood and adolescence is significantly associated with committing acts of physical and sexual violence in adulthood. In keeping with this view, a longitudinal study of the effects of playing violent video games reported by Willoughby, Adachi, and Good (2012) offered support for the position that playing violent video games may be associated with later levels of increased aggression. However, another longitudinal study by Ferguson, Garza, Jerabeck, Ramos, and Galindo (2012) found no association between playing violent video games and several indices of aggression.

Thus, as with the debate about the effects on children of corporal punishment, there are reservations about the methodological robustness of the evidence claiming harmful effects (Adachi & Willoughby, 2011; Ferguson & Kilburn, 2009, 2010). Ferguson and Kilburn (2010) have also called into question the ecological validity of the research, much of which is laboratory-based. They note that while violent video games have become increasingly popular over time, recent years have actually seen a large drop in violent crime rates among youths and adults in the United States, Canada, United Kingdom, Japan, and many other industrialised countries.

It is possible to address the issue of validity by changing research strategy. Thus, many young people play violent video games but only a small proportion commit violent acts, so rather than study samples drawn from the general population more may be learned by looking at known violent offenders. An American study by DeLisi,

Vaughn, Gentile, Anderson, and Shook (2013) looked at the histories of a sample of 227 male and female young delinquents held in secure facilities. They found that for this particular group of adolescents playing violent video games correlated significantly with levels of delinquency and violent behaviour: this correlation remained when controlling for factors such as age, sex, race, criminal record, and psychopathic personality traits. The step of moving from a *correlational* relationship to establishing whether or not a *causal* relationship exists is the next step. Further, given that not all young people who play violent video games become aggressive, precision in identifying the individual risk factors is also needed. As DeLisi et al. note, until they are on very certain ground it is as well for researchers to be very cautious in their recommendations to policy-makers. Ferguson, Garza, Jerabeck, Ramos, and Galindo (2012) reinforce this point in quoting from a US Supreme Court decision:

The majority decision of the US Supreme Court considered the existing research unconvincing noting that "[t]hese studies have been rejected by every court to consider them, and with good reason: They do not prove that violent video games cause minors to act aggressively (which would at least be a beginning). Instead, '[n]early all of the research is based on correlation, not evidence of causation, and most of the studies suffer from significant, admitted flaws in methodology'" (p. 1)

A notable aspect of the literature on both corporal punishment and the effects of video games is the way in which researchers are drawn into opposing camps. Of course, there are always issues to resolve such as the best research design, preferred measures, and the nature of the critical outcome variables, but disagreements can run deeper than technical matters.

Nonetheless, it may appear at times almost as if each camp has its own preferred position, formed on whatever basis, and so seeks evidence to support its preference while at the same time finding fault with contradictory evidence. Ferguson and Kilburn (2009) say as much in commenting that "The concern remains that media violence effects research may continue to be driven primarily by ideological or political beliefs rather than objectivity. Media violence has a long history of being driven by ideology. Why the belief of media violence effects persists despite the inherent weaknesses of the research is somewhat of an open question" (p. 762).

It's as well perhaps to remember that researchers are people too!

Sporting Violence

The relationship between sport and interpersonal violence functions at three discrete levels: (1) the violence is the sport; (2) violence within sport; (3) violence surrounding sport. There are variations within these three levels (Kimble, Russo, Bergman, & Galindo, 2010; Sekot, 2009) but they serve to give a structure by which to consider the issue.

The violence is the sport

There are several forms of sport which are dependent upon a physical fight between two people, typically males but increasingly less so. The obvious example in Western culture is boxing, but on a worldwide basis there are many types of sport that involve direct, face-to-face combat: there is wrestling, of which there are numerous varieties such as Greco-Roman and freestyle; some martial arts including judo and karate, as well as martial arts such as kendo that involve weapons; yet further, there is kickboxing and mixed martial arts (Buse, 2006), and the list goes on and on. Many of the issues that surround the issue of violence as sport have been rehearsed at length in the context of boxing and so this sport will be considered in some detail.

Boxing

Sporting contests recognisable as boxing have been traced back to antiquity so that we know that both Greek and Roman spectators would have been familiar with sports not too dissimilar from today's boxing. It is evident that both the Greeks and the Romans were aware of the potential for harm this sport held for the contestants. The Greeks sought to make boxing safer through the introduction of hand wrappings and protective headgear. On the other hand, the more combative and ferocious Romans (see Fagan, 2011) made the contests even more bloody by introducing a heavy metal weight with sharp spikes into the boxer's hand-wrappings. As may be anticipated, this step led to many deaths. (The Romans also introduced a ring within which the fight took place.) Indeed, boxing became so violent that around AD 500 the Roman emperor Theodoric acted to abolish boxing.

Boxing, of the bare-knuckle variety was known in Britain the 1600s, where it was a popular if somewhat bloody spectacle. It was not until 1867, when the Marquis of Queensberry published rules for the conduct of the sport, that boxing moved closer to the form with which we are familiar today. There was similar interest in the United States, and by the 1800s boxing was widespread across many states, drawing large crowds to premier venues, such as Madison Square Garden in New York City, some of which are still popular today.

The bare-knuckle prize fights eventually gave way to amateur boxing, which was introduced into the modern Olympic Games in 1904, held in St Louis, USA. The elevation of boxing to an Olympic sport gave it a worldwide impetus. The Soviet Union, which did not permit professional boxing, became a world force in amateur boxing, along with several other communist countries such as East Germany, Hungary, Poland, and particularly Cuba which dominated amateur boxing for many years. In the 1950s and 1960s African countries such as Egypt, Nigeria, and Tanzania came to the fore in the amateur form of boxing.

As with the Greeks and Romans centuries earlier, modern-day concerns have been expressed about the effects of boxing on the contestants. In the contemporary

literature several commentators, such as the American physician George D. Lundberg, have expressed grave misgivings about boxing. The concerns of medical and other commentators are based on the likelihood of boxers suffering physical harm such as severe brain injury, blindness resulting from detached retinas, and other chronic physical injuries (Lundberg 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986). Concerns with the risk of head trauma to boxers remain to the current day and, indeed, have spread to other sports such as American football (Shurley & Todd, 2012).

Lundberg (1985) moves beyond the physical damage to include the following in his list of objections to boxing: “An affront to morality and ethics because it is the only major so-called sport which has as its principal purpose the intentional harm of the opponent . . . Boxing currently exploits minority youth for the benefit of the more affluent” (p. 197).

The debate about boxing continues on several fronts, encompassing the morality and acceptability of violence as a public spectacle (Annas, 1983). These concerns have resulted in bans on boxing in several countries, including Iceland, Iran, Norway, and Sweden; although some countries such as Sweden have subsequently rescinded the ban.

Violence within sport

As shown in Box 2.7, Kerr (2005) suggests that the purpose of aggression in sport, where it is allowed, is fourfold. Three of these four types of aggression, i.e., *anger*, *power*, and *thrill*, typically lie outside the written and unwritten rules of certain sports and will therefore be penalised by officials enforcing the rules of the sport.

Box 2.7 Kerr’s Classification of Aggression in Sport

Anger aggression: The aim is retribution in response to the words and actions of an opponent (although members of the same side have been known to fight on the field of play).

Play aggression: This type of aggression is allowed within the written rules of the sport, there may be “unwritten rules” to which the majority of players adhere.

Power aggression: The aim is to subdue or intimidate a rival player or opposing team. The acts are serious, often premeditated and “off the ball” so as to avoid detection, and frequently justified by the end result.

Thrill aggression: The aggressive act is perpetrated against an opponent for the sake of it, giving the immediate feelings of pleasure to the aggressor. These acts typically take place when the perpetrator perceives that they will not be caught and punished.

Source: After Kerr, 2005.

These various forms of aggression are not mutually exclusive while on the field of play: in the manner of Luckenbill's transactions (1977; see Chapter 1), one type of act may develop into or precipitate another type of aggressive act with various intended consequences.

The occurrence of these various types of aggressive acts depends to some degree on the level of contact allowed with the rules of a given sport. This variation will interact with the aggressiveness and drive to win of the individual competitors (Donahue, Rip, & Vallerand, 2009) to produce both anticipated and unexpected violent encounters in different sports.

Contact sports With boxing and similar sports there is no debate about the integral nature of interpersonal violence to the contest. However, there are other contact sports where interpersonal violence is not a fundamental aspect of the sporting contest but where, nonetheless, it occurs with varying degrees of frequency, severity, and permissibility (Kordi, Maffulli, Wroble, & Wallace, 2009). These sports may be classified, with varying degrees of agreement, as follows: (1) *full contact*, such as Australian rules football (Grange & Kerr, 2010) and ice hockey (Amin, 2011); (2) *semi-contact*, such as karate or kendo, which are characterised by limitations on the use of force, explicit rules against rendering an opponent unconscious, and the use of protective clothing to shield against injury; (3) *limited contact* such as basketball where the rules prevent most intentional or unintentional contact between players, with penalties often used to deter and punish illegal contact between players; and (4) *non-contact* sports such as athletics and tennis, where the contestants are not allowed physical contact and if this rule is broken disqualification is highly likely: contestants are typically separated by the use of lanes, as in athletics and swimming, or by a physical barrier, as in badminton and tennis, or by strict rules, as in cricket or golf.

While there are sports where contact is either forbidden or strictly regulated, there are nonetheless instances of violence. Association Football, aka “soccer”, falls into the category of a limited contact sport in which aggressive acts are typically ignored by the players (Traclet et al., 2009) but which is occasionally marked by violent acts on the field of play. Kerr (2009) describes one such violent act that took place during a football match in The Netherlands. A player (called Ridderkerker) was dismissed from the field of play for head-butting an opponent (van der Gaag). Kerr describes what happened next: “Ridderkerker began to walk off the pitch, but turned around, ran toward the prostrate opponent, van der Gaag, and kicked him in the head. Van der Gaag's skull was heard to crack when he was kicked . . . Later, in hospital, it was found that van der Gaag had a fractured skull and bone splinters in his brain” (p. 41). This incident is clearly beyond the pale in terms of the mutual consent players implicitly give for physical contact within the rules (written and unwritten) of the sport. Ridderkerker appeared in court where his actions were judged as intending to kill his opponent and he received a three-year prison sentence.

Why did this uncommon—but not unique, as seen in a similar incident in ice hockey (Kerr, 2006)—violent act take place? Kerr (2009) notes that "Ridderkerker, an unemployed man without much education who was supported by his girlfriend, derived his feelings of self-esteem to a great extent from his prowess as a footballer. When he felt he was being belittled on the field, he could not deal with it" (p. 42). His dismissal from the field of play invoked uncontrollable anger and in this highly emotional state Ridderkerker exacted retribution on the cause of his fall from grace.

Within Kerr's account of the incident there are several of the familiar ingredients associated with violence: some previous level of transaction between attacker and victim, an appraisal of the situation by the aggressor in terms of a hurtful personal injustice, and anger precipitating a loss of control and the attack on the victim. It is possible that this violent act also contained an element of retaliation, a motivation not unknown in sport. Indeed, illustrating the similar functions that violence may hold in different contexts, there is evidence that violence and associated sports injuries in youth sport may sometimes serve the purpose of bullying (Fields, Collins, & Comstock, 2010).

Dixon (2010) notes that different sports have varying levels of tolerance for acts of retaliation and gives two examples: first, the "goon" in ice hockey whose role is to target opponents who have fouled teammates; second, the pitcher in baseball, who may aim to hit opponents when the opposition pitcher has hit a teammate. There are two types of justification for such retaliatory violence: (1) the opponent "had it coming" as a result of their team's previous actions; (2) the retaliation serves as notice that there will be reprisals and so deters future attacks. As Dixon notes, retaliatory violence may also be good for team morale and unity, a sense of being together in adversity and knowing that your teammates will take care of you, as you will of them. An infamous and somewhat extreme example of organised team retaliation is described in Box 2.8.

The appeal of sport reaches beyond playing and extends to watching as a spectator. There is a great deal of enjoyment and anguish to be taken from playing and watching sport (I support Newcastle United so know all about anguish and watching sport), whether it be on a grand scale such as competing in the Olympics or as prosaic as watching one's children play for the school team. However, as discussed in Chapter 1, wherever people gather in groups or in crowds there is potential for violence, and sport is no exception.

Violence surrounding sport

Preparing to compete As anyone who has played sport seriously will know, a great deal of time is spent training and preparing to compete. This preparation time has been the subject of concerns about violence involving coaches and sportsmen and women. In particular, there are serious concerns regarding the sexual abuse of young athletes by their coaches (Brackenridge, Bishopp, Moussali, & Tapp, 2008; Brackenridge, Bringer, & Bishopp, 2005). Fasting, Brackenridge, and Kjølberg (2013)

Box 2.8 Team Retaliation: The Lions' "99" Call

The British & Irish Lions are a Rugby Union team formed once every four years from the best players in England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales to tour, in turn, Australia, New Zealand, or South Africa. The 1974 Lions' tour of South Africa was marked by fierce physical exchanges on the field of play: in order to counter what was seen as an attempt at physical intimidation the Lions adopted what they called the "99" call. Once a Lions player on the pitch made the call "99" then it was a "one in, all in" call to arms: all the Lions players immediately either joined a brawl or hit the nearest available opponent. The purpose of the "99" call was threefold: (1) it showed that the Lions would not be intimidated; (2) it engendered team unity; (3) it protected the individual from official sanctions as if all the Lions were involved it was highly unlikely that the referee would dismiss every player from the field.

The call was used several times and there is footage available that shows it in action. The most famous example occurred in the third test in Port Elizabeth, when the spirit of the call was taken to heart by Lions full-back, J. P. R. Williams, who sprinted half the length of the pitch to land a blow on a South African forward. Incidentally, the Lions won the series 3-0 with one match drawn.

analysed 15 Norwegian court cases in which a male coach was convicted of sexually assaulting one or more young male and female competitors aged from 6 to 16 years. A range of sports were involved including athletics, basketball, cross-country skiing, gymnastics, handball, karate, shooting, soccer, and swimming. Fasting et al. make the point that the offences took place mainly in the context of individual rather than team sports, allowing the coach the opportunity to groom the child over a period of time before committing the assault.

Spectators When people gather to watch sport all the ingredients for interpersonal violence are to be found in one place: for example, depending on numbers of spectators and the type of sport, there may be crowding and loss of personal space, rivalry or even hatred between opposing sets of fans, and high emotions fuelled by alcohol (e.g., Ostrowsky, 2014; Priks, 2010; Slabbert & Ukpere, 2010; Spaaij, 2014). The most obvious example of crowd violence associated with sport is to be found in football (soccer). The rivalries between opposing supporters, for both club and country, sometimes lead to outbreaks of violence both inside and outside the stadium where the game takes place. The violent clashes between rival groups of supporters, as well as between supporters and the police, can lead to injury and death in public places such as bars and cafes. The consequences of such clashes can be serious

Box 2.9 The Heysel Stadium Disaster

In May 1985 the European Cup Final between Liverpool and the Italian club Juventus was scheduled to take place at the Heysel Stadium in Brussels. The trouble began before kick-off when sections of the rival supporters, standing only yards apart and separated by just a temporary chain-link fence and a thin line of police, began to throw missiles at each other. As kick-off grew closer the missile-throwing increased and a group of Liverpool fans moved towards a perimeter wall, causing the Juventus fans to try to climb over the wall to safety. The wall collapsed, causing 39 deaths—32 Italians, four Belgians, two French, and one fan from Northern Ireland—with a further 600 fans injured. In retaliation, Juventus fans in another part of the stadium began to riot and they moved down the ground towards the Liverpool supporters. The police intervened, and for the next two hours, even as the match was being played, the Juventus fans fought the police using rocks and bottles as missiles.

As a consequence, English clubs were banned from European club competitions: the indefinite ban lasted for five years. An investigation by the British police, using still photographs and films of the events, led in 1989 to 14 fans receiving three-year sentences from Belgian courts for involuntary manslaughter.

with grave injuries and even fatalities as seen, for example, in the thoroughly documented disasters at Heysel Stadium, Brussels in 1985 (see Box 2.9) and at Hillsborough Stadium, Sheffield, in 1989.

However, it would be wrong to attribute the blame for violence at soccer matches to the game itself as a cause of violence. Piquero, Jennings, and Farrington (2015) used longitudinal data to investigate involvement in football hooliganism and criminality. They concluded that football hooliganism is likely to be one aspect of the hooligan's wider criminal lifestyle rather than an isolated behaviour specific to attending a game of football.

Some sports reach such large audiences that their progress can affect a nation. Sheikh, Ali, Saleem, Ali, and Salman (2013) suggest that in South Asia the intensity associated with the national sport of cricket works at several levels: "Although severe health concerns exist for major cricketing events, their cultural significance cannot be undermined. Health and harmony prevail as a result of such events, and their organization brings economic stability to a country" (p. 6). On a personal note, as a cricketer lover, once a player—opening bowler, quite quick, as you ask—but now a spectator, I cannot but agree wholeheartedly that cricket is beyond doubt the most harmonious of sports. (As a former rugby full-back in my rich sporting career I would dearly like to say the same of Rugby Union but that, alas, would rather be stretching a point, as illustrated in Box 2.8!)

Conclusion

The point was made at the very beginning of this book that violence is endemic across many societies and cultures. While we are rightly shocked by the extreme acts of violence we read about in newspapers and see on the television, we have come to accept or, as with the corporal punishment of children, sometimes actively argue for certain forms of violence. In the next chapter the focus moves to an arena where, unlike activities such as hunting animals, the violent conduct is hidden from public view. We may like to think of the home as a haven where we are safe from life's perils, but for some people the reality is very different.