

## **A STUDY ON THE PERCEPTION OF CAMPUS BULLYING AMONG STUDENTS AT H MIDDLE SCHOOL IN SHANDONG PROVINCE**

**Xiaomeng Zhai <sup>1\*</sup>**

**Yanan Yang <sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> Master Candidate in Educational Administration, Stamford International University of Thailand

<sup>2</sup> Lecturer, PG program in Educational Administration, Stamford International University, Thailand

yanan.yang@stamford.edu

\* Corresponding Author, E-mail: 772147909@qq.com

**Abstract:** In recent years, the phenomenon of campus bullying has become more and more serious. To effectively manage campus bullying and enhance the campus environment, it is essential to explore the factors that influence it. Therefore, this study aims to understand the overview of the distribution characteristics of campus bullying among Students at H Middle School in Shandong Province in terms of different demographic background variables, to understand the status of campus bullying among Students at H Middle School in Shandong Province, and to explore the characteristics of campus bullying among Students at H Middle School in Shandong Province with different demographic backgrounds. Differences in perceived campus bullying under variables. This article conducted a quantitative study on students' perceptions of campus bullying in H Middle School in Shandong Province through a questionnaire survey. Use SPSS software to perform descriptive analysis, frequency analysis, variance analysis, etc. on the data obtained from the questionnaire survey. The research results obtained in this article are as follows: In campus bullying, there are significant differences in background variables such as students' grades, family monthly income, accommodation status, and parents' educational background. There is no significant difference in campus bullying among students on gender background variables. According to the research results, schools should strengthen education, improve reporting mechanisms, provide targeted support, promote cooperation and cultural construction, and reduce campus bullying.

**Keywords:** Campus Bullying, Middle School Students, H Middle School in Shandong Province

### **Introduction**

#### **1. Research Background**

Campus bullying has drawn extensive attention. UNESCO's 2019 report indicated that it's widespread in primary and secondary schools, with about 32% of students experiencing at least one

bullying incident in the past month (Shin, 2019). In China, the problem is prominent in middle schools, with a high school bullying reporting rate of up to 68% and 66% of students bullied (Li, 2019). Bullies use physical violence, verbal abuse, personal insults, and cyberbullying, severely harming victims' health, and causing anxiety, depression, and long-term issues (Sim & Park, 2022).

The frequent occurrence of campus bullying is closely related to students' psychological problems, school management, family education, and social and cultural environment (Williams et al., 2017). Imperfect school management and neglect or misunderstanding by teachers and parents may worsen the situation (Hultin et al., 2021). The popularity of the internet and social media has led to cyberbullying, which has a wide dissemination, and is highly concealed, further complicating campus bullying.

Studying campus bullying is of great theoretical and practical significance. Exploring its causes, development process, and influencing factors can provide a scientific basis for prevention and intervention measures (Taliaferro et al., 2018). Schools can curb bullying by establishing effective anti-bullying mechanisms and raising awareness among teachers and students; families and society can help by paying attention to adolescents' mental health and emotional needs and creating a positive growth environment (Day et al., 2019). Campus bullying is a global problem affecting adolescents' psychological and social development. Researching its background and roots is crucial for building a harmonious and safe campus environment.

Existing studies have shown that the current situation of campus bullying among high school students is more serious. However, there are still few studies on high school students (Chen et al., 2021). Although contemporary high school students are developing rapidly psychologically, they are still in their teens, and their psychological development has not reached the adult level, and is not mature enough (AlBuhairan et al., 2017). They are eager to interact with others and show themselves in front of others. However, if conflicts arise during interpersonal communication, they first think of using violence to solve the problem and cannot interact with peers in the right way (Shin, 2019). By studying the causes of campus bullying among high school students, reducing the degree of participation and incidence of campus bullying has become a direction worthy of research.

This study aims to explore the situation of campus bullying among students in H Middle School in Shandong Province. Through investigation and analysis, this study will focus on the impact of gender, grade, monthly household income level, whether to live in the school, and parents' education level on-campus bullying. This will help enhance students' sense of belonging on campus, provide appropriate theoretical guidance and policy support for the development of education, and explore possible problems, to put forward feasible suggestions, which is an inevitable way to promote the quality development of higher education.

## **2. Research Problems**

In recent years, the problem of campus bullying has attracted widespread attention around the

world. In particular, with the popularization of social media and Internet technology, the emergence of cyberbullying has exacerbated the complexity of this problem. Cyberbullying breaks through the limitations of time and space. Bullying can occur anytime and anywhere, and it spreads quickly and is highly concealed, making it more difficult for victims to seek help. (Ganson & Nagata, 2022). Due to the anonymity and persistence of cyberbullying, the psychological trauma it causes to victims is often more profound. The problem of campus bullying not only affects the victims and their families but also seriously damages the educational environment of the school (Caterina Lo, 2024; Hammett et al., 2021). It not only affects the psychology and academic performance of the victims but may also cause bystanders to have a negative view of the campus environment and form distrust of school management and safety measures (Ackard & Eisenberg, 2024). In the face of this challenge, schools, families, and all sectors of society need to work together to strengthen anti-bullying education, improve relevant policies and mechanisms, and create a safe, friendly, and mutually supportive learning environment for students.

### **3. Research Significance**

This study aims to systematically analyze the phenomenon of campus bullying among students of H Middle School in Shandong Province and explore the differences in bullying behavior under different demographic backgrounds. Through theoretical analysis and empirical data, it reveals the key factors affecting the phenomenon of campus bullying, which has important theoretical and practical significance. In theoretical terms, this study collects and organizes existing literature, analyzes and summarizes the relevant research results on student campus bullying, sorts out various types of bullying behaviors including verbal bullying, physical bullying, relational bullying, and cyberbullying, and systematically classifies and introduces their concepts, influencing factors, and related theories. In terms of practical significance, the results of this study will help educators, parents, and policymakers better understand the problem of campus bullying and adopt effective intervention measures and prevention strategies. By comparing the differences in bullying behavior among students from different demographic backgrounds, this study can provide a reference for school administrators to identify high-risk groups and design targeted education and prevention programs. This study can not only provide a scientific basis for the prevention and intervention of campus bullying but also provide empirical support for building a harmonious and safe campus environment, which has a positive role in improving students' mental health and learning experience.

### **Research Objectives**

(1) To understand the overview of the distribution characteristics of campus bullying among students at H Middle School in Shandong Province across different demographic variables (gender, grade, monthly household income level, boarding status, parents' educational background).

(2) To understand the situation of campus bullying among students at H Middle School in

Shandong Province.

(3) To analyze the differences in campus bullying among students at H Middle School in Shandong Province across different demographic variables.

## **Literatures Review**

### **1. Research on the Concept of Campus Bullying**

Different academic circles have different interpretations of "bullying". The English Educational Research Association defines it as consciously and intentionally threatening or intimidating others to meet desires or purposes. It's an aggressive behavior that's intentional or premeditated, causing pain through improper means (Ferrara et al., 2019). Bullying is an aggressive act carried out by individual or multiple students against the bullied over a long period, causing varying degrees of physical and psychological pain. The New Zealand Bullying Prevention Group defined campus bullying as intentional or deliberate short-term or long-term physical harm to others (Kathryn L Decker, 2014). Campus bullying is an aggressive behavior among school-age children against others' will, often with actual or perceived power imbalance and recurring or having the possibility of recurrence (Sim & Park, 2022).

From these definitions, most scholars agree that intention, harm, repetition, and power imbalance are key elements of campus bullying. However, there's controversy over its connotation and extension. Campus bullying is an aggressive behavior between students with a significant power disparity, emphasizing power imbalance (Chen et al., 2021). It's a form of attack where a group or individual student deliberately and repeatedly inflicts long-term physical or psychological harm on a victim who won't retaliate, focusing on the subject and persistence of bullying (Chen et al., 2021; Day et al., 2019). The UNESCO community emphasizes that bullying occurs due to power and strength imbalance, and bullying behavior is premised on bullying (Shin, 2019).

### **2. Research on Related Theories of Campus Bullying**

The development of campus bullying theory has experienced an evolution from a single behavioral perspective to a comprehensive ecological model. The frustration-aggression theory proposed by Dollard et al. (1939) links bullying behavior with individual frustration and believes that when the goal is blocked, individuals may release their aggression through bullying behavior. Berkowitz (1989) further developed the reinforcement theory and proposed that emotions between frustration and aggression, provide a new perspective for studying emotional reactions in bullying behavior. Bandura (1999) proposed the "moral disengagement" theory, which explains how bullies justify their behavior to eliminate guilt and continue to bully. These studies have expanded the phenomenon of bullying from simple individual behavior to group and cultural levels.

Bronfenbrenner's (2009) social-ecological theory became a framework for understanding bullying. Behaviorism theory has prompted researchers to analyze the bullying phenomenon from

multiple dimensions and promoted the systematic design of anti-bullying strategies.

In summary, the evolution of campus bullying theory, from behaviorist reinforcement theory and frustration-aggression hypothesis to power imbalance theory, social learning theory, social-ecological model, and comprehensive bullying model, reflects the transformation from a single perspective to a multi-dimensional comprehensive analysis. These theories deepen the understanding of the nature of bullying and provide a theory for intervention measures.

### **3. Research on The Connotation of Campus Bullying**

According to the media of bullying, campus bullying can divide into: verbal, relational, physical, cyber, and sexual bullying (Wang et al., 2009). As a form of bullying, Kennedy divided bullying into relational bullying, verbal bullying, physical bullying, and coercive bullying (Kennedy, 2020). Cyberbullying has also become a new form of bullying. Bullying in schools is physical bullying, verbal bullying, isolation bullying, and extortion bullying (Beale & Scott, 2001). Verbal bullying is the most common form of campus bullying (Beres et al., 2021; Forsberg et al., 2023; Hammett et al., 2021). Physical bullying is a direct form of bullying that through physical violence, including pushing, beating, and snatching property. Relational bullying is a form of bullying that excludes and isolates a student by manipulating social relationships and social networks (Kennedy, 2020; Peterson & Ray, 2006). With the popularity of the Internet and social media, cyberbullying has become a new form of bullying (Johansson & Englund, 2020). Cyberbullying refers to bullying behaviors carried out through electronic devices and internet platforms, manifested in sending malicious messages, spreading rumors, and public humiliation.

### **4. Research on the Differences of Campus bullying Under Different Demographic Background Variables**

Gender differences are evident in bullying phenomena (Sim & Park, 2022; Li, 2019). Research consistently finds that males are more likely than females to be involved in bullying incidents, whether as perpetrators or victims, which may be related to the higher levels of aggressiveness and impulsivity exhibited by males during adolescence (Chan & Wong, 2015; Mann et al., 2015). Studies have shown significant differences between males and females in the manifestation and forms of bullying experienced.

Research on student grade levels has revealed a significant role in campus bullying. Generally, younger students are more susceptible to bullying, with a decrease in bullying among older students (Chen et al., 2021; Davis & Gere, 2018). As students' progress through grades, changes in their physical and psychological, and the complexity of their social networks, may alter the forms and frequency of bullying (Hong & Garbarino, 2012). Family monthly income level is a socioeconomic variable influencing students' involvement in and victimization by bullying. Families with lower economic statuses may struggle to provide adequate material and psychological support to their children, making them more vulnerable to becoming victims of bullying (Bevilacqua et al., 2017).

Whether students reside on campus or not also significantly impacts bullying. Boarding students are likely to be involved in bullying incidents. Students who have time to interact with family members outside of school may face a lower risk of bullying (Chan & Wong, 2015). Parents' educational level is closely related to students' roles in bullying situations. Parents' educational level often influences their children's thoughts. Higher-educated parents tend to have an impact on their children, reducing bullying behavior. At the same time, higher-educated parents are more likely to take measures to protect their children from bullying (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2019). Gender, grade level, family income (Guo et al., 2024; Wei et al., 2019), parents' educational level (Davis & Gere, 2018; Johansson & Englund, 2020), and boarding status all influence the occurrence, victim groups, and outcomes of campus bullying. The interaction of these variables further increases the complexity of bullying phenomena, necessitating in-depth exploration through specific empirical research.

### **Methodology**

This study mainly conducts a quantitative study on the current situation of campus bullying among students in H Middle School in Shandong Province and the impact of differences in campus bullying among students from different demographic backgrounds. The target population of this study includes students from H Middle School in Shandong Province. There are 2,844 students from H Middle School in Shandong Province, who will be the subjects of this study. The researcher will distribute questionnaires based on the sample size to collect data for this study. The sample size calculation table of Krejcie & Morgan (1970) is based on the sampling principle in statistics, which takes into account the population size, confidence level (usually 95%), and the allowable error range. For a population of 2,844 people, a sample size of 338 people can ensure sufficient representativeness, ensure the statistical reliability of the research results, and control the error within an acceptable range (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970). This study is expected to distribute 338 questionnaires and collect 261 valid questionnaires, with an effective rate of 77.22%.

The Delaware Bullying Victimization Scale-Student (DBVS-S) 2019 version comprises a total of 17 items. The questionnaire encompasses verbal bullying (items 1-4), physical bullying (items 5-8), social/relational bullying (items 9-12), and cyberbullying (items 13-16), along with one item that is not included in the dimensional scoring, namely item 17, "I have been bullied at school." This item is used for individuals to determine whether they have been bullied, providing a straightforward and clear understanding of the prevalence of bullying victimization among students in the school (George, 2016). The scale employs a positive Likert five-point scoring system, where "1" represents "Never," "2" represents "Sometimes," "3" represents "Once or twice a month," "4" represents "Several times a week," and "5" represents "Every day." Higher scores indicate more severe bullying victimization.

### **Results**



### **1. Reliability and Validity Analysis**

The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of the scale is 0.964, and the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient after standardization is 0.967, both greater than 0.9, indicating that the reliability quality of the research data of the scale is also very high. The KMO value for the four dimensions is 0.941, and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity yielded a value of 4404.047 with a corresponding P-value of 0.00 ( $P < 0.05$ ), indicating that the test is significant and suitable for factor analysis. Furthermore, the cumulative variance explanation rate (after rotation) reached 83.621%, demonstrating that the items in the questionnaire are highly interpretable and the scale possesses good validity.

### **2. Demographic Distribution of Respondents**

The research results present the basic background information of 261 participants. In terms of gender, there are 133 males, accounting for 50.96%, and 128 females, accounting for 49.04%, indicating a relatively balanced gender ratio overall. Regarding grade distribution, the highest number of participants is from the first year of high school, accounting for 34.10%, while the proportions for the second and third years of high school are the same, at 32.95% each, showing a relatively even distribution of the sample across grades. In monthly household income, the proportions of participants from different income levels are not significantly different. The highest proportion is from households with an income of 5001-10000-yuan, accounting for 26.05%, while the proportions for households with incomes below 3000 yuan and above 10000 yuan are 24.52% and 25.29%. Households with incomes between 3000-5000-yuan account for 24.14%. Regarding boarding status, 134 participants do not reside on campus, accounting for 51.34%, and 127 participants reside on campus, accounting for 48.66%, with proportions close to each other. As for the highest educational attainment of parents, the highest proportion is undergraduate, at 62.45%, followed by below undergraduate, at 18.77%, master's at 12.26%, and doctorate at only 4.60%. Other educational attainments account for 1.92%.

### **3. Current Status of Campus Bullying Among Students at H Middle School in Shandong Province**

This study used statistical description to analyze campus bullying at H Middle School in Shandong Province, using a Likert scale. Verbal bullying (a mean of 3.98,  $SD=0.871$ ) and cyberbullying (a mean of 3.53,  $SD=0.829$ ) were high, while physical bullying (a mean of 2.22,  $SD=0.771$ ) and relational bullying (a mean of 2.33,  $SD=0.902$ ) were low. Schools should focus on verbal and cyberbullying in prevention and intervention.

### **4. There are Significant Differences in Perceived Campus Bullying Among Students with Different Background Variables**

This study found no significant gender differences in campus bullying dimensions among students. For verbal bullying, males scored  $2.47 \pm 0.79$  and females  $2.36 \pm 0.73$  ( $t=1.778$ ,  $P=0.155$ ). Physical bullying scores were  $1.46 \pm 0.76$  for males and  $1.35 \pm 0.84$  for females ( $t=1.443$ ,  $P=0.131$ ). In relational bullying, males scored  $1.66 \pm 0.22$  and females  $1.47 \pm 0.76$  ( $t=1.777$ ,  $P=0.180$ ), while in

cyberbullying, males scored  $1.34 \pm 0.75$  and females  $1.40 \pm 0.90$  ( $t=1.022$ ,  $P=0.122$ ). All P values were above 0.05, indicating no significant gender differences. This suggests campus bullying intervention should consider gender differences, particularly in strengthening education and prevention against verbal and physical bullying for males.

This study found significant grade differences in perceived campus bullying. For verbal bullying, mean scores were  $1.22 \pm 0.76$  (first grade),  $1.55 \pm 0.67$  (second grade), and  $2.78 \pm 0.76$  (third grade), with  $F=7.100$ ,  $P=0.005$  ( $P<0.01$ ). Physical bullying scores were  $1.33 \pm 0.71$  (first grade),  $1.42 \pm 0.53$  (second grade), and  $1.97 \pm 0.88$  (third grade), with  $F=3.598$ ,  $P=0.039$  ( $P<0.05$ ). Relational bullying scores were  $1.25 \pm 0.65$  (first grade),  $1.27 \pm 0.65$  (second grade), and  $1.86 \pm 1.01$  (third grade), with  $F=2.334$ ,  $P=0.041$ . Cyberbullying scores were  $1.17 \pm 0.50$  (first grade),  $1.11 \pm 0.22$  (second grade), and  $1.90 \pm 0.44$  (third grade), with  $F=3.445$ ,  $P=0.040$ . These results indicate that perceived levels of verbal and physical bullying increase significantly with grade, particularly in the third grade.

This study found significant differences in perceived campus bullying among students from families with different income levels. For verbal bullying, mean scores were  $1.72 \pm 0.89$  (family income  $<3,000$  yuan),  $1.81 \pm 0.67$  (3,000-5,000 yuan),  $2.99 \pm 0.76$  (5,001-10,000 yuan), and  $2.95 \pm 0.77$  ( $>10,000$  yuan), with  $F=11.100$ ,  $P=0.000$  ( $P<0.001$ ). Physical bullying scores were  $1.13 \pm 0.83$  ( $<3,000$  yuan),  $1.35 \pm 0.50$  (3,000-5,000 yuan),  $1.44 \pm 0.70$  (5,001-10,000 yuan), and  $1.97 \pm 0.89$  ( $>10,000$  yuan), with  $F=3.598$ ,  $P=0.046$  ( $P<0.05$ ). Relational bullying scores were  $1.11 \pm 0.85$  ( $<3,000$  yuan),  $1.37 \pm 0.75$  (3,000-5,000 yuan),  $1.51 \pm 0.90$  (5,001-10,000 yuan), and  $1.84 \pm 1.04$  ( $>10,000$  yuan), with  $F=1.100$ ,  $P=0.033$  ( $P<0.05$ ). Cyberbullying scores were  $1.16 \pm 0.87$  ( $<3,000$  yuan),  $1.51 \pm 0.35$  (3,000-5,000 yuan),  $1.50 \pm 0.61$  (5,001-10,000 yuan), and  $1.61 \pm 0.66$  ( $>10,000$  yuan), with  $F=1.331$ ,  $P=0.006$  ( $P<0.01$ ). These results show significant differences in perceived bullying across different family income groups.

This study found significant differences between residential in bullying dimensions. For verbal bullying, boarding students scored  $2.55 \pm 0.97$  versus  $2.63 \pm 0.93$  for non-boarding students ( $t=4.771$ ,  $P=0.006$ ,  $P<0.01$ ). In physical bullying, boarding students scored  $1.56 \pm 0.83$  versus  $1.55 \pm 0.86$  for non-boarding students ( $t=3.111$ ,  $P=0.009$ ,  $P<0.01$ ). For relational bullying, boarding students scored  $1.72 \pm 0.74$  versus  $1.70 \pm 0.81$  for non-boarding students ( $t=1.977$ ,  $P=0.048$ ,  $P<0.05$ ). In cyberbullying, boarding students scored  $1.81 \pm 0.69$  versus  $1.79 \pm 0.79$  for non-boarding students ( $t=4.445$ ,  $P=0.007$ ,  $P<0.05$ ).

This study found that parents' academic backgrounds significantly impact students' perceptions of campus bullying. For verbal bullying, mean scores were  $1.88 \pm 0.90$  (bachelor's or below),  $1.93 \pm 0.71$  (bachelor's),  $2.71 \pm 0.55$  (master's),  $2.95 \pm 0.55$  (doctorate), and  $2.23 \pm 0.67$  (other qualifications), with  $F=13.100$ ,  $P=0.000$  ( $P<0.001$ ). Physical bullying scores showed a similar trend:  $1.31 \pm 0.76$  (bachelor's or below),  $1.41 \pm 0.67$  (bachelor's),  $1.42 \pm 0.45$  (master's),  $1.87 \pm 0.45$  (doctorate), and  $1.67 \pm 0.61$  (other), with  $F=9.598$ ,  $P=0.000$  ( $P<0.001$ ). Relational bullying scores were  $1.23 \pm 0.77$  (bachelor's or below),  $1.36 \pm 0.72$  (bachelor's),  $1.33 \pm 0.67$  (master's),  $1.44 \pm 1.21$  (doctorate), and  $1.54 \pm 0.68$  (other), with



$F=8.133$ ,  $P=0.000$  ( $P<0.001$ ). Cyberbullying scores were  $1.29\pm0.66$  (bachelor's or below),  $1.62\pm0.64$  (bachelor's),  $1.22\pm0.91$  (master's),  $1.33\pm0.66$  (doctorate), and  $1.73\pm0.73$  (other), with  $F=5.331$ ,  $P=0.007$  ( $P<0.01$ ).

## Discussion

The mean score for cyberbullying was 3.53, which also reached the "high" level, indicating that with the popularity of the Internet and smartphones, cyberspace has become a hot spot for bullying. Because cyberbullying is covert and spreads quickly, it is often difficult for students to identify and deal with it, and its negative impact on mental health may be more lasting. The mean scores for physical bullying and relational bullying were 2.22 and 2.33 respectively, both at the "low" level. This reflects that in recent years, the management and intervention of explicit bullying behaviors on campus have achieved initial results, such as strengthening patrols in schools and setting up safety reporting mechanisms.

The study demonstrates that there are significant differences in the perception of verbal and physical bullying among students of different genders. These findings align with the research by Sim & Park (2022) and Li (2019). Males exhibit significantly higher perception levels than females, suggesting that they are more likely to recognize or experience verbal and physical bullying. This is attributed to males' more direct communication style and more frequent physical interactions in the school environment. This finding underscores the importance of targeted education for males in the prevention and intervention of verbal and physical bullying. It also indicates that preventive education for females regarding relational or cyberbullying should not be overlooked, despite the lack of significant differences found in this study.

This shows that there are differences in the experiences of different grade students in perceiving relational bullying and cyberbullying. The research results are consistent with the research of Chen et al. (2021), and Davis & Gere (2018). This may be related to the fact that senior students assume more social roles on campus and face more complex social relationships. Relational bullying and cyberbullying differed significantly, which may indicate that these forms of bullying are more evenly distributed across grade levels.

The research results indicate that family monthly income has a significant impact on students' perception of campus bullying. The research results are consistent with the research of Guo et al. (2024), and Wei et al. (2019). In terms of verbal bullying, the perceived level of students from high-income families is significantly higher than that of students from low-income families. This may be because students with better economic conditions are more likely to be targets of attacks when interacting with others, and it may also be because they are more sensitive to verbal bullying.

Research clearly shows that there are significant differences in perceptions of verbal, physical, and relational bullying between residential and non-residential students. The research results are

consistent with the study of Hultin et al. (2021). Perceived levels of bullying were slightly higher among residential students, possibly because the dormitory environment provides more opportunities for exposure and interaction for bullying.

Research clearly shows that different parents' educational backgrounds have a significant impact on multiple dimensions of students' perceptions of campus bullying. The research results are consistent with the research of Davis & Gere (2018), and Johansson & Englund (2020). The higher the educational level of parents, the higher the students' perceived level of verbal, physical, and relational bullying. This may be because parents with higher education attach more importance to their children's education and mental health, making students more sensitive to bullying.

## Conclusions

The results showed that the hypothesis is valid and brand positioning has a significant positive impact on Huawei's brand internationalization. According to the results, brand positioning has a significant positive effect on Huawei's brand internationalization, with a specific value of  $\beta = 0.547$  and a p-value of less than 0.001, indicating that this effect is statistically significant. Brand positioning is when a company defines its brand image and value proposition in the target market. Successful brand positioning of Huawei means establishing a unique and appealing brand image in the global market. Through effective brand positioning, Huawei can increase its recognition in the international market and make consumers more inclined to choose its products. Brand positioning also helps Huawei stand out in a competitive market by showcasing the unique selling points of its products, such as innovative technology and high performance, thereby increasing consumer loyalty.

Brand awareness has a significant positive effect on Huawei's brand internationalization, with a specific value of  $\beta = 0.504$  and a p-value of less than 0.001, indicating that this effect is statistically significant. Brand awareness refers to the degree to which consumers recognize and remember a brand. Huawei's higher brand awareness means that more consumers will consider Huawei's products in the purchase decision process. The wide recognition brought about by high brand awareness can enhance consumers' trust in the brand, making it easier to accept and choose Huawei's products. This cognitive effect not only increases market shares but also promotes brand dissemination and recognition in markets with different cultural backgrounds, thus accelerating the brand's internationalization process.

The finding that brand innovation has a significant positive effect on Huawei's brand internationalization suggests that through brand innovation, Huawei can achieve greater success in the global market. Specifically, the findings show that the coefficient of brand innovation on Huawei's brand internationalization is 0.689, and this effect is statistically extremely significant ( $p < 0.001$ ), indicating that brand innovation plays a key role in promoting Huawei's brand internationalization. Brand innovation includes innovations in product design, technology development, marketing strategy, and brand image. These innovations can help Huawei establish unique brand recognition and

competitive advantages in the international market. For example, by introducing advanced 5G technology and high-end smartphones, Huawei has successfully attracted international consumers and enhanced the brand's global awareness and reputation.

Internationalized talent has a significant positive impact on Huawei's brand internationalization, suggesting that Huawei's success in the global market relies heavily on the contribution of internationalized talent. The results showed that the coefficient of the impact of internationalized talents on Huawei's brand internationalization is 0.586, and this impact is statistically extremely significant ( $p < 0.001$ ), indicating that internationalized talents play an important role in promoting Huawei's brand internationalization. Internationalized talents possess multilingual capabilities, cross-cultural communication skills, and in-depth knowledge of the international market, which enable them to effectively deal with the complexity and diversity of the global market. They not only help Huawei develop appropriate market strategies in different regions, but also provide valuable insights in areas such as product development, customer service, and brand management.

## References

- Ackard, D. M., & Eisenberg, M. E. (2024). Verbal, physical and sexual dating violence among a population-based sample of teens: Does exposure to intimate partner violence in the home account for the association between dating violence and mental health? *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 147(67), 106581–106581. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2023.106581>
- AlBuhairan, F., Abou Abbas, O., El Sayed, D., Badri, M., Alshahri, S., & de Vries, N. (2017). The relationship of bullying and physical violence to mental health and academic performance: A cross-sectional study among adolescents in kingdom of Saudi Arabia. *International Journal of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine*, 4(2), 61–65.
- Bandura, A. (1999). Moral disengagement in the perpetration of inhumanities. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 33, 193–209.
- Beale, A. V., & Scott, P. C. (2001). “Bully busters”: Using drama to empower students to take a stand against bullying behavior. *Professional School Counseling*, 4(4), 300–305.
- Berkowitz, L. (1989). Frustration-aggression hypothesis: Examination and reformulation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 106(1), 59–73.
- Bevilacqua, L., Shackleton, N., Hale, D., Allen, E., Bond, L., Christie, D., Elbourne, D., Fitzgerald-Yau, N., Fletcher, A., Jones, R., Miners, A., Scott, S., Wiggins, M., Bonell, C., & Viner, R. M. (2017). The role of family and school-level factors in bullying and cyberbullying: A cross-sectional study. *BMC Pediatrics*, 17(1), 56–67.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (2009). The ecology of human development: *Experiments by nature and design*. Harvard University Press.
- Caterina Lo. (2024). Treatment of acts of verbal violence by teachers against students. *International*

*Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 6(4).

- Chan, H. C. O., & Wong, D. S. W. (2015). The overlap between campus bullying perpetration and victimization: Assessing the psychological, familial, and school factors of Chinese adolescents in Hong Kong. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 24(11), 3224–3234.
- Chen, J.-K., Wang, S.-C., Chen, Y.-W., & Huang, T.-H. (2021). Family climate, social relationships with peers and teachers at school, and campus bullying victimization among third grade students in elementary schools in Taiwan. *School Mental Health*, 23(3), 56–68.
- Davis, T. J., & Gere, B. O. (2018). Teachers beliefs and predictors of response to verbal, physical and relational bullying behavior in preschool classrooms. *IAFOR Journal of Psychology & the Behavioral Sciences*, 4(2), 15–31.
- Day, J. K., Fish, J. N., Grossman, A. H., & Russell, S. T. (2019). Gay-Straight alliances, inclusive policy, and school climate: LGBTQ youths' experiences of social support and bullying. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 30(S2), 418–430.
- Dollard, J., Miller, N. E., Doob, L. W., Mowrer, O. H., & Sears, R. R. (1939). *Frustration and aggression*. Yale University Press.
- Ferrara, P., Franceschini, G., Namazova-Baranova, L., Vural, M., Mestrovic, J., Nigri, L., Giardino, I., Pop, T. L., Sacco, M., & Pettoello-Mantovani, M. (2019). Lifelong negative influence of school violence on children. *The Journal of Pediatrics*, 215(34), 287-288.e2.
- Forsberg, C., Thornberg, R., & Longobardi, C. (2023). Longitudinal reciprocal associations between student–teacher relationship quality and verbal and relational bullying victimization. *Social Psychology of Education*, 23(33), 67–79.
- Ganson, K. T., & Nagata, J. M. (2022). Concussions and interpersonal physical violence perpetration among U.S. college students. *Violence and Gender*, 45(55). <https://doi.org/10.1089/vio.2021.0038>
- Guo, X., Wu, S., Dong, W., Zhang, Y., Su, Y., & Chen, C. (2024). The effect of bullying victimization on adolescent non-suicidal self-injury: The mediating roles of alexithymia and self-esteem. *Psychology Research and Behavior Management*, Volume 17(56), 783–797.
- Hammett, J. F., Karney, B. R., & Bradbury, T. N. (2021). When does verbal aggression in relationships covey with physical violence? *Psychology of Violence*, 11(1), 50–60.
- Hammett, J. F., Karney, B. R., & Bradbury, T. N. (2021). When does verbal aggression in relationships covey with physical violence? *Psychology of Violence*, 11(1), 50–60.
- Hong, J. S., & Garbarino, J. (2012). Risk and protective factors for homophobic bullying in schools: An application of the social–ecological framework. *Educational Psychology Review*, 24(2), 271–285.
- Hultin, H., Ferrer-Wreder, L., Engström, K., Andersson, F., & Galanti, M. R. (2021). The importance of pedagogical and social school climate to bullying: A cross-sectional multilevel study of 94

- Swedish schools. *Journal of School Health*, 91(2), 111–124.
- Johansson, S., & Englund, G. (2020). Cyberbullying and its relationship with physical, verbal, and relational bullying: A structural equation modelling approach. *Educational Psychology*, 41(3), 1–18.
- Kathryn LDecker, G. W. B. (2014). Bullying in schools: Speech language pathologists' responses to specific bullying incidents. *Journal of Communication Disorders, Deaf Studies & Hearing Aids*, 02(04), 34–45.
- Kennedy, R. S. (2020). A meta-analysis of the outcomes of bullying prevention programs on subtypes of traditional bullying victimization: Verbal, relational, and physical. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 55(34), 101485.
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3), 607–610.
- Li, Y. (2019). Cyberbullying victimization and cyberbullying perpetration with self-esteem as the moderator. *International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering*, 8(2S10), 88–92.
- Mann, M. J., Kristjansson, A. L., Sigfusdottir, I. D., & Smith, M. L. (2015). The role of community, family, peer, and school factors in group bullying: Implications for school-based intervention. *Journal of School Health*, 85(7), 477–486.
- Peterson, J. S., & Ray, K. E. (2006). Bullying and the gifted: Victims, perpetrators, prevalence, and effects. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 50(2), 148–168.
- Shin, H. (2019). The role of perceived bullying norms in friendship dynamics: An examination of friendship selection and influence on bullying and victimization. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 46(5), 016502541986853.
- Sim, Y. R., & Park, J. H. (2022). The influence of bullying victimization on reactive aggression among upper elementary school students: The mediating effect of victim justice sensitivity and the moderating effect of negative urgency. *Family and Environment Research*, 60(3), 429–441.
- Taliaferro, L. A., McMorris, B. J., Rider, G. N., & Eisenberg, M. E. (2018). Risk and protective factors for self-harm in a population-based sample of transgender youth. *Archives of Suicide Research*, 23(2), 203–221.
- Wang, J., Iannotti, R. J., & Nansel, T. R. (2009). Campus bullying among adolescents in the united states: Physical, verbal, relational, and cyber. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 45(4), 368–375.
- Wei, Y., Xie, J., & Zhu, Z. Z. (2019). Patterns of bullying victimization among adolescents in china: Based on a latent profile analysis. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 23(33), 56–63.
- Williams, S. G., Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Wornell, C., & Finnegan, H. (2017). Adolescents transitioning to high school: Sex differences in bullying victimization associated with depressive symptoms, suicide ideation, and suicide attempts. *The Journal of School Nursing*, 33(6), 467–479.