

Chapter 13

**BULLYING AMONG TRAINING SCHOOL MALE
ADOLESCENTS AND MALE ADULT PRISONERS:
DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS**

Kristi Kõiv, Ph.D. and Liine Maasikas*
Institute of Education, University of Tartu, Estonia

Abstract

The current study aims to address the lack of research exploring differences between male adult prisoners and male juvenile training school students in relation to their bullying behavior.

A training school is a correctional facility that is used for the custody and re-education of juvenile offenders. Training schools are a part of the educational system in Estonia and they are used to prepare incarcerated youth for returning to society. The first sample of this study consists of all 53 male adolescent offenders (13–17 years old with average age 14.7 years) at the only maximum security male juvenile training school in Estonia, and the second sample consists of 105 male adult offenders (21–66 years old with average age 33.1 years) at one of four maximum security male prisons in Estonia.

The present study used a self-reported questionnaire developed by Ireland and Archer (1996) to provide not only a descriptive analysis of the nature and extent of bullying among adolescents in training school and among adults in prison, but also a comparison between two study group to assess the hypothesis that adolescents' bullying would involve a greater proportion of direct forms than adults' would, and that adults' bullying would display a greater proportion of indirect forms than youth' would.

The perceived extent of bullying was higher in prison compared with juvenile training school. Bullying in the juvenile training school was predominately physical (direct) but adult reported a higher frequency of indirect bullying in prison. A particular characteristic of individuals (e.g. vulnerable) was viewed as being predisposed to become a victim of bullying and various reasons (e.g. victims are easy targets) were suggested as to why a person was bullied, but adults in prison were significantly more likely than juveniles in training school to suggest sex offenders, and adolescents more likely than adults the physical weakness of victim. Bullying was seen to occur at locations out of sight of staff but more in living areas in

* E-mail address: kristi.koiv@ut.ee; Tel: +3727376474; Address: Salme 1a Tartu, 50103, Estonia. (Corresponding author)

the prison and more at school and private areas in the juvenile training school. More juveniles at training school than prison inmates reported that both they and staff were willing to help the victims of bullying. A relatively higher percentage of inmates in both institutions - prison and training school, admitted to being bullies, victims and bully/victims with on average 2 to 4 bullying incidents in previous week.

Keywords: Bullying, prison, training school, male adolescent and adult inmates

Introduction

Research on bullying in diversity of settings (Monks, Smith, Naylor, Barter, Ireland & Coyne, 2009) has grown rapidly during the last two decades, initially in schools but also in other settings and relationships: between siblings, in children's homes, in prisons, and in the workplace among children, adolescents, and adults. Common trends across contexts include age and sex differences. For example, general trends in prison bullying can in part be understood in terms of the developmental model (Björkqvist, Österman, & Kaukiainen, 1992) whereas younger inmates are more likely to use direct and physical forms of bullying and older inmates more indirect and less physical bullying forms; and with special trends in prison settings. Namely, indirect aggression is used to the same extent (or even more), than direct aggression as and due to its covert nature, it reduces the risk of being caught and of the perpetrator being subjected to any official punishment (Ireland, 1999a).

Main settings of studying bullying are schools (overview: Smith, 2011) and prisons (overview: Ireland, 2011), but bullying in training schools is a setting that interweaves these two abovementioned study areas. Bullying in prison occurs more frequently than among schoolchildren (Ireland 2005). For example, between 15 and 20 per cent of children and adolescents experienced intense and repeated victimization during their school years, which give an example to the extensive range of research on school bullying in whole world (Smith and Brian, 2000; included Estonia: Kõiv, 2009). Nearly two decades there is a scientific interest to the topic of prison bullying with leading role of studies in the United Kingdom (Ireland, 2002a).

Within school context, bullying tends to be defined as specific phenomenon as a subsection of aggressive behavior (intended, repeated attack with power imbalance), whereas in the prison context it is seen within the wider approach indicating that frequency, duration and intent as criteria for defining bullying may be not always applied (Coyne & Monks, 2011; Ireland, 2005a). But other researchers (Edgar, 2005) have argued that repetition is an essential element for behavior to be labeled bullying in prison. Ireland (1999a) has noted that one way in which researchers try to avoid definitional problems in bullying research is to present respondents with a definition of the phenomenon. In addition to the different definitions applied to prison-based studies, a variety of methods have also been used to collect data: interviews, official records, and self-report questionnaires (Ireland, Jarvis, Beck, & Osiowy, 1999), and in this field research has commonly used self-reports to measure the nature and the extent of bullying (included direct measurement of bullying, and measurement of behavior indicative of bullying), which have been found to be more reliable and valid than either staff or peer-reports (Connell and Farrington, 1997).

This chapter compares the nature and extent of bullying by male inmates in two settings – one is juvenile training school and the other is adult male prison. Training schools are

correctional facilities that are used for the custody and re-education of juvenile offenders. The primary focus of training schools is to provide care, treatment, education and custody for juveniles committed by the courts and to create programs that will rehabilitate, re-educate and re-socialize juvenile offenders. To keep juvenile offenders from falling behind in their education, the training school offers a full range of academic courses as well as art, sports and music electives, and also vocational training. At the same time, juvenile courts reserve the power of incarcerating the juveniles in this type of correctional institutions (e.g. Milan, 1996). The effectiveness of these schools has been the subject of recent controversy (e.g. Inderbitzin, 2006). The age of trainings school inmates more closely matched samples of juveniles in prison-based research.

Although, the overall interest to prison bullying research has increased covering full remit of the prison population – adults, young offenders, juveniles, men and women, although of these juveniles and women remain the least researched (Ireland, 2005a), with Ireland and Monaghan (2006) stressing the need for more research in juveniles in correctional institutions. The current study aims to assess the lack of research exploring differences between juvenile males in training school and adult males in prisoners in relation to bullying behavior, whereby both facilities were maximum security correctional institutions.

The focus of prison bullying research has been on adult offenders, especially to men (Ireland, 2011), whereby few studies focus on the differences in bullying behavior in prison among 18–20 year old (young offenders) and 14–17 year old (juveniles) offenders.

At one side, research exploring differences between adults and young prisoners self-reported bullying behavior have been restricted to five studies: two of them exploring bullying behavior across sample of male and female inmates (Ireland, 1999a; 1999b), one examining bullying behavior and attachment and emotional loneliness among males (Ireland & Power, 2004); one exploring bullying and psychological health among males and females (Leddy & O'Connell, 2002); and another (Smith, Pendleton, & Mitchell 2005) concentrated to bullying behavior and prison anti-bullying policy experiences among males. Ireland et al. (1999) conducted a brief review studies and reported a high prevalence rate for self-reported bullying and victimization in young offender institutions compared to adult institutions. In prison settings male youth offenders reported more psychological, physical and verbal bullying than adults (Ireland, 1999a, 1999b; Ireland & Power, 2004): adults did demonstrate a preference for indirect aggression, whereas young offenders demonstrated a preference for direct aggression displaying psychical and verbal bullying types towards others.

On the other side, only few studies explored self-reported bullying behavior among juveniles in prison: four studies (Ireland, 2002b, 2005b; Ireland & Archer, 2004, Ireland & Monaghan, 2006) had examined the nature and extent of bullying between young and juvenile male offenders, with focusing on the aggressive traits (Ireland & Archer, 2004), and on the psychological health (Ireland 2005b); one descriptive study explored the perceptions of male adult, young and juvenile prisoners with regards to how bullying was defined (Ireland & Ireland, 2003); and one study compared juvenile, young and adult prisoners within the same dataset (Ireland & Hafiz, 2010).

The prison-based research with regards to adolescents has been descriptive in nature exploring the nature and extent of bullying: Juveniles were found to be more likely to report behaviors indicative of “being bullied physically” than young offenders (Ireland, 2002b; Ireland & Monaghan, 2006), with indicating (Ireland, 2005b; Ireland & Monaghan, 2006) that this extended to psychological, verbal, and overall direct forms of victimization; juveniles

were more likely than young offenders to be classified as bully/victims, whereas young offenders were more likely to be classified as not involved than juveniles (Ireland, 2005b; Ireland & Hafiz, 2010), and both juveniles and young offenders reported similar levels of indirect bullying behavior (Ireland, 2002b).

The present study used a self-reported questionnaire to provide a descriptive analysis of the nature and extent of bullying at training school among male adolescents and at prison among male adults, and the aim of the study was to compare the nature and extent of bullying between these two male institutionalized study groups. It was hypothesized that adolescents' bullying at training school would involve a greater proportion of direct forms than adults' would; and that adults' bullying in prison would display a greater proportion of indirect forms than juveniles' would. It is hoped that this will address the lack of research which examines nature and extent of bullying in training school setting for male juvenile delinquents.

Method

Samples

The first sample consists of 105 male adult offenders 21 - 66 years old with average age 33.1 years ($SD=9.3$) at one of the four maximum security male prisons in Estonia (overall: five prisons and one of them for females). All had been sentenced with an average length of 3.1 years; the combined range of offences included property crimes (43.8%), violent offences (18.9%), drugs offences (11.9%), homicide (9.4%) sex offences (4.6%), criminal damage (3.55%), and other offences (7.9%). 54% were Estonians, 44% Russians and 2% mixed nationality.

The second sample consists of 53 male adolescent offenders (whole sample) 13-17 years old with average age 14.7 years ($SD=1.24$) at the only maximum security male juvenile training school (the other training school is for girls) in Estonia. All male adolescents at training school had been *incarcerated* with an average length of 1.1 years; the combined range of offences included public order crimes (72.1%), property crimes (36.6%), violent offences (44.2%), drugs offences (49.0%), and other offences (4.5%). 57% were Estonians, 40% Russians and 3% mixed nationality.

The men's maximum security prison was part of the correctional system, whereas the juvenile training school was part of the educational system. Both institutions had no anti-bullying policies.

Instrument

The self-report questionnaire developed by Ireland and Archer (1996) was used to measure the awareness of bullying in the correctional institution, individual involvement in bullying, characteristics of bullies and victims, types of bullying, staff and peers intervention, the prevention of bullying and places in the institution where bullying occurred consisting of close end and open end questions. A definition of bullying was given near the start of the questionnaire. Questions about temporal occurrence of bullying (during day and week) in the institution were added into the questionnaire. Additionally, the extent of bullying was

measured using the number of inmates who reported themselves as being involved in bullying behavior.

Pretest and Procedure

After approval was received from the prison and training school institutions' internal review boards, an announcement was made on all of the units in both facilities to participate in the study. Before survey research, the Estonian and Russian version of questionnaire was pre-tested in prison and juvenile correctional facility by the authors. Pre-testing was done on a small sample of respondents (N=16) from the target population. After the pilot test respondents were asked a series of questions regarding the survey as well as the process of data collection during the debriefing session.

Participants were invited to *participate voluntarily* and asked to fill in an anonymous questionnaire without being informed of its nature. *The authors conducted questionnaire surveys* in both correctional institutions. The questionnaire was administered in small groups of two or three, with respondents seated in available rooms, at separate corners, facing away from each other. They were asked individually to read the information preceding the questionnaire including definition of bullying and the explanation of the research. The anonymity of questionnaire was stressed. Each respondent was provided with unmarked sealable envelope in which to place their completed questionnaire. Respondents were asked if they had any difficulties in reading and if so the questionnaire was conducted individually and verbally. All defaced, non-completed questionnaires (total 2.4%) were disregarded and not entered into the analysis.

The results were content analyzed and differences assessed through Chi-square or *t*-tests. The overall percentage of agreement between two raters on the descriptive categories of open-ended questions developed after data collection was 92.3% (these data were unsuitable for analyze).

Results

Extent of Bullying

The perceived extent of bullying, based in the Likert scale of 0 (none) to 7 (a lot) showed a mean of 4.08 among adult prisoners and 2.50 among juvenile delinquents, with prisoners responding a significantly higher value than young offenders ($t=4.46$, $p<0.001$).

Number of Inmates Seen or Heard in the Past Week Being Bullied

Most of the inmates (77% adults and 62% adolescents) reported having seen an inmate being bullied with highest frequency of inmates was seeing 2 – 4 (59% in both institutions).

More inmates in prison (63%) compared with inmates in juvenile training school (44%) have heard about bullying of inmates in the past week ($\chi^2=4.1$; $p<0.05$) with highest frequency of involving of 2 - 4 inmates.

Bullies, Victims and Bully/Victims

The *self-reported prevalence* rates of *bullying*, *victimization*, and *bully/victims* in the prison were accordingly: 21%, 18%, and 17%. In the juvenile training school the rate of bullies was 17%, prevalence of victims 13%, and bully/victims 15%. Overall 56% of inmates were involved in bullying behavior in prison versus 45% in juvenile correctional facility (there were no significant differences between rates between two types of correctional facilities).

About half of all bullies reported having 2 to 4 occasions of bullying (among adults 52% and youth 55%), and half of victims reported being a target of bullying 2 to 4 occasions (among adults 54% and youth 57%) during past week. (Henceforward: Subjects offered more than one response across categories.). More than one third (prison: 36%, training school: 40%) of bullies know their victims beforehand, and more than 70% (prison: 71%, training school: 82%) victims know their bully beforehand.

Table 1. Overall ranked responses (%) among male adult prisoners and juveniles in training school to the open-ended question “Why they are bullied?”

Category	Adult prison inmates (N=105)	Juvenile delinquents (N=53)
The victim deserved it	14%	27.6%
Victim is sex offenders	15.8%	0%
Boredom/fun	49.1%	9.3%
Those considered of low physical power	0%	34.6%
Bullying involves all	10.5%	10.9%
Those considered of low intelligence	1.8%	6.9%
Minority/differences/not liking	5.3%	3.4%
No real reason	3.5%	8.2%

Table 2. Overall ranked responses (%) among adult prisoners and juvenile offenders in training school to the open-ended question “Why do they get bullied?”

Category	Adult prison inmates (N=105)	Juvenile delinquents (N=53)
Minority/difference	12.4%	13.7%
Older/younger inmates	8.1%	10.7%
Boredom/fun	36.7%	3.5%
Refusing to comply with bully’s demands	12.4%	0%
Isolated/rejected	14.6%	3.6%
Because of their offence	9.2%	0%
Bully wishes to assert power/physical weakness of victim	9.5	67.9%
Victims are easy targets	2.1%	3.6%

Most common reasons given as to why they bullied included “the victim deserved it”, but differed in some aspects: adults explain bullying more by boredom and with victims’ sex offenders than adolescents (15.8% vs. 0%; $\chi^2=8.9$; $p<0.01$; 49.1% vs. 10.3%; $\chi^2=8.3$; $p<0.01$), and adolescents mentioned more often than adults that victims had low physical power

(34.6% vs. 0%; $\chi^2=9.7$; $p<0.00$), whereby about one tenth of inmates had an attitude, that bullying involves all inmates in the institutions (Table 1).

Reasons offered as to why victims felt they had been bullied included being different/minority and older/younger inmates with more attention to reasons connected to boredom or fun for adults (41.7% vs. 10.3%; $\chi^2=9.0$; $p<0.00$), to isolation or rejection for adults (14.6% vs. 3.6%; $\chi^2=5.0$; $p<0.05$), to refusing to comply with bully's demands for prisoners (12.4% vs. 0%; $\chi^2=5.8$; $p<0.05$), to their offence for prisoners (9.2% vs. 0%; $\chi^2=4.8$; $p<0.05$), and to physical weakness for adolescents (67.9% vs. 12.5%; $\chi^2=12.0$; $p<0.00$) in correctional institutions (Table 2).

Who Was Bullied

Adults in prison were significantly more likely than juveniles in training school to suggest sex offenders ($\chi^2=12.2$; $p<0.00$), and adolescents more likely than adults the physical weakness ($\chi^2=12.4$; $p<0.00$) younger inmates ($\chi^2=5.4$; $p<0.05$), whereby both study groups viewed victims as vulnerable and introvert, as different from others inmates (mentally, socially, nationally) with little connections with peers (subculture) network (Table 3).

Table 3. Overall ranked responses (%) among adult prisoners and juvenile offenders in training school to the open-ended question "What sorts of people get bullied here?"

Category	Adult prison inmates (N=105)	Juvenile delinquents (N=53)
Vulnerable, introverts	21.1%	19.4%
Physically weak	14.5%	40.3%
Young inmates	1.6%	13.9%
Sex offenders	19.1%	0%
Those considered of low intelligence	12.5%	6.9%
Minority/difference	6.3%	1.4%
No effective social skills	2.3%	4.3%
All are bullied	6.6%	6.9%
Non-conformists with criminal subculture	9.4%	6.9%
No social support from other peers	3.1%	2.6%
Problem history	1.2%	0%
Staff is bullying	2.3%	0%

Why Inmates Were Bullied

Men in prison were significantly more likely than male youth in youth institution to offer the category "because of their sex offence", and "boredom"(accordingly: $\chi^2=6.7$, $p<0.00$; $\chi^2=4.7$, $p<0.05$), whereas adolescents were significantly more likely to offer "physically or mentally weak" ($\chi^2=4.9$, $p<0.05$) and the category "victims are easy targets" ($\chi^2=8.6$, $p<0.01$) and then adults, whereby the last category was most characteristic for both study groups (Table 4).

Table 4. Overall ranked responses (%) among adult prisoners and juvenile offenders in training school to the open-ended question “Why do they get bullied?”

Category	Adult prison inmates (N=105)	Juvenile delinquents (N=53)
Victims are easy targets	31.8%	50.7%
Boredom	11.8%	1.6%
Because of their sex offence	11.4%	0%
Physically or mentally weak	4.1%	14.9%
Bully wishes to assert power	9.8%	8.0%
Non-conformists with criminal subculture	9.5%	13.4%
Isolated or rejected	9.1%	11.9%
Belonging to the lower hierarchy	3.2%	1.5%
Unable to look after themselves	3.2%	1.5%
Younger inmates/old inmates	1.4%	4.5%
Bullied by staff	0.9%	0%

Who Was Bullying

Both groups of inmates generally characterized bullies as those persons who wish to assert power, but adolescents more likely than adults ($\chi^2=11.9$, $p<0.00$). Prisoners mentioned more frequently bullying of inmates by staff than juveniles ($\chi^2=5.5$, $p<0.05$) (Table 5).

Table 5. Overall ranked responses (%) among adult prisoners and juvenile offenders in training school to the open-ended question “What sorts of people bully others here?”

Category	Adult prison inmates (N=105)	Juvenile delinquents (N=53)
Bully wishes to assert power	58.9%	85.8%
Staff is bullying	13.0%	0%
Aggressive/violent	10.3%	8.1%
Low intelligence/education	4.1%	0%
Young/old inmates	4.8%	4.1%
All are bullies	2.7%	2.0%
Boredom	6.2%	0%

Types of Bullying

The main common category of bullying in two types of institutions was mainly verbal bullying (about one third of cases) and also in some degree (less than 3%) sexual bullying, but juvenile offenders were significantly more likely than adults to report gossiping ($\chi^2=4.1$, $p<0.05$), intimidation ($\chi^2=13.1$, $p<0.00$), rejecting ($\chi^2=4.2$, $p<0.05$), and ostracising ($\chi^2=4.0$, $p<0.05$), whereby juvenile male offenders report more often than men physical assaults ($\chi^2=23.8$, $p<0.00$) (Table 6).

Table 6. Overall ranked responses (%) among adult prisoners and juvenile offenders in training school to the open-ended question “Describe the type of bullying that takes place in as much detail as possible?”

Category (type of bullying)	Adult prison inmates (N=105)	Juvenile delinquents (N=53)
Verbal (direct)	33.9%	32.9%
Gossiping (indirect)	7.5%	0%
Intimidation (indirect)	20.8%	2.6%
Rejecting (indirect)	9.0%	1.3%
Ostracising (indirect)	6.5%	0%
Physical (direct)	12.9%	56.6%
Sexual (direct)	3.3%	1.3%
Taking things (direct)	6.1%	6.6%

When the categories were conducted into direct and indirect aggression, then adolescents in training school were more likely than adult prisoners to report direct forms of bullying (93.6% vs. 57.1%; $\chi^2=4.0$, $p<0.01$), and prisoner more likely report indirect forms of bullying than youth inmates (42.9% vs. 6.4%; $\chi^2=4.0$, $p<0.01$).

A brief description of the names given to specific acts of bullying by: (1) the prison inmates includes words describing forms of verbal, indirect bullying, and also bullying for fun, and (2) the juvenile offenders describing consists forms of physical bullying using their mother tongue and English synonym, whereby both study groups described specific acts of sexual bullying.

Where Bullying Occurs

The main categories arising from the question “Where do they get bullied?” were “anywhere” (in prison: 25.7% and in juvenile training school: 21.5%) and “out of sight of staff” (in prison: 14.1% and in juvenile institution: 15.2%), and in the yard (prison: 5.6% vs. juvenile institution: 5.6%). Differences between two study groups revealed among three categories: prisoners were significantly more likely than juveniles in training school tended to offer category “living quarters” (accordingly: 45.1% vs. 24.1%; $\chi^2=13.4$, $p<0.00$), and adolescents more frequently than adults reported category “washrooms/toilets” and “classroom” (accordingly: 2.1% vs. 13.7%; $\chi^2=9.4$, $p<0.01$ and 3.3% vs. 24.1%; $\chi^2=14.9$, $p<0.00$).

When Bullying Occurs

Answers to the questions “When does bullying occur during the day in the institution?” were as follows: Morning (significant differences between two study groups with more prevalent results among adolescents compared with adults: accordingly 15.1% vs. 6.4%; $\chi^2=5.3$, $p<0.01$), afternoon (in prison: 32.3% and in juvenile training school: 17.8%), evening (in prison: 38.5% and in training school: 24.7%), and at midnight (more frequently mentioned among adolescents compared with adults: accordingly 2.4% vs. 21.9%; $\chi^2=15.2$, $p<0.00$).

Research results indicated that more prisoners than juveniles reported that bullying occurring in the institution during all days in the week (79.6% vs. 47.8%; $\chi^2=8.4$, $p<0.00$) whereas more juvenile offenders mention significantly more likely that bullying occurs in the

institution during working days compared with prisoners' opinions (10.2% vs. 29.3%; $\chi^2=7.4$, $p<0.00$).

Interventions with Bullying

The majority of inmates (prison: 56%, training school: 62%) stated that other inmates would try to help when bullying is occurring. Nearly one sixth of adult prisoners and adolescents revealed that when someone of inmates is being bullied they try to calm the situation down (accordingly: prison inmates: 14.9% and juvenile delinquents: 13.1%). Also, juveniles in training school were significantly more likely than inmates in prison to say that they try to help the victim unconditionally (accordingly: 57.9% vs. 17%; $\chi^2=13.6$, $p<0.00$) and reported to the help of adult staff members (accordingly: 23.7% vs. 0%; $\chi^2=8.9$, $p<0.001$). Adult prisoners were significantly more likely than juveniles to reveal that they help conditionally: when the victim is friend (29.8% vs. 5.3%; $\chi^2=4.1$; $p<0.05$), when it is useful for them (21.3% vs. 0%; $\chi^2=7.2$, $p<0.01$) or even support the bully (17% vs. 0%; $\chi^2=4.2$, $p<0.05$).

Reasons given as to why other inmates would not help included "non of their business/not want to get involved" (prison: 45.4% and training school: 28.1%), "fear of retaliation" (prison: 39.4% and training school: 50.0%), "the victim usually deserves it" (prison: 9.1% and training school: 6.3%), and "there are many bystanders of bullying" (prison: 6.0% and training school: 15.6%), whereby no significant differences was found.

Staff Intervention

Juvenile offenders in training school were significantly more likely than inmates in prison to say that staff try to intervene when bullying occurs in correctional institution (87.5% vs. 57.9%; $\chi^2=15.4$, $p<0.00$). Most prison inmates and juvenile delinquents stated that staff would intervene by "placing the bully on report on punishment" (prison: 21.7% and training school: 16.7%), "warning/confronting bully" (prison: 37.7% and training school: 29.6%), and "separating the bully and victim" (prison: 20.3% and juvenile training school: 25.9%). Additionally, inmates in prison revealed more likely than juveniles at training school that staff intervention is ineffective (37.7% vs. 0%; $\chi^2=10.4$, $p<0.00$), and juveniles stated two more possibilities for staff intervention: monitoring and talking to the victim (14.8% vs. 0%; $\chi^2=7.6$, $p<0.00$; 13.0% vs. 0%; $\chi^2=4.2$, $p<0.05$).

Reasons given for why staff would not help included: "unaware of the problem" (significant differences between two groups with more prevalent results among adolescents compared with adult inmates accordingly: 93.8% vs. 34.8%; $\chi^2=11.7$, $p<0.00$), "not bothered/don't care" with frequent answers among prisoners compared with juveniles (45.5% vs. 62.%; $\chi^2=8.8$, $p<0.01$), "indulgent attitude towards bullying" (13.6% vs. 0%), and "can't really do anything to stop it" (7.1% vs. 0%) with prisoners' prevalent answers.

To Whom Would an Inmate Advise a Victim of Bullying to Speak to

The two main choices were "another inmate" (prison: 21.8% and training school: 17.8%) and "prison officer or school teacher" (prison: 22.8% and training school: 18.7%), and "nobody" (prison: 2.1% and juvenile institution: 5.0%). Additionally, adolescents in training school revealed more frequently than adult prisoners that they prefer friends and family members (accordingly: 20.8% vs. 1%; $\chi^2=13.6$, $p<0.00$; 19.8% vs. 5.8%; $\chi^2=10.7$, $p<0.00$) as sources of help about bullying issues, and prisoners tended to prefer more frequently

specialists in institution than adolescents in training school (40.3% vs. 18.8%; $\chi^2=11.3$, $p<0.00$).

Intervention into Bullying

Most frequent suggestions for intervention of bullying included “nothing” (prison: 23.9% and training school: 37.7%), “more activities and work” (prison: 30.2% and training school: 20.8%), “victim must be more *assertive*” (prison: 10.6% and training school: 13.2%), remove the bullies (prison: 6.9% and training school: 17%), harsher punishment (prison: 7.4% and training school: 11.3%), and increase staff awareness about bullying (prison: 6.3 % and training school: 4.1%). Adult prisoners were more likely than adolescents to suggest “stop mixing prisoners with violent/sex offence history” (17.7% vs. 0%; $\chi^2=13.2$, $p<0.00$).

Conclusion

This study provides a descriptive analysis and compares bullying behavior in the male adult prison and in the male juvenile training school, whereby both institutions were maximum security facilities. Male adults in prison and male adolescents in training school were surveyed by self-report questionnaire developed by Ireland and Archer (1996) about the extent of bullying, the frequency the respondent had bullied or been bullied, their perception of bullying, possibilities about prevention and intervention of bullying; and time and place where bullying occurred.

The research aims of the present study were to provide a descriptive analysis of the nature and extent of bullying to examine differences between the male adults in prison and the male adolescents in training school.

Differences between male adolescents in training school and male adult prisoners were found in relation to extent of perceived bullying in these correctional institutions: the perceived extent of bullying was higher in prison compared with juvenile training school. Previous studies support this tendency among juvenile prisoners compared with young offenders (Ireland, 2002b) and among adult prisoners (Ireland & Archer, 1996).

Reports of actually seen of bullying incidences was high (higher than reported among adult prisoners: Ireland & Archer, 1996) - more than 60% of adults and adolescents reported in prison and in training school, whereby the prevalence of hearing of bullying incidents was more frequent in prison compared with juvenile training school setting. Thus, the findings confirm that bullying is a widespread problem not only in male prison, but also in male adolescent training school too, and the key question is not whether, but to what degree.

Overall, 56% of adult males in the prison (not involved 54%), and 45% (not involved 55%) adolescent males in the training school classified, when asked directly, as bullies, victims or bully/victims, with on average 2 to 4 victims each in previous week. Also, approximately the same prevalence of bullying behavior was found among juvenile prisoners (Ireland, 2002b; Ireland & Monaghan, 2006; Leddy & O’Connell, 2002). The overall percentage of self-reported bullying behavior in this study was relatively high, with nearly equal proportion of bullies, victims and bully/victims in both male institutions (prison: 21%, 18%, 17%; training school: 17%, 13%, 15% respectively). Previous studies showed that the proportion of prisoners reporting behaviors indicative of “being bullied” and of “bullying others” were broadly consistent among male young and juvenile offenders (Ireland, 2002b;

Ireland & Archer, 2004; Ireland & Monaghan, 2006) and among male young offenders and adult offenders (Ireland & Power, 2004) with regards to classification into these groups; although there was a trend for a higher proportion of young offenders to be classified as bully/victims than adults (Ireland & Power, 2004), and less proportion of young prisoners to be classified as bully/victims than juveniles in prison (Ireland, 2005b; Ireland & Monaghan, 2006). Regardless of the specific method to classify prisoners into groups bully/victims tending to be the most common and representative of the categories in prison (measured by the behavior indicative of bullying: e. g. Ireland, 2002a; Ireland & Ireland, 2008), in this research direct measurement of bullying was used and differences between proportion of bully/victim category among adult prisoners and juveniles in training school was not revealed.

A particular characteristic of individuals (e.g. vulnerable, introvert) was tended to be viewed as being predisposed to become a victim of bullying among both study groups, as reported previously among adult prisoners (Ireland & Archer, 1996). Additionally, it was revealed that among the male adults in prison, the description of potential victims concurred with reported by Ireland & Archer (1996) and Brookes (1993) featured – sex offenders, but juveniles in training school empathized more frequently the physical weakness of victim and young inmates as victims. Also, Ireland (2002b) revealed that male juveniles were less likely than young offenders in prison to perceive sex offenders as targets for bullying and juveniles were more likely than young offenders to report younger prisoners. The present study confirms these tendencies and specifies it across to settings – male prisoners reported significantly more sex offenders and male juvenile delinquents physically vulnerable and young inmates as potential victims of bullying with general trend for both groups to report victims as vulnerable and introvert characteristics.

Perceptions of causes of victimization included different reasons viewed (1) by juvenile offenders as being predisposed to become victims of bullying as weak (physically or mentally), easy targets and bullies as perpetrators assessing power over victims; and (2) *boredom and particular offence (sex offence)* was behind many incidents of bullying in prison with acknowledgement that bullying may occur as bullying of prison inmates by staff. Thus, juvenile offenders' perceptions about the causes of bullying included the notification of the bullying phenomenon in the area of overt power imbalance, and prisoners perceived the causes of bullying as reflection of specific aspects of lower-stimulation closed prison environment, supporting previous studies (e.g. Ireland & Archer, 1996). As school bullying is defined as subsection of aggressive behavior with repetitiveness and power imbalance (Olweus, 1996), the essence of bullying for juvenile delinquents was analogical for this concept. Additionally, it was revealed that bullying was more probably motivated by boredom in prison than in training school, supporting previous (Spain, 2005) studies among incarcerated youth. Some previous research advocated that bullying in young offenders prison (Spain, 2005) and in juvenile offenders prison (Peterson-Badali, & Koegl, 2002) raveled not only among prisoner, but also between prisoners and staff - bullying of prisoners by staff; and this study support these findings first of all in the male adult prisoners setting.

It was hypothesized that adolescents' bullying at training school would involve a greater proportion of direct forms than adults' would; and that adults' bullying in prison would display a greater proportion of indirect forms than juveniles' would; and these hypotheses were supported.

Overall, the majority of adult prisoners' and juvenile offenders' bullying behavior comprised verbal bullying followed by physical bullying by adolescents in training school and indirect bullying by prisoners. Namely, the types of bullying in prison among men were predominately indirect (gossiping, intimidation, rejection, and ostracizing), corresponding with previous evidence from male prisoners (e.g. Brookes, 1993; Ireland & Archer, 1996; Turner & Ireland, 2010), whereby male juveniles in training school used predominately physical forms of bullying, corresponding with previous evidence from males in juvenile prisons (Ireland & Monaghan, 2006; Ireland & Hafiz, 2010) and from male young offenders in prison (Ireland, 1999b; Ireland & Power, 2004). The finding that juveniles reported being subjected to more physical bullying than adult offenders is consistent with developmental pathways (Björkqvist, Österman, & Kaukiainen, 1992) suggesting that younger age groups may indeed use more physical aggression. Indirect aggression, on the other hand, carries a higher chance of being caught and the perpetrator risks retribution (Ireland, 2002a), empathizing the possibility that in a prison setting adult prisoners have come to recognize the value of indirect bullying over direct, and employ it. However, male prisoners used more indirect forms of bullying than juveniles in training school did, and both contingents used also direct verbal forms of bullying, whilst sexual bullying was the least common - a pattern also akin with previous prison research (Connell & Farrington, 1996; McGurk & McDougall, 1986, Ireland, 2005b).

In the adult prison and juvenile training school settings the terms connected with bullying (but not the term bullying) were not culturally sensitive, but tended to reflect the prevalent forms of bullying in the detention facility with holding negative connotations. Ireland and Ireland (2003) also asked young and juvenile male prisoners through a self-report questionnaire about their perceptions of bullying and results indicated that bullying could include predominately direct forms of bullying.

Bullying was seen to occur: (1) at locations throughout the correctional institution – mainly out of sight of staff, but relatively more frequently in living areas in prison and more private areas (e. g. bathrooms) in juvenile training school; and (2) during all days a week and all time of day, but relatively more frequently in the morning and midnight during working days among juvenile delinquents. In previous studies young offenders have mentioned more than juveniles that bullying occurred in their living areas in prison (Ireland, 2002b) and much of bullying happened during evening and meal time, on social period in the evening, and at night in the dormitory in young and adult male prisons (Smith, Pendleton, & Mitchell, 2005).

Male inmates of both correctional institutions in this study reported that both they and staff were willing to help victims of bullying, but relatively more (1) prisoners admit that staffs' help was ineffective; self-help was conditional (helping friends, beneficial support), and they even supported the bully; and (2) juvenile offenders tended to believe that staffs' help was effective: monitoring and talking to the victim, and self-help was unconditional. Also, Spain (2005) examining young offenders' attitudes regarding ways for the establishments to combat bullying in prison showed that the majority of participants revealed staffs' failure for supervision.

Regarding interventions, most training school juveniles and prison inmates reported that staff and inmates would intervene – it is consistent with previous studies (Ireland & Archer, 1996; Ireland, 2002b). The reasons why prisoners and juvenile offenders do not intervene were the same as was revealed previously (Ireland & Archer, 1996) in prison context: Fear,

detach, blame of victim, but differentiated concerning with perceived reasons of staff nonintervention – more juveniles revealed that staff is unaware of the bullying problem in the institution than prison inmates, and more prisoners than juveniles had accepting attitude toward bullying or even supported bullies. Researchers (Ireland, 2005c) have reported attention on the motivators and functions underlying prison bullying, pointing out also the role of fear.

Two main choices for which an inmate in prison and juvenile training school would advice a victim of bullying to approach were either peer or prison office/school teacher, whereby prisoners prefer more often specialists in prison and juvenile offenders' friends and family members. The last trends were revealed in previous studies (Ireland, 2002b): Juveniles were more likely than young offenders to advise a victim of bullying to speak to their family, a specialist, and a prison officer.

Regarding the possibility of preventing bullying, the most frequent suggestion, as in previous works (Ireland & Archer, 1996), was “nothing” illustrating attitude that bullying is part of every day's life in prison and in training school too. Parallel with this pessimistic view, there were also suggestions connected with improvement of social environment of both institutions (activation of inmates, punishment of bullies, and increasing of staffs' awareness about bullying), whereby the only prison settings related suggestion was made concerning with separating violent or sex offenders from other inmates. Additionally, previous studies revealed that the most common piece of advice by young or juvenile offenders in prison with reference to how to combat bullying was action on the part of the young offender being victimized (Spain, 2005; Ireland, 2002b). This highlights the importance of taking into account the specific environment (e. g. training school versus prison; male versus female correctional institution) in which the bullying behavior is taking place before applying prevention and intervention.

Like early studies in the research history in the emerging area of prison bullying (Ireland, 2011) employed measures based on school-based definitions that asked offenders directly about their experiences of bullying, using the term “bullying” itself (e.g. Ireland and Archer, 1996), our study is the first one in this area in Estonia. Needless to say that issue of bullying behavior within prison settings has been started now in Estonia and should be continue within adolescent and adult and male and female offenders in prison-based settings as a part of research (Kõiv, 2009) on bullying in diversity settings. Although only descriptive in nature, the present study is the first to offer a valuable insight into bullying behavior that occurs within juvenile training school setting. It demonstrated that, in this setting, bullying is a prevalent phenomenon, which takes various forms and which is worth further investigation. Building on prison-based research among juvenile, young and adult offenders, this paper also highlighted the importance of addressing research across comparison of different age and sex groups to have focus on similar correctional settings. By applying a questionnaire which did use the term bullying, this study has not managed to overcome the methodological difficulties connected with shortcomings leading to possible underestimation of the extent of bullying as mentioned by Ireland (2002b). It is important to note, however, that the current study employed a relatively small sample of adult prisoners and juvenile training school adolescents and thus the conclusions drawn with regard to developmental differences must be done with caution. By examining differences in the nature and extent of male bullying behavior, intervention programs can focus on specific juvenile inmate population in different correctional institutions, included juvenile training schools.

References

- Björkqvist, K., Österman, K., & Kaukiainen, A. (1992). The development of direct and indirect aggressive strategies in males and females. In K. Björkqvist & P. Niemela (Eds.), *Of mice and women: Aspects of female aggression* (pp. 51–64). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Brookes, M. (1993). Reducing bullying at HMP Ranby. East Midlands, *Psychology Research Report*, No. 8, U.K.
- Connell A, & Farrington D. (1997). The reliability and validity of resident, staff and peer reports of bullying in young offender institutions. *Psychology, Crime, and Law*, 3, 287–300.
- Coyne, I., & Monks, C. P. (2011). An overview of bullying and abuse across settings. In C. P. Monks & I. Coyne (Eds.), *Bullying in different context* (pp. 231–256). UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Edgar, K. (2005). Bullying, victimization and safer prisons. *The Journal of Community and Criminal Justice*, 52(4), 390–400.
- Inderbitzin, M. (2006). Lessons from a juvenile training school: Survival and growth. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 21, 7–26.
- Ireland, J. L. (1999a). Bullying behaviors among male and female prisoners: A study of adult and young offenders. *Aggressive Behavior*, 25, 161–178.
- Ireland, J.L. (1999b). Provictim attitudes and empathy in relation to bullying behaviour among prisoners. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 4, 51–66.
- Ireland, J. L. (2002a). *Bullying among prisoners: Evidence, research and intervention strategies*. London and Hove: Brunner-Routledge.
- Ireland, J. L. (2002b). Do juveniles bully more than young offenders? A comparison of the perceived and actual bullying behaviour reported by juvenile and young offenders. *Journal of Adolescence*, 25, 155–168.
- Ireland, J. L. (2005a). Bullying among prisoners: The need for innovation. In J. L. Ireland (Ed.), *Bullying among prisoners: Innovations in theory and research* (pp. 1–30). Hove: Willan Publishing.
- Ireland, J. L., (2005b) Psychological health and bullying behavior among adolescent prisoners: A study of young and juvenile offenders. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 36, 236–243.
- Ireland, J. L., (2005c). Prison bullying and fear: Can fear assist with explanations of victim responses?. In J. L. Ireland (Ed.), *Bullying among prisoners: Innovations in theory and research* (pp. 129–149). Hove: Willan Publishing.
- Ireland, J. L. (2011). Bullying in prisons: Bringing research up to date. In C. P. Monks & I. Coyne (Eds.), *Bullying in different context* (pp. 137–156). UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Ireland, J. L., & Archer, J. (1996). Descriptive analysis of bullying in male and female adult offenders. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 6, 35–47.
- Ireland, J. L., & Archer, J. (2004). Association between measures of aggression and bullying among juvenile and young offenders. *Aggressive Behavior*, 30, 29–42.

- Ireland, J. L. & Hafiz, N. (2010). Psychological ill health, social self-esteem and bullying behavior among prisoners: A study of juvenile, young and adult male prisoners. In: K. Österman (Ed.), *Indirect and direct aggression* (pp. 203–213). Peter Lang Pub Inc.
- Ireland, J. L., & Ireland, C. A. (2003). How do prisoners define bullying? A study of adult, young and juvenile male offenders. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 8, 159–173.
- Ireland, J. L., & Ireland, C. L. (2008). Intra-group aggression among prisoners: Frequency of bullying and exploration of victim-perpetrator mutuality. *Aggressive Behavior*, 34, 76–87.
- Ireland, J. L., & Monaghan, R. (2006). Behaviors indicative of bullying among young and juvenile male offenders: A study of perpetrator and victim characteristics. *Aggressive Behavior*, 32, 72–180.
- Ireland, J.L., & Power, C. L. (2004). Attachment, emotional loneliness and bullying behavior: A study of adult and young offenders. *Aggressive Behavior*, 30, 298–312.
- Ireland, J. L., Jarvis, S., Beck, G. and Osiowy, S. (1999). Recent research into bullying in prison. *Forensic Update*, 56, 4–9.
- Kõiv, K. (2009). Bullying among Estonian pupils: an overview. Mikk, J.; Veisson, M.; Luik, P. (Eds.), *Teenagers in Estonia: Values and behaviour* (pp. 103–123). Frankfurt am Main Berlin Bern Bruxelles New York Oxford Wien: Peter Lang Europäischer Verlag der Wissenschaften.
- Leddy, J., & O'Connell, M. (2002). The prevalence, nature and psychological correlations of bullying in Irish Prison. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 7, 131–140.
- McGurk, B. J., & McDougall, C. (1991): The prevention of bullying among incarcerated delinquents. In: P. K. Smith and D. Thompson (Eds.), *Practical approaches to bullying* (pp. 130–140). London: David Fulton.
- Milan, M. A. (1996). Working in institutions. In C. R. Hollin, & K. Howells (Eds.), *Clinical approaches to working with young offenders* (pp 85-108). Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Monks, C. P., Smith P. K., Naylor, P., Barter C., Ireland, J. L., & Coyne, I. (2009). Bullying in different contexts: Commonalities, differences and the role of theory. *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 14, 146–156.
- Olweus, D. (1994). Bullying at school: Basic facts and effects of a school-based intervention programme. *Journal of Child Psychology and Child Psychiatry*, 35, 1171–1190.
- Peterson-Badali, M., & Koegl, C. J. (2002) Juvenile experiences of incarceration: The role of correctional staff in peer violence, *Journal of Crime Justice*, 30, 41–49.
- Smith, P. K. (2011). Bullying in schools: Thirty years of research. In C. P. Monks & I. Coyne (Eds.), *Bullying in different context* (pp. 36–60). UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, P. K., & Brain. P. (2000). Bullying in schools: Lessons from two decades of research. *Aggressive Behaviour*, 26, 1–9.
- Smith, P. K., Pendleton, E., & Mitchell, H. (2005). Bullying and anti-bullying policies: A young offender institution and an adult prison. In J. L. Ireland (Ed.), *Bullying among prisoners: Innovations in theory and research* (pp. 109–125). UK: Willian Publishing.

- Spain, A. (2005). Bullying among young offenders: Findings from a qualitative study. In J. L. Ireland (Ed.), *Bullying among prisoners: Innovations in theory and research* (pp. 62-83). UK: Willian Publishing.
- Turner, P., & Ireland, J. L. (2010). Do personality characteristics and beliefs predict intra-group bullying between prisoners? *Aggressive Behavior*, 36, 261–270.