DOI: 10.16835/j.cnki.1000-9817.2025362

· 儿童青少年同伴欺凌防控专栏 ·

基于微系统的初中生同伴欺凌综合干预效果评价

王新惠[1],李楚楚[1],王聪[1],刘志浩[2],汪耿夫[1,3],苏普玉[1,3]

1.安徽医科大学公共卫生学院儿少卫生与妇幼保健学系,合肥 230032;2.江苏省疾病预防控制中心健康教育所;
3.出生人口健康教育部重点实验室/环境与人口健康安徽省重点实验室

【摘要】 目的 基于生态系统理论的微系统视角,实施家庭-学校-社区协同综合干预方案,评估其在减少初中生同伴欺凌行为方面的效果,为初中生欺凌防治工作提供实证依据和可行路径。**方法** 采用方便与整群相结合的抽样方法,于 2024 年 10 月在安徽省阜阳和安庆市选取 3 所普通初级中学 6 268 名学生为研究对象,采用抽签法随机分为家庭-学校-社区联合干预(2 063 名)、仅学校干预(1 864 名)和对照(2 341 名)3 组。于 2024 年 10 月 10 日—2025 年 1 月 10 日对干预组采用海报、宣传手册、视频相结合的方式实施为期 3 个月的干预,每半个月干预 1 次,每次 40 min,家庭-学校-社区联合干预组接受涵盖家庭、学校与社区的多层面干预;仅学校干预组仅接受校园干预;对照组除常规校园宣传教育外,不采取其他任何干预。干预前后使用同伴欺凌量表收集初中生同伴欺凌数据,采用 χ^2 检验进行同伴欺凌检出率的比较。**结果** 干预后组间比较结果显示,家庭-学校-社区联合干预组、仅学校干预组和对照组在被同伴欺凌及其各维度和同伴欺凌他人及其各维度上差异均有统计学意义($\chi^2=28.61\sim66.85$,P 值均<0.05)。家庭-学校-社区联合干预组被言语欺凌(7.51%)、被关系欺凌(5.62%)、被躯体欺凌(3.34%)、被网络欺凌(1.75%)、被同伴欺凌(10.81%)、言语欺凌他人(2.67%)、关系欺凌他人(1.55%)、躯体欺凌他人(1.36%)、网络欺凌他人(1.41%)及同伴欺凌他人(3.64%)的检出率均低于对照组(12.52%,11.58%,6.24%,5.00%,19.14%,7.56%,4.49%,4.53%,3.80%,9.40%);在言语欺凌他人、同伴欺凌他人、被言语欺凌、被同伴欺凌 4 个方面的检出率均低于仅学校干预组(4.67%,6.65%,13.14%,16.42%),差异均有统计学意义(χ^2 值分别为30.04,48.49,19.75,34.60,58.89,52.65,31.32,37.37,24.14,58.26;11.25,18.53,33.93,26.41,P 值均<0.016 7)。组内比较显示,2 个干预组绝大多数同伴欺凌行为在干预后显著减少($\chi^2=4.86\sim171.01$,P 值均<0.05)。**结论** 以微系统为基础的家庭-学校-社区联合干预能有效降低初中生同伴欺凌行为,其效果优于单一学校干预。该模式可为构建中国学生欺凌多层级防治体系提供实践参考。

【关键词】 暴力;干预性研究;精神卫生;学生

【中图分类号】 R 179 C 913.5 G 444 **【文献标识码】** A **【文章编号】** 1000-9817(2025)12-1691-05

Effectiveness of the comprehensive intervention on junior high school students peer bullying based on microsystem

WANG Xinhui*, LI Chuchu, WANG Cong, LIU Zhihao, WANG Gengfu, SU Puyu

Department of Maternal, Child and Adolescent Health, School of Public Health, Anhui Medical University, Hefei 230032, Anhui Province, China

【Abstract】 Objective To evaluate the effectiveness of a family-school-community integrated intervention based on the microsystem theory in reducing peer bullying among junior high school students, so as to provide empirical evidence and feasible pathways for junior high school students bullying prevention and control in China. **Methods** A combining convenience with clustering method was employed to select 6 268 students from three regular junior high schools in Fuyang and Anqing cities, Anhui Province, as the study subjects in October 2024, and randomly assigned by drawing lots to three groups: family-school-community integrated intervention ($n=2\ 063$), school-only intervention ($n=1\ 864$), and control group ($n=2\ 341$). From October 10, 2024, to January 10, 2025, the intervention was implemented for three months using posters, brochures, and videos, with one session every half month, each lasting 40 minutes. The family-school-community integrated intervention group received multi-level interventions involving families, schools, and communities, while the school-only intervention group received only school-based interventions. The control group received routine school health education but no other interventions. Before and after the intervention, data on peer bullying among junior high school students were collected using the Peer Bullying Scale, and comparison of detection rate of peer bullying by *Chi*-square test. **Results** After the intervention, group comparison results showed that the incidence rates of various types of peer bullying in the family-school-community integrated intervention group, the school-only intervention group, and the control

【基金项目】 国家自然科学基金项目(82173539, 82204071)

【作者简介】 王新惠(2000-),女,山东枣庄人,在读硕士,主要研究方向为儿童青少年发育与行为医学。

【通信作者】 苏普玉,E-mail:supuyu@ahmu.edu.cn

group all showed statistically significant differences (χ^2 = 28.61 – 66.85, all P < 0.05). The detection rates of verbal bullying (7.51%), relational bullying (5.62%), physical bullying (3.34%), cyberbullying (1.75%), being bullied (10.81%), verbal bullying others (2.67%), relational bullying others (1.55%), physical bullying others (1.36%), cyberbullying others (1.41%), and overall peer bullying (3.64%) in the family-school-community integrated intervention group were all lower than those in the control group (12.52%, 11.58%, 6.24%, 5.00%, 19.14%, 7.56%, 4.49%, 4.53%, 3.80%, 9.40%); additionally, the detection rates of verbal bullying others, overall peer bullying, verbal bullying, and being bullied, in the family-school-community integrated intervention group were all lower than those in the school-only intervention group (4.67%, 6.65%, 13.14%, 16.42%), with statistically significant differences (χ^2 = 30.04, 48.49, 19.75, 34.60, 58.89, 52.65, 31.32, 37.37, 24.14, 58.26; 11.25, 18.53, 33.93, 26.41, all P<0.016 7). Group comparison showed that in both intervention groups, the majority of peer bullying behaviors decreased after the intervention (χ^2 = 4.86–171.01, all P<0.05). **Conclusions** The family-school-community integrated intervention based on the microsystem can effectively reduce peer bullying among junior high school students, with better efficacy than the single-school intervention. The model can serve as a practical reference for establishing a multi-level prevention and intervention system for junior high school students bullying in China.

【Keywords】 Violence; Intervention studies; Mental health; Students

同伴欺凌是重要的公共卫生问题,指个体反复、故意对他人实施伤害性或令人不适的挑衅行为[1],常发生于同伴或同龄人之间,亦称为校园欺凌[2],包括传统欺凌(言语、关系、躯体等)与网络欺凌 2 种形式[3]。我国研究显示,约 10.89%的学生曾遭受欺凌,1.38%实施过欺凌,2.72%兼具受害与实施双重角色[4];另有纵向研究发现,61.3%的青少年曾遭受传统欺凌,15.35%曾遭受网络欺凌[5]。欺凌对青少年发展构成严重危害,受害者常出现抑郁、焦虑、睡眠障碍、自杀意念等心理行为问题,实施者则表现出更高的外化行为问题与成年后高违法犯罪风险[6-7]。另有研究进一步表明,中小学阶段经历同伴欺凌与大学时期自杀风险升高显著相关[8]。

生态系统理论将个体发展置于由个体、微系统、中系统、外系统等组成的嵌套结构中,强调各系统间交互作用对行为的影响[9]。多项研究基于该理论探讨了儿童青少年欺凌行为的诱因[10-12]。其中微系统(家庭、学校与同伴群体)作为最直接、最易干预的环境层面,对欺凌行为的发生与防治具有关键作用[13]。为此,本研究基于生态系统理论的微系统视角,整合家庭、学校与社区 3 个层面,构建多组分结构化干预方案,并评估其在减少初中生欺凌行为方面的效果,为我国欺凌防控提供科学依据与实践路径。

1 对象与方法

1.1 对象 于 2024 年 10 月采用方便抽样法在安徽省选取阜阳和安庆市的 3 所普通初级中学,将学校全体学生纳入研究,采用抽签法将 3 所学校随机分为家庭-学校-社区联合干预(2 063 名)、仅学校干预(1 864 名)和对照(2 341 名)3 组,共 6 268 名七至九年级学生。3 组在性别、性格、自评家庭经济状况、母亲文化程度、与母亲的关系、父亲文化程度、与父亲的关系、学习成绩方面的构成差异均有统计学意义(χ^2 值分别为 14.80, 52.60, 54.04, 437.82, 36.11, 772.96, 14.63, 62.34, P 值均<0.05)。本研究获得安徽医科大学生物医学伦理委员会批准(批号:20210355),并取得学校、学生及家长的知情同意。

1.2 方法

1.2.1 调查问卷 (1)一般人口学特征:通过自编问卷获得研究对象性别、年级、班级、自评性格类型、自评家庭经济状况、是否独生子女、父母文化程度、与父母关系、学习成绩等。(2)同伴欺凌量表:采用同伴欺凌问卷[14]调查研究对象过去 3 个月内遭受欺凌和实施欺凌情况。该问卷共 16 个条目(被欺凌和欺凌他人问卷各 8 个条目),分别对言语、关系、躯体、网络 4 种欺凌类型进行评价。每个条目采用 4 等级评分(1 = 没有发生过,2 = 每月 <2 次,3 = 每月 2 ~ 3 次;4 = 每月 ≥4 次)。每种类型每个月发生 ≥2 次即被评定为遭受或实施过某种同伴欺凌,任何一种欺凌类型阳性,即为遭受或实施过同伴欺凌[15]。本研究中干预前后该问卷的 Cronbach α 系数分别为0.82和 0.87,内部一致性良好。

1.2.2 干预方法及流程 采用海报、宣传手册、视频相结合的方式实施干预。家庭-学校-社区联合干预组要求家长观看、学习同伴欺凌宣传视频及手册;校园内投放展板张贴同伴欺凌宣传海报,老师观看同伴欺凌宣传视频,学生在班会课观看宣传视频及宣传手册内容;社区方面在学生居住的社区内张贴宣传海报。仅校园干预组实施上述校园干预的内容。每半个月接受 1 次干预,每次 40 min,持续 3 个月(2024 年 10 月 10 日—2025 年 1 月 10 日)。对照组除常规校园宣传教育外,不采取其他任何干预措施。

1.3 质量控制 调查前,进行干预项目的前期审核及预调查以确保项目完整可行、调查表无误;对调查员进行统一培训。现场调查时,要求调查对象逐题填写,独立作答,有疑问者举手示意,由调查员帮助解

释,作答完毕由调查员收取并检查,如有遗漏,及时返还被调查者补齐。对回收问卷进行检查剔除完成率<80%的问卷,随后编号。使用 EpiData 3.1 软件建立数据库,采用双录入进行一致性检验并针对错误进行改正,最终确定无误后导出。逻辑检查与核对,对缺失值进行必要的填补,最大程度恢复原始资料的完整性。

1.4　统计学分析　使用 SPSS 27.0 软件对数据进行处理分析。基线数据,采用描述性分析介绍干预组和对照组研究对象基本情况,计数资料以频数和率表示,组间比较采用χ^2 检验;干预前后组内的比较采用配对χ^2 检验,以 $P<0.05$ 为有统计学意义。3 组间干预前后的组间比较均采用χ^2 检验,有统计学意义的组别之间再进行事后两两比较,校正后的 $\alpha=0.016\ 7$。

2　结果

2.1　干预前各组初中生同伴欺凌相关变量情况比较　表 1 显示,干预前被言语欺凌、被躯体欺凌、被同伴欺凌及各类欺凌他人行为组间差异均有统计学意义(P 值均<0.05),被关系欺凌和被网络欺凌在干预前组间差异均无统计学意义(P 值均>0.05)。

表 1　干预前后不同干预措施组初中生同伴欺凌检出率比较

Table 1　Comparison of the detection rate of peer bullying among different intervention groups before and after the intervention

干预前后	组别	人数	统计值	被欺凌					欺凌他人				
				被言语欺凌	被关系欺凌	被躯体欺凌	被网络欺凌	被同伴欺凌	言语欺凌他人	关系欺凌他人	躯体欺凌他人	网络欺凌他人	同伴欺凌他人
干预前	对照组	2 341		316(13.50)	232(9.91)	98(4.19)	78(3.33)	442(18.88)	212(9.06)	86(3.67)	38(1.62)	47(2.01)	260(11.11)
	仅学校干预组	1 864		433(23.23)	188(10.09)	102(5.47)	69(3.70)	516(27.68)	309(16.58)	93(4.99)	84(4.51)	70(3.76)	369(19.80)
	家庭-学校-社区联合干预组	2 063		238(11.54)	183(8.87)	64(3.10)	61(2.96)	324(15.71)	173(8.39)	65(3.15)	49(2.38)	54(2.62)	212(10.28)
			χ^2 值	115.15	2.03	13.64	1.70	92.02	82.16	9.33	33.95	12.09	93.57
			P 值	<0.01	0.36	<0.01	0.43	<0.01	<0.01	0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
干预后	对照组	2 341		293(12.52)	271(11.58)	146(6.24)	117(5.00)	448(19.14)	177(7.56)	105(4.49)	106(4.53)	89(3.80)	220(9.40)
	仅学校干预组	1 864		245(13.14)	112(6.01)	63(3.38)	41(2.20)	306(16.42)	87(4.67)	45(2.41)	30(1.61)	35(1.88)	124(6.65)
	家庭-学校-社区联合干预组	2 063		155(7.51)	116(5.62)	69(3.34)	36(1.75)	223(10.81)	55(2.67)	32(1.55)	28(1.36)	29(1.41)	75(3.64)
			χ^2 值	39.67	66.85	28.61	45.78	59.19	55.37	35.74	53.83	29.97	58.38
			P 值	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01

注:( )内数字为检出率/%。

2.2　干预后各组初中生同伴欺凌相关变量情况比较

2.2.1　组间比较　干预后,同伴欺凌相关变量的组间差异均有统计学意义(P 值均<0.01)。事后两两比较发现,家庭-学校-社区联合干预组被言语欺凌、被关系欺凌、被躯体欺凌、被网络欺凌、被同伴欺凌、言语欺凌他人、关系欺凌他人、躯体欺凌他人、网络欺凌他人及同伴欺凌他人的检出率均低于对照组,差异均有统计学意义(χ^2 值分别为 30.04, 48.49, 19.75, 34.60, 58.89, 52.65, 31.32, 37.37, 24.14, 58.26, P 值均<0.016 7);家庭-学校-社区联合干预组被言语欺凌、被同伴欺凌、言语欺凌他人、同伴欺凌他人检出率均低于仅学校干预组(χ^2 值分别为 33.93, 26.41, 11.25, 18.53, P 值均<0.016 7);仅学校干预组被关系欺凌、被躯体欺凌、被网络欺凌、言语欺凌他人、关系欺凌他人、躯体欺凌他人、网络欺凌他人及同伴欺凌他人的检出率均低于对照组,差异均有统计学意义(χ^2 值分别为 38.86, 17.93, 22.47, 14.77, 12.94, 28.24, 13.42, 10.41, P 值均<0.016 7)。见表 1。

2.2.2　组内比较　配对χ^2 检验结果显示,对照组、仅学校干预组和家庭-学校-社区联合干预组 3 组在被关系欺凌、被网络欺凌、言语欺凌他人、躯体欺凌他人、网络欺凌他人、同伴欺凌他人行为指标上干预前后差异均有统计学意义(χ^2 值分别为 4.86, 10.94, 5.00, 37.90, 15.47, 5.56; 27.51, 8.71, 158.98, 30.38, 13.46, 171.01; 20.50, 8.12, 73.28, 6.21, 9.92, 84.93);而在被言语欺凌、被同伴欺凌、关系欺凌他人上仅有家庭-学校-社区联合干预组和仅学校干预组干预前后差异有统计学意义(χ^2 值分别为 26.19, 30.27, 12.52; 82.58, 92.26, 20.57);在被躯体欺凌上仅有对照组和仅学校干预组干预前后差异有统计学意义(χ^2 值分别为 4.86, 27.51)(P 值均<0.05)。

3　讨论

本研究结果显示,干预后 2 个干预组同伴欺凌行为与被欺凌行为检出率基本较干预前下降,且均低于对照组,表明干预措施对减少初中生同伴欺凌具有积极效果,与既往研究一致[16-18]。然而,单纯依赖学校层面干预可能因忽视家庭、社区等因素而使效果受限[19-20]。近年来,多数学者倡导构建基于生态学理论的多层面协同干预模式,研究证实该干预模式可降低欺凌行为发生率[21-25]。本研究也发现,家庭-学校-社区联合干预组部分欺凌相关行为检出率低于仅学校干预组,与上述观点相符。

本研究结果为生态系统理论在同伴欺凌干预中的应用提供了实证支持。该理论强调个体发展受微系统、中系统、外系统等多层次环境共同影响,欺凌行为的防控亦嵌套于此交互网络中[9]。基于此构建的综合干预以微系统为切入点,通过协同家庭、学校与

社区形成跨系统保护机制:家庭干预提升家长识别与应对能力,增强情感支持[26-27];学校干预构建积极校园氛围,打破欺凌沉默文化[28-30];社区干预整合资源,消除环境诱因。此类多维策略可弥补单一层面干预的局限,对受害初中生实施综合干预,不仅有助于降低再受害风险、提升社会适应能力,还可能通过表观遗传等机制促进心理行为积极转变[30-33]。目前我国欺凌治理仍以政策引导为主,缺乏系统化、可推广的综合干预方案,本研究将生态系统理论转化为可操作的干预实践,验证了多维协同策略的有效性,为我国欺凌防治提供了具体路径。

本研究存在一定局限性:研究对象限于安徽省部分城市初中生,样本代表性不足;缺乏长期追踪数据,难以评估干预效果的持续性;欺凌变量主要依赖自评量表,可能存在社会期望偏差;尽管采用随机分组,但 3 组在部分人口学特征及欺凌指标上基线不均衡,可能影响组间比较的纯粹性。未来应拓展区域与群体范围,延长评估周期,结合教师评价、同伴提名等多源信息,提升结果的可靠性与生态效度。

利益冲突声明 所有作者声明无利益冲突。

参考文献

[1] ÖZCANÖ, KOCABACAK O, KOLCU M. Peer bullying tendencies of school children: the role of demographic, health-related, and school-related factors[J]. J Pediatr Nurs, 2024, 78: 31-36.

[2] WIERTSEMA M, VRIJEN C, VAN DER PLOEG R, et al. Bullying perpetration and social status in the peer group: a Meta-analysis[J]. J Adolesc, 2023, 95(1): 34-55.

[3] 刘小群,刘倩雯,吴芳,等.中学生同胞欺凌和同伴欺凌的共发性及其与抑郁和焦虑的关联性[J].中国临床心理学杂志,2022,30(2):382-386,413.
LIU X Q, LIU Q W, WU F, et al. The co-occurrence of sibling and peer bullying and its association with depression and anxiety in high-school students[J]. Chin J Clin Psychol, 2022, 30(2): 382-386, 413. (in Chinese)

[4] LUO X, ZHENG R, XIAO P, et al. Relationship between school bullying and mental health status of adolescent students in China: a nationwide cross-sectional study[J]. Asian J Psychiatr, 2022, 70: 103043.

[5] MANG L, HUANG N, LIU X, et al. The interaction effects of social support and four types of bullying on sleep quality in Chinese adolescents[J]. J Affect Disord, 2023, 341: 119-127.

[6] ARMITAGE R. Bullying in children: impact on child health[J]. BMJ Paediatr Open, 2021, 5(1): e000939.

[7] WOLKE D, LEREYA S T. Long-term effects of bullying[J]. Arch Dis Child, 2015, 100(9): 879-885.

[8] WANG G F, HAN A Z, ZHANG G B, et al. Sensitive periods for the effect of bullying victimization on suicidal behaviors among university students in China: the roles of timing and chronicity[J]. J Affect Disord, 2020, 268: 12-19.

[9] 苏普玉,汪耿夫.遏制儿童青少年同伴欺凌 加强常规行为监测和干预[J].中国学校卫生,2022,43(10):1441-1445.
SU P Y, WANG G F. Prevent and eradicate peer bullying in children and adolescents through routine bullying surveillance and intervention[J]. Chin J Sch Health, 2022, 43(10): 1441-1445. (in Chinese)

[10] SCHOELER T, CHOI S W, DUDBRIDGE F, et al. Multi-polygenic score approach to identifying individual vulnerabilities associated with the risk of exposure to bullying[J]. JAMA Psychiatry, 2019, 76(7): 730-738.

[11] WANG Q. Association of childhood intrafamilial aggression and childhood peer bullying with adult depressive symptoms in China[J]. JAMA Netw Open, 2020, 3(8): e2012557.

[12] ELGAR F J, GARIEPY G, DIRKS M, et al. Association of early-life exposure to income inequality with bullying in adolescence in 40 countries[J]. JAMA Pediatr, 2019, 173(7): e191181.

[13] 马皓苓.校园欺凌者行为发生的影响因素:生态系统理论视角[J].教育科学论坛,2019(31):75-77.
MA H L. The influencing factors of bullying behaviors in schools: from the perspective of ecosystem theory[J]. Educ Sci Forum, 2019(31): 75-77. (in Chinese)

[14] SU P Y, WANG G F, HE H, et al. Is involvement in school bullying associated with increased risk of murderous ideation and behaviours among adolescent students in China?[J]. BMC Psychiatry, 2019, 19(1): 121.

[15] KOWALSKI R M, LIMBER S P. Psychological, physical, and academic correlates of cyberbullying and traditional bullying[J]. J Adolesc Health, 2013, 53(Suppl 1): S13-S20.

[16] KELLY E V, NEWTON N C, STAPINSKI L A, et al. A novel approach to tackling bullying in schools: personality-targeted intervention for adolescent victims and bullies in Australia[J]. J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry, 2020, 59(4): 508-518.

[17] FRAGUAS D, DÍAZ-CANEJA C M, AYORA M, et al. Assessment of school anti-bullying interventions: a Meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials[J]. JAMA Pediatr, 2021, 175(1): 44-55.

[18] BONELL C, ALLEN E, WARREN E, et al. Effects of the learning together intervention on bullying and aggression in English secondary schools (INCLUSIVE): a cluster randomised controlled trial[J]. Lancet, 2018, 392(10163): 2452-2464.

[19] SMITH J D, SCHNEIDER B H, SMITH P K, et al. The effectiveness of whole-school antibullying programs: a synthesis of evaluation research[J]. Sch Psychol Rev, 2004, 33(4): 547-560.

[20] ORTEGA-RUIPÉREZ B, CASTELLANOS SÁNCHEZ A, MARCANO B. Risks in adolescent adjustment by Internet exposure: evidence from PISA[J]. Front Psychol, 2021, 12: 763759.

[21] GEORGE P, COSGROVE J, TAYLOR J, et al. Antibullying interventions in schools: assessing the evidence base[J]. Psychiatr Serv, 2024, 75(9): 908-920.

[22] ARANGO C, MARTÍN-BABARRO J, ABREGú-CRESPO R, et al. A web-enabled, school-based intervention for bullying prevention (LINKlusive): a cluster randomised trial[J]. EClinicalMedicine, 2024, 68: 102427.

(下转第 1700 页)

行为的关联[J].中国学校卫生,2023,44(9):1360-1364.
YE J, WANG S J, WANG G F. Association of peer bullying, life satisfaction with self-harm among junior high school students[J]. Chin J Sch Health, 2023, 44(9): 1360-1364. (in Chinese)

[24] HOLMES C J, KIM-SPOON J, DEATER-DECKARD K. Linking executive function and peer problems from early childhood through middle adolescence[J]. J Abnorm Child Psychol, 2016, 44(1): 31-42.

[25] POTARD C, KUBISZEWSKI V, COMBES C, et al. How adolescents cope with bullying at school: exploring differences between pure victim and bully-victim roles[J]. Int J Bullying Prev, 2022, 4(2): 144-159.

[26] 李燕萍,李皓璇.固步自封还是开拓进取?员工工作反刍对其反馈寻求策略的影响机制研究[J].科技进步与对策,2023,40(17):139-149.
LI Y P, LI H X. Thinking alone or seeking help to forge ahead? The influence mechanism of employees' work-related rumination on their feedback seeking strategies[J]. Sci Technol Prog Policy, 2023, 40(17): 139-149. (in Chinese)

[27] NELSON C A, SULLIVAN E F, VALDES V. Early adversity alters brain architecture and increases susceptibility to mental health disorders[J]. Nat Rev Neurosci, 2025, 26(10): 642-656.

[28] SOLECKI S. The phubbing phenomenon: the impact on parent-child relationships[J]. J Pediatr Nurs, 2022, 62: 211-214.

[29] ZHANG J, DONG C, JIANG Y, et al. Parental phubbing and child social-emotional adjustment: a Meta-analysis of studies conducted in China[J]. Psychol Res Behav Manag, 2023, 16: 4267-4285.

[30] KNEZEVIC E, NENIC K, MILANOVIC V, et al. The role of cortisol in chronic stress, neurodegenerative diseases, and psychological disorders[J]. Cells, 2023, 12(23): 2726-2743.

[31] 刘欢,李墅明,顾小萍.慢性应激中糖皮质激素及其受体在阿尔茨海默病中的作用[J].神经损伤与功能重建,2023,18(9):530-533.
LIU H, LI S M, GU X P. The role of glucocorticoid and its receptor in Alzheimer's disease during chronic stress[J]. Neural Inj Funct Reconstr, 2023, 18(9): 530-533. (in Chinese)

[32] BRONFENBRENNER U. Ecological systems theory[M]//KAZDIN A E. Encyclopedia of psychology. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000: 129-133.

[33] 王新光.公共管理视角下 X 市初级中学校园霸凌治理研究[D].海口:海南大学,2022.
WANG X G. Research on the government of campus bullying in X city junior middle school from the perspective of public management[D]. Haikou: Hainan University, 2022. (in Chinese)

[34] SABATIER C, CERVANTES D R, TORRES M M, et al. Emotion regulation in children and adolescents: concepts, processes and influences[J]. Psicol Caribe, 2017, 34(1): 1-25.

[35] HETTWER M D, DORFSCHMIDT L, PUHLMANN L M C, et al. Longitudinal variation in resilient psychosocial functioning is associated with ongoing cortical myelination and functional reorganization during adolescence[J]. Nat Commun, 2024, 15(1): 6283.

收稿日期:2025-11-04 **修回日期**:2025-12-01 **本文编辑**:汤建军

(上接第 1694 页)

[23] VALENZUELA D, TURUNEN T, GANA S, et al. Effectiveness of the KiVa antibullying program with and without the online game in Chile: a three-arm cluster randomized controlled trial[J]. Prev Sci, 2022, 23(8): 1470-1482.

[24] HUITSING G, LODDER G M A, BROWNE W J, et al. A large-scale replication of the effectiveness of the KiVa antibullying program: a randomized controlled trial in the Netherlands[J]. Prev Sci, 2020, 21(5): 627-638.

[25] MENESINI E, NOCENTINI A, PALLADINO B E. Empowering students against bullying and cyberbullying: evaluation of an Italian peer-led model[J]. Int J Conf Viol, 2022, 6(2): 314-320.

[26] MOHEBBI M, MIRNASAB M, WIENER J. Parental and school bonding in Iranian adolescent perpetrators and victims of bullying[J]. Sch Psychol Int, 2016, 37(6): 583-605.

[27] 黄亮.我国 15 岁在校学生遭受校园欺凌的情况及影响因素:基于 PISA 2015 我国四省市数据的分析[J].教育科学研究,2017(11):36-42.
HUANG L. The situation and influencing factors of school bullying among 15-year-old students in China: analysis based on PISA 2015 data from four provinces in China[J]. Educ Sci Res, 2017, (11): 36-42. (in Chinese)

[28] 张倩.我国青少年对校园欺凌的态度:现状、后果及其影响因素——基于 PISA 2018 的数据分析[J].湖南师范大学教育科学学报,2020,19(5):79-84.
ZHANG Q. The attitude of teenagers in China towards bullying on campus: status, consequences and influencing factors—a data analysis based on PISA 2018[J]. J Educ Sci Hunan Norm Univ, 2020, 19(5): 79-84. (in Chinese)

[29] 黄亮,赵德成.家庭社会经济文化地位与学生遭受校园欺凌关系的实证研究:家长支持和教师支持的中介作用[J].教育科学,2018,34(1):7-13.
HUANG L, ZHAO D C. Empirical research on relationship between family economic, social and cultural status and students' exposure to school bullying: mediating effects of parental support and teacher support[J]. Educ Sci, 2018, 34(1): 7-13. (in Chinese)

[30] KONISHI C, HYMEL S, ZUMBO B D, et al. Do school bullying and student: teacher relationships matter for academic achievement? A multilevel analysis[J]. Can J Sch Psychol, 2010, 25(1): 19-39.

[31] PERROUD N, SALZMANN A, PRADA P, et al. Response to psychotherapy in borderline personality disorder and methylation status of the BDNF gene[J]. Transl Psychiatry, 2013, 3(1): e207.

[32] HIBLER E, HUANG L, ANDRADE J, et al. Impact of a diet and activity health promotion intervention on regional patterns of DNA methylation[J]. Clin Epigenetics, 2019, 11(1): 133.

[33] MCEWEN L M, GATEV E G, JONES M J, et al. DNA methylation signatures in peripheral blood mononuclear cells from a lifestyle intervention for women at midlife: a pilot randomized controlled trial[J]. Appl Physiol Nutr Metab, 2018, 43(3): 233-239.

收稿日期:2025-11-03 **修回日期**:2025-11-21 **本文编辑**:汤建军