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Abstract: We assume that bullying is a cruel behavior, present in interpersonal relationships in which a strongest person turns weakest ones into his or her fun and pleasure objects. We studied bullying in the virtual environment in order to understand its occurrence during high school students’ leisure time. Thus, we conducted document research, selecting three communities of the social media network Orkut as material for analysis. We analyzed the ways members of those communities practice cyberbullying on school colleagues – focusing their attacks on bodies. We understand that Physical Education classes can either play or question that type of harassment, even though cyberbullying deviant behavior is a result of broad cultural and social context of adolescents.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Bullying is present in interpersonal relationships and manifests itself as cruel behavior where stronger people convert weaker ones into their fun and pleasure objects (FANTE, 2005). According to this view, power is unevenly exercised and therefore bullying is violence, even when it is intangible and therefore making pedagogical exercises against it more difficult.
Another exciting aspect is that it can formally be seen as a playful experience for the aggressor and it can be exercised outside the school environment, where it is more common. There, it would be disguised as an activity elected for time available – i.e., bullying can be seen as fun (PIMENTEL, 2010).

Since bullying gives pleasure to its perpetrator, sporadic behavior soon turns into continuous action, systematic aggression in which the subjects who suffer that aggression are increasingly unable to defend themselves. Bullying is a continuous form of individual or group aggression. When it is intentional, it is repeated (OLWUES, 1993; SMITH, SHARP, 2004) and the child or young person has difficulty responding assertively in order to get out of the situation (PEREIRA, 2008).

Being mixed with purely humorous manifestations, bullying would be initially understood as close to what Caillois (1994) calls corruption of playfulness, that is, when the spirit of playing exceeds its limits and has harmful consequences to individuals and society. In addition, considering bullying during free time, we would have a pathological dimension of leisure from a mephitic perspective, that is, violent behaviors perpetrated against people or places as pointed out by Rojek (2005). To that effect, in empirical studies by Pereira and Neto (1994; 1997), bullying behaviors emerge as the hidden face of leisure. Having started their research on children’s leisure activities, they quickly realized that bullying had defined very colorful lines on children’s leisure.

Bullying’s humorous and sensual tone contributes for the absence of any strong perception of it as a problem. Knowledge about that manifestation based on a category (bullying: continuous, aggressive and unequal harassment) started in the last 20 years.

These studies were initiated in Nordic countries where birth rates were too low and children were highly prized since they were few, and all of them had access to high levels of education (compulsory education). That is when the first studies giving voice to children were conducted (PEREIRA, 2008).
Particularly interesting is that free time at school, particularly recess, is highly associated to the occurrence of such violence, but also to its reversal (CARVALHO; BARROS; PEREIRA, 2009). To illustrate it, Pereira (2006; 2008) implemented an intervention program at schools focused on educating the school community about bullying, improvements in recesses and diversification of the school’s sports and cultural activities and monitoring cases of bullying. Marques Neto and Pereira (2001) and Marques et al. (2005) developed an intervention program focused on school recesses and playful equipment available for children as well as supervision, which proved to be effective in prevention.

On the other hand, sports participation (in federations or schools) has not shown significant effects in protecting against bullying, which can be related to coaches’ culture encouraging hostility in that environment (MELIN; PEREIRA, 2013).

Faced with this debate, considering the contribution of Physical Education, this study addressed bullying as a form of fun at the expense of harassment of someone in a vulnerable situation – usually students stereotyped as more studious, poor, obese, weak, timid, freakish, religious or ugly – or simply the young person who was in the wrong place at the wrong time.

Cyberbullying, in turn, is a type of indirect or direct bullying (when the original author of the aggression is identified, as on Facebook or Orkut). Even if it is similar to other practices, the technology resource allows increasing anonymity of the perpetrator and spreading ill-being on a large scale.

For the empirical study, considering that the school is a privileged place to educate for leisure, we chose the most characteristic study of bullying as mephitic leisure exercised freely during time available. That means that, outside the school context, students decide, among other possibilities for fun, to use the internet to ridicule someone and spread rumors about that person. Among the several media where cyberbullying can be found, we chose communities on the social networking site Orkut. The goal...
was to analyze the ways in which members of those communities bully through virtual leisure. Those ways include derision, that is, criticism and satire directed to a real person, known to the group, and associating bodily aspects that are different from standard aesthetics with moral deviations.

2 Methodological aspects

Data were obtained through document research, performing collection of materials that had not yet received analytical treatment in non-commercial websites and that are characterized as cyberbullying. The exploratory work was carried out on Orkut pages because they had material with higher incidence and more complaints of derision, generating situations ranging from cyberbullying to racism.

The software was developed by Google employee Orkut Büyükkökten, in order to establish social circles for virtual relationship. Since January 2004, thousands of networks of distinct styles have been created, allowing several people to communicate simultaneously around topics of interest after being invited by a third party (a mutual friend) – even from a distance and with no prior contact. That social networking tool became especially popular in Brazil and its use has been serving several purposes (COUTO; ROCHA, 2010).

In an exploratory way, we selected ten communities to test the analytical matrix, all of them from Brazil. Forums of many different types were selected on Orkut. They were linked to moments of unconventional leisure, so as to select the type of community most oriented toward bullying. The following leisure-oriented Orkut communities were analyzed in exploratory collection: *A Leigh B tem cara de cavalo* (Leigh B has a horse face); *CLE – Centro de Lazer Errante* (WLC – Wandering Leisure Centre); *ODEIO GÓTICOS* (HATE GOTHICS); *As biscates Fuçam Meu Orkut* (Slutty girls mess with my Orkut); *Ve vai na +feia e eu na outra!* (You get the ugly one and I get the other!); *AMO ouvir música ALTA* (LOVE listening to LOUD music); *Eu odeio filme dublado* (I hate movies with subtitles); *Preciso Morar na Praia* (I need to live in a beach); *Eu só fumo*
The analysis in this phase allowed us to select keywords such as “I hate ...” which best helped to direct the search for communities with a strong inclination to cyberbullying. We intentionally selected three communities for the study, which share the relationship with girls from the school and characterization of the victim’s body as the main focus of derision. The initial screening criterion was that communities were opened. Since we found many, we choose communities with more written material so as to allow safer exegesis of the texts. Since modes of derision were repeated in communities, the three communities with more content were analyzed according to a saturation criterion.

From the perspective of dialectic hermeneutics, the analysis considered attackers’ different ways to get to their victim in the community. In this process, we described derision cases under the analogy of texts that require interpretation, from different layers of meaning, which makes us turn to who the authors of the texts were and their production context. Categories of analysis were derived from the recurrence of derision and diversification of the ways they occur. After that, we conducted content analysis in order to show and understand derision ways towards bodies in cyberbullying. But since virtual bullying reflects unequal and multivariate power relations, we considered our study would gain from analyzing the material from Foucault’s genealogy perspective.

Many “authors” become attackers in the virtual environment because of the need to be part of the group or to avoid being the next victim, so they slander their colleagues.

This process can occur through conversations between members and on discussion forums, in polls about the victim, which are left there by the aggressors for members to vote, or by exposing an idea to trigger a reverse process so the damage is caused by victims themselves.

Taking social networking websites as texts coming from public documents, we considered some limitations: the difficulty to
contextualize them; the possibility of people not telling the truth; access to social networking sites being limited to requests from members; and especially cancellation of websites that promote cyberbullying more explicitly before we had access to them.

On privacy-related aspects, there is no consensus among users. Academically, the use of this material, which becomes public as soon as it is posted and accessed by others, still generates insecurity. Furthermore, there is no control of identity when users are in the virtual environment. The power that others are able to exercise as well as the use and degree of occupation of space, when related to the personal sphere, indicate the need to filter information (SCHWARTZ; COMPAGNA, 2006).

Given the specificity of the study, we did not resort to direct contact with human beings and therefore did not adopt an Informed Consent Statement. The research project was registered as document research and was approved under no. CAAE 02695112.4.0000.0104. Thus, since using material from websites is still new and the content might reveal the identity of those involved in bullying, we adopted ethical research procedures, blurring pictures and addresses that could compromise the anonymity of those involved.

3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In relation to Orkut, Faustino and Oliveira (2008) see four ways as the most usual to expose a person: posting offensive messages on the victim’s profile; sending personal messages to the victim; creating a fake profile for the victim; or creating a community. According to the authors, cyberbullying on social networking sites has the added difficulty of being open to “be seen by any user and thus increasing prejudgment of the victim by those who access that offensive content” (FAUSTINO; OLIVEIRA, 2008, p. 187).

Indeed, it was possible to identify virtual communities where bullying is practiced on Orkut, as well as those directed to support victims. In the digital age, derogatory nicknames, photo manipulation
with negative effects, and exposure of intimate information are among the findings that begin in the classroom and spread to Orkut communities and MSN conversations, in addition to the most feared cyberbullying: exposure on YouTube.

The first community selected was established in a city in the state of São Paulo, in April 2007, and has had 35 members since the analysis was conducted. This community is not moderated; it is public, i.e., new members need not to be authorized by the owner. This allows a user to enter the community, to write insults and then leave it, so his or her identity can remain anonymous for group members or any other user.

In this case people gathered to offend the specific victim in conversations on forums. The figure below illustrates the call to revenge against the prejudiced behavior of a certain “frog-faced girl” (slang that can express ugliness or a person with bulging eyes and wide mouth):

**Figure 1** – Community: I hate that frog-faced girl

Source: Orkut

Another characteristic is that this community was not necessarily made for members to be able to talk to each other about the fact that they do not like the girl, but also for her to read the comments that were being made about her.

The community’s description makes it clear that it aim is to offend and that, according to members’ profiles, the language in the description and discussion forums, they are high school students.

The victim is identified in the photo intended for an image that identifies the community and the city name. However, in the space for publicizing related communities there is no other community to makeup the offensive community image, as seen in many others.

Cyberbullying’s paradox lies in that the victim in this case is taken as an aggressor at school. Cyber-aggressors call upon those dissatisfied with their colleague’s behavior to demonstrate it to the community. Is that believable? Consistent with studies on bullying (FANTE, 2005), it is not uncommon that the same person can be a victim in the virtual environment and an aggressor at school or become an aggressor after being victimized.

Another contradiction is that, concomitant to the alleged complaint about the prejudices of the “frog-faced girl”, the community resorts right away to a physical rather than moral characterization. On the “frog face” Forum, there were the following comments:

she really has a frog face, her forehead is iron, it reminds me of the forehead of a train, besides being resentful for losing the cute boys to us, LOL.......

(Comment F1 Taa).

Girl why so much resentment if it’s not our fault that you’re born such a monster who came straight out of the horror house … LOL I’m so sorry for you, ‘cause not even a plastic surgery will help you ... want some advice? Kill yourself ... I’m outta here (Comment F1Tab).
The comments found do not focus on the complaint about the classmate’s aggression, but on the derision and the – machoist – projection of solutions. Basically, they refer to the logic that ugliness makes someone socially unpleasant, but this would reflect her desire to receive sexual attention. On the Forums called “She’s a little whore, naughty and has a big forehead” and “The Nightmare”, it can be inferred that aggression is combined with libel and slander.

hey your dirty slut what u deserve is to take a dick
you damned little bitch

(Comment F1Tfa)

This girl must be unbearable, we can tell that right away for her FROG face. But I think she looks more like an AGOUTI IN HEAT. But there’s no way, because that bitch’s gotta be a piece of work. Get real, go get that nasty pussy fucked, maybe that DEAD FISH face of yours gets better, ‘cause you need it bad. But of course, who will want that crap. She has several characteristics, such as: LITTLE SLUT, SCUM, NASTY, NUT FACE, HORSE GUTS, R FACE, AGOUTI IN HEAT, WORM PISS, DEEP, AND ETC. Now I ask: Who’s up to give that blowfly a treat? (Comment F1Tba).

The content of the messages has the same style of attacks found by Faustino and Oliveira (2008) at other Orkut communities. Common traits include: speech directed at the victim, who is a woman; defamation and slander; suicide suggestion; offenses related to sexuality and the body; threats; ironies and contradictions in arguments; and verbal and psychological aggression.

Given these considerations, we take that cyberbullying in the community is based on the following arguments: a) a call to denigrate someone under the pretext that he or she deserves it because of b) antisocial behavior whose c) alleged cause is an unfortunate physical characterization together with sexual disqualification of the person; d) solution lies in carrying out the
sexual instincts assigned by his or her attackers and e) catharsis through verbal attacks they launch against the object of their revolt as well as negative physical and psychological characterizations; f) this system, by becoming public, turns participants into attackers, since there is defamation against the victim, with predictable damage.

The second community was established in November 13, 2008, in Pelotas, RS, with 18 members. School bullying is evident because the description of the author (community owner) includes the place where probably both study, identifying the girl with photo and name exposed as confirmed by the image below:

*Figure 2 – Community: We hate HORSE face from JD*

Source: Orkut
Comparing the communities, the very evident gender issue is very is significant, since it is intended to offend girls. Precisely because of that, there is disqualification of the body – a key symbolic capital for social relations in adolescence, but which also suffers fast changes during that life stage. According to Azzarito and Solmon (2006), in high school, bodies suffer (positive or derogatory) qualifications according to expectations ascribed to the subject (filtered by markers such as ethnicity and gender) around personality and body (height, strength, muscles and appearance).

The difference between the first community and the second one is that the latter has no derogatory comments on its discussion forums. The young girl is denigrated through polls in which participants vote on options regarding the victim’s self.

There are no honorable alternatives among the options, “little whore”, “idiot” or “conceited” to define “what she is”.

Another interesting aspect is the recourse to facial markers for stereotyping. While in the other community the victim is “frog faced”, in this one she would be the “horse faced” of the school, whose initials are JD. Besides the curious regionalism in which “frog” is used in a floodplain city and “horse” appears in a region marked by a livestock tradition, it is essential for aggressors to ridicule and animalize their victims. This reification mechanism, besides favoring the coward environment, would facilitate the understanding, current among aggressors, that deep down, they enjoy attacking. Initially motivated by some sense of revenge, the community gradually takes on mephitic tones for the practice of derision, until it trivializes.

On the internet, this sensual aspect is fully compatible with the production of polls whose origin refers to the imaginary of major media entertainment systems (radio, television and now the Internet) and in TV shows. The major relationship between leisure and the media on youth everyday life contributes to this (HACK; PIRES, 2007). After all, the internet is only a means for spreading the greatest possible number of youth practices, among
which derision will take a special place thanks to the possibility of anonymity and the fact that the aggression does not occur in direct confrontation with the target person. Under such reasoning, cyberbullying is displaced from the field of cathartic aggression to a humorous variant of leisure. In short, violence is justified by the victim’s features, only to be subsequently diluted as a playful activity. In other words, participants sublimate violence when playing offense.

More recently, following today’s new perspectives, Schwartz (2003) suggests the inclusion of the virtual contents of leisure, based on technological advances and the new practices offered by adhesion to the virtual environment.

The virtual environment is associated with the leisure context, especially by offering it opportunities for personal satisfaction and creating expectations and desires.

Based on a study applied via internet, Schwartz and Compagna (2006) show that by interacting with the virtual world, subjects can adopt different conducts, such as obtaining varied information and promoting relationships, thus providing opportunities for personal satisfaction and the creation of expectations.

Still on the virtual environment as a leisure technology, it is clear that the internet has placed private bodies on a new visibility level, which has intensified, besides two other complementary effects: hyper exposure of intimacy and porno-leisure. On the first aspect, when searching videographies of herself on YouTube, Ribeiro (2012) concluded that this type of personal expression in cyberspace facilitates accidentally revealing the person’s private issues. Among aspects of this virtual self-representation, Pimentel (2010) underscores attention to the “sensualization” of the subject, so that leisure produced in these experiments of oneself carries subtle elements of sex appeal. Thus, a double movement emerges: on the one hand we have the need to make ourselves attractive in cyberspace; on the other hand – in cyberbullying – attackers make use of sexual connotations for derision of bodies (see community “I hate this frog-faced girl”).

In this regard, Rojek (2005, p. 186) shows the negative aspect of virtual leisure where leisure forms are placed in culture as spaces in which the individual reinforces fundamental social values. However, leisure time involves the relaxation of those rules and regulations. Therefore, these leisure activities are compatible with the relaxation that involves separation of the individual from society and crystallization of antisocial behavior. There are leisure ways and practices for harming both oneself and others, which would justify the individual behaviors of others to be stereotyped as negative.

These practices are based on the violent commitment against others and can both dissipate and feed destructive behavior at leisure.

Finally, the last community is designed more explicitly to mock the girl considered “the school’s ugliest”. This was the most common reason for cyberbullying in the exploratory phase, when communities were selected so as to infer that being beautiful is a must in school sociability, at the expense of public and virtual execration of those most susceptible to this violence. The text describing the community justifies it by attempting to put the young woman on the “Book of Records” as the “The World’s Ugliest Chick”. There are no arguments for that, although the nicknames assigned to the girl – “Bar-B-Cue_4Eyes_Land Whale” refer to features such as obesity and visual impairment.

The community was established on June 24, 2009 in São Paulo, and has had twenty members since the analysis was conducted. This community, like all the others mentioned, is public, i.e., the owner does not need to authorize the entry of new members, so any user can join the community and answer the polls available (Figure 3).

Unlike the first community, there is no praise for hatred, which is reflected in short answers and less virulent attacks. However, it is still disturbing to observe how poll questions converge around justification for ugliness. They make up a path that is born from innate attributes until they settle down in the moral confirmation of this attribute. In the question “Why do you guys consider her the school’s ugliest??”, answers are directed to the congenital
dimension: “‘Cause she’s a natural-born ugly”; “‘Cause she was already born ugly” or “she’s always been ugly”. In addition, another question – “why are her glasses broken?” – refers to the issue of aspects reinforcing the natural condition, since by prompting participants to look to an unfavorable situation, the economic condition is placed as an ugliness-perpetuating component.

It is still possible to blame the victim by ridiculing her attempt to fix the damaged glasses, according to one of the answers: “Gee her glasses is held with tape”. Added to the description of the girl as fat, this leads us to infer the strengthening of the moralizing interpretation of obese people as sloppy and therefore as beauty antitheses.

Thus, although rudimentary, those lines can produce meanings since they are anchored in social representations of health and beauty. Therefore, they constitute aggression, even though, by virtual means, the psychological consequences to the victim are not usually subject to community knowledge. And specially because attackers, unlike face-to-face or physical bullying (more common among males), do not witness the effects of their harassment (FAUSTINO; OLIVEIRA, 2008).
According to the image above, questions include the request to agree (or disagree) with the statement of the website, collect justifications and identify laughable aspects in the girl’s image.

Interestingly, questions (isn’t the chick ugly?) and answers (poor thing, let her be ugly, no doubt; yeah; sure; totally) show the paradox of a community in the “Schools and students” category using language that is not that (learned language) officially taught in school. Perhaps the desire for subversion expresses itself in writing, although they only create a new code under a more alternative standard. In any case, other standards fit the joking game and it is necessary to master them to join the group.
Regarding collectivism in cyberbullying, in this community, the polls were conducted by someone else (another community member), not by the one who really created and was responsible for the community. This aspect is exemplary to show that the victim is harassed in a collective – or mephitic, according to Rojek – way, and not necessarily by a single attacker. This gregarious dimension of joking is significant both to isolate the victim and to drive the lubricious relations of mephitic sociability. In that, what was supposed to become an attack liable to estrangement and punishment gains shades of sadistic enjoyment. In addition, it is possible that many members sometimes come because of their need to adapt to dominant sociability, thus avoiding the possibility to become the next victim.

In this respect, Lopes Neto (2005) states that the use of aggressive behavior against classmates is seen by many adolescents as the best way to reach popularity; therefore they become bullies, triggering this premise as a rule for social survival. If, as the Latin saying goes, man is a predator of man, since he is the only animal that kills for fun, this dark aspect is channeled in these situations to the point that it turns into a traditional rite on college and military pranks at a later stage of school life.

On the other hand, although these actions express a clear organizational trend between oppressors and oppressed, typical of social reproduction, such dynamics rather than being something naturalized, is a human construction in line with the phenomenon in which the oppressed hosts the oppressor after seeing that subjection relations prevail for so long (Freire, 2003). The very adhesion of young people to those mephitic enjoyments can, notwithstanding their gregarious power, be neutralized given the dual recognition, on the one hand, of the victim’s humanness and, on the other hand, because the electronic joke is not playful to them. Illustrating this analysis, still in the “isn’t the chick ugly??” poll, a response by one of the participants stands out: “nahh I just took part in the community ‘cause my friends asked me to” (Commentary F3Tac). Making use of the same language codes and following the precept of youth sociability when joining a community suggested by friends, subjects
can still say no – better yet, “nahh” – to cyberbullying.

Already approaching our final remarks, the subject’s empowerment to not reproduce those practices also needs to be developed in those who are subjected to harassment, whether virtual, verbal or physical. According to Faustino and Oliveira (2008), the effect of cyberbullying on victims is undetermined since it is usually proportional to the representation they have of themselves. According to Paulo Freire (2003), an empowered person (or group) is able to act autonomously in favor of change.

In this case, the fact that results point to attacks based on body stereotypes begs the question: Which is the contribution of Physical Education to empower students? Although it is seen as a privileged channel for actions, the biggest problem of PE is more serious because traditional pedagogies would not only be inert; they would also foster standards that guide the subsequent disqualification and rejection of subjects whose bodies are marginalized (AZZARITO; SOLMON, 2006). Therefore, it seems that the paradigm shift in Physical Education comes before disciplining models for critical, libertarian or communicative approaches. After all, it is not a question of taking specific actions to repress bullying for three reasons: this phenomenon is merely the “tip of the discrimination iceberg” fueled by stereotypes; “Physical Education classes reproduce the environment that favors them” (OLIVEIRA; VOTRE, p. 173 and 194); and if that behavior is determined by context, repressive action would only mask the causes, besides serving as a subterfuge to counter different student challenges.

It seems that, in the school arena, participatory and co-responsible development of educational programs should be the main action, since it aims to strengthen subjects to face adversity, while punitive and repressive measures have only short effects. Thus, we agree with Farenzena et al. (2011) for whom labeling and criminalizing practices is reductionist “when the multifactor nature of the phenomenon establishes the impossibility of unilateral and focused resolution.”
So, rather than creating punitive and repressive measures that will only channel the mephitic drive to other practices, we believe it is essential to establish a different model of society, which also involves changing pedagogical practices. The very school that nurtures bullying is the locus where the domain of technical rationality spreads with its production of docile and productive bodies instead of constituting emancipated political subjects. In this sense, the allegedly neutral curricular Physical Education is inert and it – uncritically – reproduces control mechanisms of which bullying is a reticent and uncomfortable consequence.

4 Final Considerations

“The headlong stream is termed violent, but the river bed hemming it in is termed violent by no one” (Bertold Brecht).

To conclude the study, we present the following considerations:

The content of the messages we analyzed privileged bodily characteristics as an entry door to derision, though moral aspects of the victims are also evoked, especially in the strongest insults.

It is noteworthy that these communities, being open, expose the victim. Therefore, this aggression exceeds the possible need for catharsis and then it progresses to defamation.

Empirically, the findings have some recurrences. It is worth mentioning that those communities: 1) are located in the Orkut category called “Students and schools”; the case of the virtual communities analyzed are branches of school bullying; 2) there is language (wrong, according to educated rules of Portuguese language) that identifies them as a group (“tribe”); 3) They have contact with the victim, which allows them to obtain her digital photo; 4) They adopt physical traits as their preferred focus of defamation; 5) Members display pictures of them (although the possibility of fake profiles is not ruled out) and make comments in an open community, which then shows the native legitimacy given to this practice (or confidence...
in impunity); 6) Cathartic laughing becomes pleasant and gregarious and may worsen to a situation of sadistic fun, although not all people invited to it express themselves that way.

By treating bullying as a social practice, we do not do an eulogy to it; we rather debate it as a concrete action without any moralistic bias. Because at leisure moments, aggressors occupy their spare time to express their aggression, rejection or intolerance against an individual or a particular stereotype of people through the internet. But this is not an individual deviant behavior, which led us to conclude that it is mephitic leisure, i. e., dysfunctional fun exercised as a group, with unmistakable traces of violence.

In general, such behavior is attributed to gangs (as the case of taggers), denoting an action organized to carry out a playful activity considered bad by society. Therefore, in their complexity, these activities are done in secret, but with an effort to make their results visible to everyone. Since bullying has only recently been classified as inadequate in society, it was still possible to notice it empirically between the times when its actors/authors practiced it publicly in the virtual environment and did so as something deviant, underground.

Although there are preferred profiles for such joking, cyberbullying increases the risk of someone changing between victim, aggressor or witness, or become victim/aggressor. As a result, this activity is part of a diffuse set of powers in which organized and empowered individuals would be, in theory, fitter to resistance.

Given this, the awareness of the consequences of abuse by bullying and/or cyberbullying is complex and difficult to resolve. Generalizations are not welcome and so it is essential that schools treat the problem as it is – with its paradoxes and complexity. Therefore, the educational work must be continuous, prevail over the repressive paradigm, and encourage structural changes in the school’s mission. As a privileged discipline to feel/think playfulness, but not the only one, Physical Education has received attention in anti-bullying programs, especially with special work during school recess. However, that initiative is insufficient and merely compensatory. The
material in communities analyzed shows that praised body standards in the hegemonic strains of the field are used as a reference for joking in cyberbullying. How can PE prove educational against bullying if both have the same ethical and aesthetic bases? When thinking about the developments of these findings in the field of intervention, we reiterate concerns relevant to our professional community regarding deviations that can be strengthened by reified body norms, as we inferred here in relation to derision of bodies in cyberbullying.

As limitations of the study, we selected only cases of Orkut communities based on forms of aggression via cyberbullying, which describe violence beginning at school. We also point out the need to expand the categories of analysis and conduct field studies based on the perspective of the actors involved, comparing them with the representations found in online documents (a specific source for this study). Theoretically, it should also be pointed out that the analysis did not cover reflection on violence produced in society and school and how they affect the objectification of bullying as a free-time activity. In this line, it is also important to increase reflection on bullying and Physical Education as supporting greater subjugation disguised not only as control but also as seduction. Another point worthy of discussion is the role played by the distinct curriculum disciplines in school, regarding the necessary democratization movement of access to computers and the Internet. This debate, however, is still very much focused on technical procedures, and it needs to address the political and ethical dimensions – which would echo in cyberbullying practices.
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